

The assessment of fishery status depends on fish habitats

Christopher J. Brown¹  | Andrew Broadley¹ | Maria F. Adame¹ | Trevor A. Branch² | Mischa P. Turschwell¹ | Rod M. Connolly³

¹Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland, Australia

²School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

³Australian Rivers Institute – Coast and Estuaries, School of Environment and Science, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

Correspondence

Christopher J. Brown, Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Qld, Australia.

Email: chris.brown@griffith.edu.au

Funding information

Australian Research Council, Grant/Award Number: DE160101207; Queensland Government, Australia

Abstract

At the crux of the debate over the global sustainability of fisheries is what society must do to prevent over-exploitation and aid recovery of fisheries that have historically been over-exploited. The focus of debates has been on controlling fishing pressure, and assessments have not considered that stock production may be affected by changes in fish habitat. Fish habitats are being modified by climate change, built infrastructure, destructive fishing practices and pollution. We conceptualize how the classification of stock status can be biased by habitat change. Habitat loss and degradation can result in either overly optimistic or overly conservative assessment of stock status. The classification of stock status depends on how habitat affects fish demography and what reference points management uses to assess status. Nearly half of the 418 stocks in a global stock assessment database use seagrass, mangroves, coral reefs and macroalgae habitats that have well-documented trends. There is also considerable circumstantial evidence that habitat change has contributed to over-exploitation or enhanced production of data-poor fisheries, like inland and subsistence fisheries. Globally many habitats are in decline, so the role of habitat should be considered when assessing the global status of fisheries. New methods and global databases of habitat trends and use of habitats by fishery species are required to properly attribute causes of decline in fisheries and are likely to raise the profile of habitat protection as an important complementary aim for fisheries management.

KEYWORDS

climate change, habitat loss, mangroves, seagrass, stock assessment

1 | INTRODUCTION

Thirty-one per cent of marine fish stocks globally are over-exploited, meaning that their potential productivity is lower than what could be supported if fishing pressure was reduced (FAO, 2016). Given the large number of extinct and threatened freshwater fish species, freshwater fisheries are likely to be faring worse, although incomplete and geographically fragmented data make determinations of the current status of most inland fisheries difficult at present (Welcomme, 2008; Welcomme et al., 2010). Recovering over-exploited fisheries would bring significant economic and social benefits to humanity (Costello et al., 2016). Many

fisheries support the livelihoods of people with few other sources of protein (Hall, Hilborn, Andrew, & Allison, 2013), and income from fisheries can be a major contributor to social well-being in coastal and inland communities (FAO, 2016). In some parts of the world, management regulations have successfully reduced the capacity of fishing fleets and reduced fishing pressure to levels that should enable stock recovery (Bell, Watson, & Ye, 2017; Rosenberg et al., 2017; Worm et al., 2009). To date, the debate over the global status of fish stocks has focussed on overfishing as the primary cause of declines in fish stock production (e.g., Branch, Jensen, Ricard, Ye, & Hilborn, 2011; Pauly, Hilborn, & Branch, 2013; Worm et al., 2009). However, many well-managed fish populations are

not recovering as expected (Neubauer, Jensen, Hutchings, & Baum, 2013; Szuwalski & Thorson, 2017), suggesting other causes have contributed to declines in stock productivity. This contention is supported by evidence that many fish populations are driven by unpredictable regime changes (Vert-pre, Amoroso, Jensen, & Hilborn, 2013) and over time, the productivity of many fish stocks has been declining (Britten, Dowd, & Worm, 2016).

One mechanism for unexplained changes in stock production is alterations in suitable habitat. Globally, marine and freshwater habitats are also facing considerable changes, predominantly degradation and areal loss (e.g., Hamilton & Casey, 2016; Waycott et al., 2009; Welcomme, 2008; Ye et al., 2013), although habitat for some species may be improving and expanding (Brown & Trebilco, 2014; Claisse et al., 2014). Here, we define “fish habitat” as the scenopoetic niche of aquatic species (Hutchinson, 1978), which for a given species is the set of physical, chemical and biological variables that define where an organism lives. The scenopoetic niche is distinguished from the bionomic niche, which is the resources that an organism consumes (Hutchinson, 1978). While there have been global-scale models of the effects of the bionomic niche on the status of fisheries (Christensen et al., 2014), global assessments of fishery status have not accounted for habitat.

There are numerous local examples that show fishery status has been affected by habitat change. For instance, hypoxia and macrophyte loss reduce catches of crustacean (Breitburg, Hondorp, Davias, & Diaz, 2009; Loneragan et al., 2013) and bivalve fisheries (Orth, Luckenbach, Marion, Moore, & Wilcox, 2006); nursery habitat loss limits recruitment of adults to fisheries (Beck et al., 2001; Sundblad, Bergström, Sandström, & Eklöv, 2014); the status of many salmon (Salmonidae) fisheries has been degraded by loss of stream habitat (Gregory & Bisson, 1997); and many of Europe’s major ocean fisheries depend on threatened coastal habitats (Seitz, Wennhage, Bergström, Lipcius, & Ysebaert, 2014). Across many stocks, the types of habitats used by fish populations are an important predictor of their long-term dynamics (Britten et al., 2016; Szuwalski & Thorson, 2017), implicating habitat in unexplained failure to recover. With systematic degradation of fish habitats, global assessments of stock status will overestimate the ability of fisheries management to improve the fish stock status. Surprisingly, given the long history of habitat studies, knowledge of which fisheries species are dependent on threatened habitats is incomplete even for relatively well-studied habitats like mangroves (Lee, 2004; Sheaves, 2017) and fish habitats along Europe’s coasts (Seitz et al., 2014).

Here, we argue that global assessments of fishery status are incomplete and potentially misleading without considering habitat change. First, we review how habitat change affects the population parameters used to determine the status of fisheries. Then, we demonstrate that fisheries reference points are sensitive to habitat change using a simple model that captures the key dynamics in fisheries stock assessments. We then examine habitat use by fisheries stocks listed in the most comprehensive global database of fisheries stock assessments, the RAM Legacy database (Ricard, Minto, Jensen, & Baum, 2012). This database has been used in numerous studies to support global assessments of stock status, relative to historical fishing pressure (Branch et al., 2011; Costello et al., 2012,

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. EFFECTS OF HABITAT CHANGE ON POPULATION DEMOGRAPHY	2
3. MODEL FOR HOW HABITAT CHANGE CAN AFFECT FISHERY STATUS	4
4. GLOBAL TRENDS IN HABITATS AND THE STATUS OF FISHERIES	5
4.1 Stocks in the RAM Legacy database	5
4.2 Unassessed fisheries	6
5. DISCUSSION	8
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11
REFERENCES	11

2016; Hutchings, Minto, Ricard, Baum, & Jensen, 2010; Thorson, Branch, & Jensen, 2012; Worm et al., 2009). If there is evidence that habitat change affects a large proportion of stocks in this database, then habitat change is likely to be a globally significant driver of fisheries status. We also consider trends in other stocks with less data. Finally, because the quantitative consideration of habitat status in global stock reports remains elusive, we suggest avenues for including fish habitats in global stock assessments.

2 | EFFECTS OF HABITAT CHANGE ON POPULATION DEMOGRAPHY

There are numerous mechanisms by which habitat change can affect the demography of fish populations (Vasconcelos, Eggleston, Le Pape, & Tulp, 2013). Here, we describe the eco-physiological processes by which habitat change can affect population parameters under the broad categories of *carrying capacity*, *population growth rate* and *catchability* (Table 1).

The population’s carrying capacity is determined by the strength of intra- and interspecific density dependence and bottlenecks in habitat availability. If increasing availability of certain habitats weakens density dependence, loss of those habitats will reduce the population’s carrying capacity. For instance, survival of salmonid eggs to juvenile stages can be strongly density-dependent due to competition among adults for space to lay eggs (Berghe & Gross, 1989) and competition among newly emerged juveniles (Milner et al., 2003). The available area of appropriate stream habitat will therefore put an upper limit on adult abundance. The strong dependence between habitat area and juvenile production predicts large declines in carrying capacity in many modified catchments, such as a >30% decline in the capacity of river basins in Washington State to produce Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*, Salmonidae) smolt (Beechie, Beamer, & Wasserman, 1994). Carrying capacity may also be affected if habitat is a bottleneck to species progressing through a certain life stage. For instance, abundance of adult perch (*Perca fluviatilis*, Percidae) and pikeperch (*Sander lucioperca*,

TABLE 1 Examples of effects of humans on habitat change and how habitat change may affect demographic parameters and catchability

Parameter	Species	Habitat	Description	Reference
Population growth rates	Bumphead Parrotfish (<i>Bolbometopon muricatum</i> , Scaridae)	Pacific coral reefs	Sedimentation causes loss of recruitment habitat	Hamilton et al. (2017)
Population growth rates	Coral Trout (<i>Plectropomus maculatus</i> , Serranidae) and Stripey Snapper (<i>Lutjanus carponotatus</i> , Lutjanidae)	Great Barrier Reef	Recruits prefer live corals of specific genera and these recruitment hot spots can enhance adult density locally	Wen, Pratchett, Almany, and Jones (2013), Wen, Almany, et al. (2013)
Population growth rates	Barramundi (<i>Lates calcarifer</i> , Latidae)	River, estuaries and floodplain wetlands of northern Australia	Restricted access to floodplain wetlands reduces food availability	Jardine et al. (2012)
Population growth rates	Coho Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> , Salmonidae)	Streams and rivers	Increasing agricultural and urban land use in catchments related to lower rates of recruitment to adult population.	Bradford and Irvine (2000)
Population growth rates	Atlantic Bluefin Tuna (<i>Thunnus thynnus</i> , Scombridae)	Pelagic zone, Gulf of Mexico	Ocean warming predicted to shift suitable habitat for spawning and larvae to earlier in spring	Muhling, Lee, Lamkin, and Liu (2011), Muhling et al. (2017)
Carrying capacity/population growth	Brook Trout (<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i> , Salmonidae)	Lakes (Ontario)	Egg survival determined by competition for spawning sites (density dependent) and habitat quality (density independent)	Blanchfield and Ridgway (2005)
Carrying capacity	Coho Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> , Salmonidae)	Stream and lake beds	Loss of stream and lake habitat for coho eggs and juveniles has likely reduced adult recruitment, because females compete for space to spawn	Beechie et al. (1994), Berghe and Gross (1989)
Carrying capacity	Eurasian Perch (<i>Perca fluviatilis</i> , Percidae), Pikeperch (<i>Sander lucioperca</i> , Percidae)	Nearshore regions with specific biophysical conditions	Availability of habitat for juveniles strongly related to regional adult abundance	Sundblad et al. (2014)
Carrying capacity	King George Whiting (<i>Sillaginodes punctate</i> , Sillaginidae)	Shallow seagrass	Loss of seagrass reduces larval recruitment and feeding opportunities	Connolly, Jenkins, and Loneragan (1999)
Catchability	Brown Shrimp (<i>Farfantepenaeus aztecus</i> , Penaeidae)	Demersal, soft sediment	Hypoxia causes aggregation of shrimp in areas with higher finfish abundance	Craig (2012)
Catchability	Giant Mud Crab (<i>Scylla serrata</i> , Portunidae)	Mangrove-lined estuary	Increased river flow into estuary stimulates migration into fished areas	Loneragan (1999)

Percidae) is higher in regions with greater availability of juvenile nursery habitat (Sundblad et al., 2014). This bottleneck effect may act as a density-independent control on fish carrying capacity if greater habitat availability increases the chance of juveniles finding appropriate nursery habitat. Habitat change may affect the population growth rate if it influences individual growth, survival of individuals at any life stage or spawning production per individual. For instance, the presence of mangroves near to coral reefs can enhance the biomass of fisheries species that live on coral

reefs as adults, because juveniles use mangrove habitat (Mumby et al., 2004). Mangroves have been hypothesized to benefit juvenile fish by providing food for juveniles and by providing shelter from predation (Nagelkerken, 2009). In many cases, the decision of juvenile fish to leave mangroves and migrate to reefs may be balancing a life-history trade-off between survival and growth. For instance, growth of juvenile French Grunt (*Haemulon flavolineatum*, Haemulidae) is slower in mangroves than on reefs, but mortality rates from predation are also lower in mangroves than reefs

(Grol, Nagelkerken, Rypel, & Layman, 2011). Thus, loss of mangrove habitat will affect the ability of French Grunt to balance a life-history trade-off between growth and survival, and ultimately will hinder recruitment to the adult population.

Oceanographic conditions may also define a species' habitat, and changes in oceanographic conditions can affect population growth rates. For instance, spawning of the three bluefin tuna species (*Thunnus maccoyii*, *T. orientalis*, *T. thynnus*, Scombridae) is largely confined to tropical oligotrophic seas during seasons when ocean temperatures are between 22 and 29°C (Muhling et al., 2017). The selected spawning locations may be an adaptation to help larvae avoid predators and competitors (Bakun, 2013; Ciannelli, Bailey, & Olsen, 2014) and ensure that larvae experience optimal temperatures for their growth (Muhling et al., 2017). Bluefin tuna larvae grow faster in warmer waters, and individuals with higher growth rates have higher survival (Muhling et al., 2017). Warmer years predict higher recruitment of juveniles for some tuna stocks, but only within their preferred temperature range, and therefore, tuna recruitment success may be vulnerable to ocean warming (Muhling et al., 2017).

Habitat change may affect the catchability of fish stocks by making fish more or less available to fishers. For instance, hypoxia may cause shrimp and fish to aggregate in a smaller area, thus making them easier to catch (Craig, 2012). Migrations that increase the catchability of fished species can also be tied to physical habitat characteristics. Mud crab (*Scylla serrata*, Portunidae) catch is higher in years of greater summer rainfall, because river flow stimulates downstream movement that may increase their catchability in the lower estuary and bays (Loneragan, 1999). Undetected increases in catchability may lead stock assessments to overestimate biomass and contribute to stock collapse when catch per unit effort is used as an index of biomass (Rose & Kulka, 1999). Catchability changes caused by habitat change may bias the determination of stock status.

The relationship between habitat and demography can be more complex than habitat change affecting a single demographic parameter: There can also be interactions between demographic parameters. The quantity and quality of stream beds for Brook Trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*, Salmonidae) to lay their eggs may affect both the population's carrying capacity and intrinsic population growth rate. Brook trout compete for space to spawn in gravel on stream beds, and superimposition of egg laying results in declines in the rate of survival of eggs as adult density increases (Blanchfield & Ridgway, 2005). Thus, the available area of suitable stream beds affects the Brook Trout's carrying capacity. Different stream beds also vary in their habitat quality; for instance, streams with groundwater seepage have higher egg survival (Blanchfield & Ridgway, 2005). The availability of nesting sites with high groundwater seepage is likely to affect the intrinsic population growth rate.

3 | MODEL FOR HOW HABITAT CHANGE CAN AFFECT FISHERY STATUS

Here, we modify the Schaefer model to demonstrate how undetected changes in habitat could result in incorrect classification of

fishery status. The Schaefer model is the logistic model of population growth with harvesting added. The status of a fishery is determined relative to the reference points of the biomass at maximum sustainable yield (B_{MSY}) and the fishing mortality rate at maximum sustainable yield, F_{MSY} (Mace, 2001). Biomass and biomass reference points are usually estimated using assessment models that are fit to catch-per-unit-effort and fishery-independent survey data. The same models produce estimates of fishing mortality from catch and biomass (exploitation rates are catch divided by biomass). Biomass and fishing mortality can also be estimated from carefully designed mark-recapture studies (Walters & Martell, 2004). The maximum sustainable yield (MSY) is a theoretical value that has traditionally been the basis of management targets, but is now seen as a limit reference point for precautionary fishing, to ensure that biomass should remain above B_{MSY} (Mace, 2001). Here, we analyse how the reference points will be affected by habitat change; however, note that the ongoing monitoring of mortality and biomass may also be biased by habitat change (most famously unaccounted increases in catchability cause overestimation of biomass and contribute to collapse (Rose & Kulka, 1999)).

Fish stocks that grow faster, have higher survival or are more fecund will tend to produce higher MSY values and be exploited at a higher F_{MSY} rate. For biomass-based reference points, a stock is said to be underfished if biomass is well above B_{MSY} , sustainably fished if near B_{MSY} and overfished if biomass is well below B_{MSY} (e.g., Ye et al., 2013). For fishing rates, if fishing mortality rate is greater than F_{MSY} , overfishing is occurring; while if fishing mortality is lower than F_{MSY} , overfishing is not occurring and biomass will tend to increase to B_{MSY} . Stocks are classified as recovering if they are overfished but overfishing is not occurring ($F < F_{MSY}$). Note that under the logistic model, and for age-structured assessments, biomass can increase if fishing mortality is slightly more than F_{MSY} and biomass is below B_{MSY} , because of density-dependent effects (Hilborn, Hively, Jensen, & Branch, 2014).

The reference points are determined by two parameters, the intrinsic rate of population increase (r) and the unfished biomass (B_0), also known as the "carrying capacity" (K) (Table 1). In the logistic model we used in our illustration, B_{MSY} is obtained at 50% of B_0 , but in more complex age-structured stock assessments, B_{MSY} is on average at 40% of B_0 (Thorson, Cope, Branch, & Jensen, 2012). Habitat change could also affect the catchability (q) of a fish stock, which measures the relation between biomass and catch per unit effort (CPUE): biomass = $q \times$ catch/effort. While changes in catchability (q) do not directly affect the reference points, they can bias estimates of fishing mortality rate, because the relationship between fishing effort and fishing mortality (catch/biomass) hinges on the catchability (Walters & Maguire, 1996).

We model three fisheries that are managed using reference points set on \hat{B}_{MSY} , \hat{r} and \hat{q} , where the hat indicates the parameter is an estimate, which initially is set equal to the true values for the population. We run simulations where the true value of one of these parameters at a time changes to represent a change in habitat quality or quantity (see Table 1 for examples). We assumed an exponential

decline of the true population parameters r and B_0 over 50 years to half their initial values and a logistic increase in q to twice its initial value. For each type of habitat decline, we modelled two management scenarios where the manager targets either \hat{B}_{MSY} or \hat{F}_{MSY} . In this way, the assumed (“estimated”) values of parameters slowly diverge from the true values over time. While it is straightforward to solve for the difference between the reference points and their true values at a time, we conduct simulations here to provide a more tangible representation of how stock status would change over time when habitat is dynamic. In simulations, the manager sets fishing mortality to target a reference point, but is slow to respond to changes in stock status (e.g., Brown, Fulton, Possingham, & Richardson, 2012). Thus, fishing mortality at a time becomes (Thorson, Minto, Minte-Vera, Kleisner, & Longo, 2013):

$$F_{t+1} = F_t * (B_t / \hat{B}_{MSY})^x$$

for the scenarios where \hat{B}_{MSY} was a target and

$$F_{t+1} = F_t * (\hat{F}_{MSY} / F_t)^x$$

where \hat{F}_{MSY} was the target. Parameter x controls the rate of response, and we set it to 0.2 here following Thorson et al. (2013). We plot the results of simulations on “Kobe” plots, which are often used to classify the status of multiple stocks on the basis of B_{MSY} and F_{MSY} (e.g., Costello et al., 2016; Worm et al., 2009). Here, we modify the stock status plots so that they represent status relative to the biased estimates of \hat{B}_{MSY} or \hat{F}_{MSY} used by the manager, but we add guidelines for B_{MSY} and F_{MSY} as they would be estimated in the final year of simulation. Changes in catchability did not affect the estimates of the reference points, but we allowed them to cause estimation bias such that the managers assumption for the value of F_t was underestimated if catchability increased. Stocks with regular assessment updates would likely result in estimated values changing over time to become closer to the true values.

We found that the effect of habitat change on stock status depends on how habitat controls population dynamics and which reference point was used in fisheries management. If habitat change affected carrying capacity, then the biomass-based reference points (B_{MSY}) were affected. Halving of the carrying capacity also required a halving of B_{MSY} , so a manager's target of \hat{B}_{MSY} was twice what it should be. If the manager targeted \hat{B}_{MSY} (Figure 1c), the stock was classified as below target levels due to low biomass, but, counter-intuitively, \hat{B}_{MSY} is at $2B_{MSY}$, which is the B_0 . The only way of attaining \hat{B}_{MSY} was thus to set fishing mortality rate to zero, resulting in an economic collapse of the fishery. If the manager targeted \hat{F}_{MSY} (Figure 1d) when the carrying capacity declined, the stock was classified as below the biomass reference point, but on target for the mortality reference point.

If habitat change affected the intrinsic population growth rate, then exploitation rate-based reference points needed to be updated, but the biomass-based reference points remained correct (Figure 1e,f). When management targeted \hat{B}_{MSY} the stock was assessed as being under-exploited in terms of \hat{F}_{MSY} , but was on target for B_{MSY} . If management targeted \hat{F}_{MSY} the stock was classified as underfished, resulting in its eventual extirpation (Figure 1f).

Finally, changes in catchability may cause errors in estimating exploitation rate if they are not accounted for in stock assessment models. If catchability increases, then exploitation rate may be underestimated. Thus, the effect of a catchability change on stock status (Figure 1g,h) was similar to the effect of a decline in the intrinsic population growth rate (Figure 1e,f).

To summarize, if habitat change affects a state parameter (carrying capacity), then biomass-based reference points will be overly conservative and rate-based reference points unaffected. If habitat change affects a rate parameter (r or q), then biomass-based reference points will be unaffected but rate-based reference points overly risky (Figure 2).

4 | GLOBAL TRENDS IN HABITATS AND THE STATUS OF FISHERIES

We reviewed habitat usage by stocks in a global stock assessment database and considered how trends in some key habitats may affect the status of those fisheries. We estimated the proportion of stocks that use threatened habitats. These estimates should be considered an upper limit of habitat dependency, because we followed the practice established by Unsworth, Nordlund, and Cullen-Unsworth (2018) and considered both facultative and obligate use of habitats by fishery species. Then, we consider the effects of trends in stocks without stock assessments and for stocks that use difficult to monitor habitats.

4.1 | Stocks in the RAM Legacy database

We reviewed the habitat usage of 418 marine stocks listed in the most comprehensive global stock assessment database: the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment Database (RAM Legacy; Ricard et al., 2012), available at <http://ramlegacy.org/>. The RAM Legacy database has been widely used to support global-scale stock assessments (e.g., Thorson, Branch, et al., 2012; Worm et al., 2009) and analysis of the drivers of stock dynamics (Szuwalski & Thorson, 2017; Szuwalski, Vert-Pre, Punt, Branch, & Hilborn, 2015; e.g., Vert-pre et al., 2013). The RAM Legacy database has a well-known geographic bias towards temperate regions that have the scientific capacity to conduct stock assessments (Ricard et al., 2012). Several analyses have addressed this bias by creating predictive models of stock status that extrapolate from the RAM Legacy database to unassessed fisheries (Costello et al., 2012; Thorson, Branch, et al., 2012). Therefore, habitat dependencies that exist in the RAM Legacy stocks are also likely to influence the status of fish stocks as estimated in many global assessments of stock status.

The review of fish habitat associations aimed to comprehensively document associations for all species in the RAM Legacy database at all life-history stages (including eggs, larvae, juvenile, adult and spawning). We searched the literature for studies that documented the habitat associations for each species listed in the RAM Legacy database. Fish habitat associations could be documented by direct

observation (e.g., divers), fishery catch in certain habitats, catch surveys in certain habitats and electronic tagging studies. We recorded the depth of observation and habitat type. Habitat was classified whether it was physiochemical (e.g., temperature range for pelagic species) or substrate. Substrate categories included the nonexclusive categories: coral, macroalgae, mangroves, mud, reef, rock, sand, seagrass and soft sediment. In total, 7,156 observations of species' life stages associating with particular habitats were identified in 137 references. In general, it was not reported whether relationships to habitats were facultative or obligate. Further details on this "fishscape" database are available at "<https://github.com/cbrown5/fishscape>" and in the Supporting Information (Table S1).

We focussed on habitats where large-scale regional and global trends have been documented (see Table 2 for a summary of rates and trends). These included nearshore habitats of seagrass (Waycott et al., 2009) and mangroves (Duke et al., 2007; Hamilton & Casey, 2016), tropical coral reefs (De'ath, Fabricius, Sweatman, & Puotinen, 2012; Jackson, Donovan, Cramer, & Lam, 2014; Perry et al., 2013) and macroalgae, specifically kelp (Krumhansl et al., 2016). Seagrass and coral reefs are in decline across a large number of regions (De'ath et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2014; Waycott et al., 2009). Kelp and mangroves show considerable regional variability, with some regions showing increases but a majority showing declines (Hamilton & Casey, 2016; Krumhansl et al., 2016)(Table 2). Regardless of the variability, all these habitats exhibit significant trends that are expected to affect the status of dependent fish stocks.

We found that 49% of species in the RAM Legacy database used habitats that included seagrass, mangroves, tropical reefs and kelp, making up 46% of the catch in 2001 (not all stock assessment time series in the database continue to recent years). Of these major habitat types (not including the other habitats comprising 54% of catch), most species relied on macroalgae, then seagrass. Coral reefs and mangroves were less frequently used, likely reflecting the bias in the RAM Legacy database towards temperate fisheries. Most regions with good assessment coverage had >50% of species associated with threatened habitats (Figure 3), with the exception of the Benguela Current (South-East Atlantic). Global assessments of fisheries status are often conducted on the basis of the Food and Agricultural Organisation's (FAO) major fisheries regions (e.g., Costello et al., 2012; Thorson, Branch, et al., 2012), and we found that >20% of stocks in most FAO regions are associated with one of the globally threatened habitat types.

4.2 | Unassessed fisheries

The RAM Legacy database has some biases and does not have good coverage of small-scale and tropical fisheries; furthermore, it does not include freshwater species, with the exception of diadromous fisheries. However, there is additional evidence that the global status of these data-poor fisheries is likely dependent on habitat. First, small-scale marine fisheries, including artisanal fisheries, subsistence fisheries and recreational fisheries, are often operating in the nearshore coastal zone, where the habitats showing major declines

occur. Because small-scale fisheries are often limited in travel distances, they are typically close to centres of human population, which are also the epicentre of numerous threats to coastal fish habitats, like land-based stressors (Halpern et al., 2009). Threats to fish habitats in the coastal zone include land-based pollution such as increased sediment inputs from cleared land or dredging, which results in turbid waters and causes seagrass die-off (Orth, Carruthers, Dennison, & Williams, 2006); nutrient inputs that can lead to algal blooms and hypoxia (Breitburg et al., 2009); clearing of mangroves for development of fish farms or coastal infrastructure (Duke et al., 2007); coastal armouring (Dethier, Toft, & Shipman, 2016); and developments that modify hydrology (Heery et al., 2017). The limited data available for small-scale fisheries mean that the link between habitat change and changes in fisheries production is poorly established; however, there is strong circumstantial evidence that these fisheries are affected globally by habitat change. For instance, the fisheries operating in seagrass meadows are typically small-scale, but many of the species targeted have a strong dependence on seagrass, so the global decline in the extent of meadows is expected to have impacted these fisheries (Nordlund, Unsworth, Gullström, & Cullen-Unsworth, 2017).

Second, tropical fisheries are not well covered in the RAM Legacy database, but many are predicted to be over-exploited (Costello et al., 2012, 2016). The poor status of tropical fisheries has typically been attributed to their occurrence in regions with poor capacity for management (Melnichuk, Peterson, Elliott, & Hilborn, 2017; Mora et al., 2009). However, there is strong circumstantial evidence that habitat degradation is also an important contributor to the declining status of tropical fisheries. As an example, coastal tropical fisheries are often associated with coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass, which are in decline in many tropical locations. Many fished coral reef species have close associations with their habitats (Graham & Nash, 2013) and support locally important subsistence fisheries (Sale & Hixon, 2015), and reef habitats are threatened by human stressors including dynamite fishing, climate change (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2007) and land-based pollution (Brown et al., 2017; Hamilton et al., 2017). There is regional evidence that fisheries dependent on mangroves, coral reefs and seagrass are also threatened by losses of those habitats (Aburto-Oropeza et al., 2008; Sale & Hixon, 2015; Unsworth & Cullen, 2010).

Finally, numerous local and regional studies have documented strong associations between freshwater fisheries and their habitats, and freshwater habitats are globally threatened by pollution, habitat destruction, barrier construction and water abstraction (Dudgeon et al., 2006; Reis et al., 2017; Vörösmarty et al., 2010). Freshwater ecosystems support globally significant fisheries, and their contribution to global fisheries has likely been underestimated in official statistics (Deines et al., 2017; FAO, 2016). For instance, Lake Victoria (central Africa) once supported an important fishery for indigenous predatory cichlid fish (>100,000 tons per annum (Hecky, Mugidde, Ramlal, Talbot, & Kling, 2010). That fishery has now been largely replaced by harvesting of the introduced Nile Perch (*Lates niloticus*, Latidae). Multiple stressors have been implicated in the transition




FIGURE 1 Stock status plots showing the effects of declines in habitat on the status of a theoretical fish stock. The points show biomass and fishing mortality rate for a theoretical stock over different years, starting in an overfished state (top left quadrant) and moving towards a management target. Darker points are later years. The grey dashed lines show the management reference point if habitat change is not considered, and their intersection represents the theoretical management target for a sustainably fished stock. The black dotted lines show where the reference points would shift to if habitat change was considered in a stock assessment. Arrows show trajectories for stocks that have not reached equilibrium. Simulations are given for: no change in demographic parameters (a, b), a decline in carrying capacity (c, d), a decline in intrinsic population growth rate (e, f) and an increase in catchability (g, h). a, c, e, g show a manager that targets \hat{B}_{MSY} and b, d, f and h show a manager that targets \hat{F}_{MSY}




FIGURE 2 Schematic for how habitat change may affect a hypothetical fish species that has an ontogenetic migration across multiple habitat types. Declines in spawning habitat increase competition among adults for spawning sites and reduce the carrying capacity; declines in refuge habitat decrease survival of juveniles and reduce the intrinsic population growth rate; anoxia causes fish to aggregate and increases their catchability by the fishery. Changes to the fish population's demographic parameters may impact on assessment of the fishery's status in different ways. Images: Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (ian.umces.edu/imagelibrary/)

between these species, but an important contributing factor was run-off of fertilizer that caused eutrophication and an increase in the turbidity of the lake. Turbid conditions gave Nile Perch a competitive advantage over native predators, because they are better adapted to turbid conditions. The domination of Nile Perch in the lake did not coincide with their introduction, but occurred decades later and coincided with eutrophication (Hecky et al., 2010).

A further important impact on freshwater habitats is the construction of barriers including dams and weirs that prevent migration of freshwater fish and also alter habitat by modifying flow regimes (Dudgeon et al., 2006). For instance, dam construction in the state of Maine reduced lake habitat accessible to diadromous fish to <3% by 1900 (Hall, Jordaan, & Frisk, 2011) and dams on the west coast of the United States have contributed to extinctions of nearly 1/3 of Pacific salmon populations (Gustafson et al., 2007). The global trend of increasing stressors on freshwater systems would suggest that the types of ecological changes in fish assemblages that occurred in Lake Victoria may be common to many other freshwater fisheries.

5 | DISCUSSION

We have argued that the global status of fisheries is dependent on trends in aquatic habitats, and thus, habitat change should be considered in global assessments of stock status. Quantifying the dependence of stock status on habitat change is an important objective, because if stocks are strongly dependent on habitat change, fishery management alone will be insufficient to prevent productivity

declines or recover over-exploited fisheries. Habitat gains may also mask poor fishery management. For most fished species, it is unclear how habitat change will affect population demography (Vasconcelos et al., 2013). This gap needs to be filled to enable consideration of habitat change in the global assessment of fisheries. A first step could be to model habitat change as a change in carrying capacity, because this is the typical assumption used in many fisheries models, such as those used to model the spatial effects of fisheries closures on fish catch (Brown et al., 2015; Walters, Hilborn, & Parrish, 2007). However, we found it difficult to identify unambiguous examples of habitat change affecting a stock's carrying capacity and noted many examples where habitat change likely affected a stock's intrinsic population growth or catchability. For instance, it is common to measure density of a species across different habitats, but uncommon and more empirically challenging to measure whether the demographic effects of habitat are density-dependent (Vasconcelos et al., 2013). Habitat change will affect carrying capacity only if survival or reproductive success is density-dependent or if habitat is a bottleneck to progression through a certain life stage. In the absence of detailed information on the habitat-demography link, fisheries models should consider a broader range of processes by which habitat could affect population demography. For instance, evidence we found here for habitat change affecting catchability is concerning, because undetected changes in catchability have led to assessment errors that contributed to major stock collapses (Rose & Kulka, 1999).

The conceptual model suggested that the impact of habitat change on a fishery's status depends on how habitat affects the

TABLE 2 Evidence of global declines in fish habitats and their potential to affect assessments of the status of fisheries. Habitat usage was reviewed for all fish species in the RAM Legacy database (Ricard et al., 2012) (Supporting Information Table S1). Catch data are for 2001, the most recent year with catch data available for all populations

Habitat	Evidence for global habitat change	% of fish species in RAM Legacy that use this habitat	% of catch in RAM Legacy for fish stocks that use this habitat
Seagrass	Global median rate of change—0.9% per year, 58% of reported seagrass sites are declining (Waycott et al., 2009)	23	28
Macroalgae	Kelp declining in 38% of ecoregions, increasing in 27% of ecoregions (Krumhansl et al., 2016)	23.6	24
Mangroves	Global rate of loss of 0.16–0.39% per year, up to 8% in some regions (2000–2012) (Hamilton & Casey, 2016).	4.6	<1
Coral reef	Great Barrier Reef: 0.53% per year decline (1985–2012) (De'ath et al., 2012). Caribbean: 50% decline in carbonate production rates (Perry et al., 2013)	15.2	1.4

stock's demography, whether management of fishing pressure is effective, and the type of reference point used by fisheries management. Habitat loss could drive over-exploitation of an effectively managed fishery, but counter-intuitively it could also cause a well-managed fishery to become more conservative and set annual catch too low, eventually resulting in economic collapse of the fishery even though the stock could in theory support some fishing. Thus, assessments of the effects of habitat change on fisheries must also consider the specific type of management targets a fishery operates on before making recommendations for altered management targets on the basis of habitat change.

It is common to consider environmental change and regime shifts when determining reference points for fisheries on a regional scale. For instance, abundance and recruitment for many fishery species in Alaskan waters, including Pollock (*Theragra chalcogramma*, Gadidae) and King Crab (*Paralithodes* spp., Lithodidae), show pronounced regime shifts (Szuwalski & Hollowed, 2016). Fisheries assessments for these species only use time-series data from the current regime to set baselines for reference points (Szuwalski & Hollowed, 2016). Regime shifts are also evident at global scales; for instance, regime shifts have been detected in about 70% of abundance time series in the RAM Legacy database (Vert-pre et al., 2013). Given the regional importance of environmental change, such drivers should be included in global stock assessments.

While a global assessment that includes habitat is an important goal, we have not conducted such an analysis here because there are several important data gaps that must be filled. There are few databases of sufficient scale that cover trends in fish habitats. Many habitats like deep-sea biogenic habitats and structurally complex sediment habitats have likely been substantially degraded (Clark et al., 2015; Puig et al., 2012), but difficulty in observing these types of habitats means their trends have only been quantified in a few regions. Two advances in technology are creating new opportunities for global-scale synthesis of hard-to-observe habitats. First, models based on meta-analysis of experimental trawling may allow

global estimation of the impacts of trawling on soft-sediment habitats (Hiddink et al., 2017). Second, video monitoring and automated image analysis are enhancing capacity to observe large areas of habitats, particularly in areas that are difficult to survey with conventional methods (e.g., Ferrari et al., 2016).

An important habitat category for which to our knowledge there are no globally comprehensive analyses of trends is the habitats that occur on the soft-sediment and cobble areas of the continental shelves and slopes. It is likely that these habitats have been degraded by trawl fishing over large areas at a globally significant scale (Eigaard et al., 2017; Halpern et al., 2008). For instance, trawling smooths natural complexity in soft sediments, resuspends sediment and thus affects water quality (Puig et al., 2012); trawling also directly damages biogenic habitats like sponge beds (e.g., Watling & Norse, 1998). If degradation of these habitats by trawling was included in our analysis, the per cent of species that associate with degraded habitats would likely rise considerably. Few studies have documented impacts of trawl disturbance on soft-sediment fish habitats, but these effects include both direct long-term negative impacts of trawling on habitats that improve juvenile survival and positive food subsidies to fish because injured or dying fauna are left in the wake of trawling gear (Collie et al., 2017). Soft-sediment regions provide a wide variety of important habitats to numerous fisheries species, but these different habitats vary widely in their resilience to trawl disturbance (Hiddink et al., 2017). Future modelling studies could combine estimates of biogenic habitat resilience with maps of habitat types to estimate the global impact of trawling on biogenic seabed habitats (Hiddink et al., 2017). This information combined with information on fish habitat associates, like that in our Fishscape database, could be used to assess the degree to which trawling impacts on habitats may have affected fishery status at a global scale.

In many regions, time series of fisheries may predate data on habitat change, so it is difficult to determine baselines for habitats. Historical studies that found evidence of habitat change often




FIGURE 3 The Food and Agricultural Administration's major fisheries areas and the per cent of stocks from a global stock assessment database that use the at-risk habitats: tropical corals, seagrass, mangroves or macroalgae [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

report surprising trends in fish habitats that are counter to common beliefs (McCain, Rangeley, Schneider, & Lotze, 2016; Rochette et al., 2010; Shelton et al., 2017). For instance, on the West Coast of the United States, analysis of seagrass area as part of previously unpublished herring (*Clupea pallasii*, Clupeidae) egg surveys unexpectedly revealed no significant long-term trends in seagrass area despite increasing coastal stressors (Shelton et al., 2017). Historical analysis of charts dating back to the 1850s reveals that the Seine estuary may once have provided nursery habitat for up to 25% of the English Channel's Sole (*Solea solea*, Soleidae) population, but habitat degradation has reduced that to a few per cent (Rochette et al., 2010). Similarly, nearshore cod-spawning areas near river outlets have been systematically lost over time, as revealed from historical analysis of cod catches (Ames, 2004).

Even where there are sufficient data on habitats, it can be difficult to detect its effects on fish populations and fisheries. Often, the scale of associations between fish and their habitats is not captured in habitat data, and commonly measured metrics like habitat area maybe a poor indicator of how fish use habitats. Our conceptual model indicated that accurate quantification of stock status requires knowledge of how habitat interacts with population demography, but few studies have quantified how habitat affects demography (Vasconcelos et al., 2013). Such studies are important, because the demographic effects of habitat can be counter-intuitive, such as the slower growth rates of juvenile French Grunt in mangroves, even though mangroves are a preferred habitat (Grol et al., 2011). Further, our estimates for the per cent of fishery species using threatened habitats are maximum values, because it is difficult to determine whether species that are associated with habitats have a facultative or obligate dependence on them (Sheaves, 2017). The challenge of

differentiating between facultative and obligate use of habitat can be met by careful ecological studies that attempt to quantify the many links between habitats and fish life history (Sheaves, 2017).

Finally, multistressors may often hide the effects of habitat loss. For instance, much of Queensland's coastal wetlands that are important fish habitats have been lost or degraded, but there is little evidence that these trends have manifest in catch of wetland-dependent species by coastal fisheries (Sheaves et al., 2014). Eutrophication from nutrient run-off may have offset the effects of habitat loss by enhancing productivity and food availability for fish (Sheaves et al., 2014). Disentangling these multiple cotrending stressors may require direct studies of changes in multiple life-history processes that includes diet composition of adult species, which may benefit from enhanced production and quantifying the relationship between wetland area and survival of juveniles that use wetlands as nurseries (Haas, Rose, Fry, Minello, & Rozas, 2004).

Protection of existing habitats may often be much more effective management practice than attempting to restore lost habitats. Even coastal and shallow water habitats, like seagrass and coral reefs, which are easily accessible, can be prohibitively expensive to restore, and restoration activities often have a high failure rate (Bayraktarov et al., 2016). In many cases, habitat change may also represent a regime shift that is not easily reversible. For instance, once a seagrass meadow is lost, increased sediment resuspension and decreased nutrient processing act as positive feedback loops that prevent reestablishment (Maxwell, Pitt, Olds, Rissik, & Connolly, 2015), even with intensive restoration efforts (Katwijk et al., 2016). There are, however, some highly successful exceptions of habitat restoration improving the status of fisheries, particularly for freshwater fisheries (Louhi, Vehanen, Huusko, Mäki-Petäys, & Muotka,

2016). For instance, dam removal can drastically increase the available habitat for salmon fisheries and be an important determinant of their recovery from historical habitat loss and overfishing (e.g., Burroughs, Hayes, Klomp, Hansen, & Mistak, 2010). The barrier of cost to restoration can be partly overcome if restoration strategically targets areas with the greatest benefit to fisheries production, such as restoring oyster reefs in locations that connect the habitats used by fish across their lifespan (Gilby et al., 2018).

Habitat degradation and loss may not always degrade the productivity of fisheries, so the relationship between habitat and the status of multispecies fisheries can be complex. Insufficient data to attribute the status of individual fisheries directly to habitat change mean we may have missed some important cases where habitat degradation has improved the status of a fishery. Changing habitats can enhance the productivity of some species, potentially supporting new fisheries that may offset lost production from other species (Brown & Trebilco, 2014). For instance, climate change and pollution have degraded many of the world's coral reefs, but it is hypothesized that since degraded reefs can have high algal productivity, they may support productive herbivore fisheries (Brown et al., 2017; Rogers et al., 2015). Artificial habitats, like oil rigs, also have the potential to enhance fisheries production (Claisse et al., 2014). Addressing the role of novel and degraded habitats in supporting productive fisheries is particularly important in regions where people have high dependence on fishing for livelihoods and subsistence, like many places with coral reefs.

Our review shows that a high proportion of stocks use habitats that are well documented to be changing substantially on a global scale. Further, many data-poor stocks likely also have strong dependencies on habitats that are at risk of degradation. Together, these results suggest that reducing fishing pressure is necessary but in many cases not sufficient to recover fish stocks and that global assessments may have overstated the potential for recovery of fish stocks on the basis of improved management of fisheries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CJB was supported by a Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DE160101207) from the Australian Research Council. TAB was supported in part by the Richard C. and Lois M. Worthington Endowed Professor in Fisheries Management. MFA is supported by an Advance Queensland Fellowship from the Queensland Government, Australia.

ORCID

Christopher J. Brown  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7271-4091>

REFERENCES

- Aburto-Oropeza, O., Ezcurra, E., Danemann, G., Valdez, V., Murray, J., & Sala, E. (2008). Mangroves in the Gulf of California increase fishery yields. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 10456–10459. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0804601105>
- Ames, E. P. (2004). Atlantic cod stock structure in the Gulf of Maine. *Fisheries*, 29, 10–28. [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8446\(2004\)29\[10:ACSSIT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8446(2004)29[10:ACSSIT]2.0.CO;2)
- Bakun, A. (2013). Ocean eddies, predator pits and bluefin tuna: Implications of an inferred 'low risk-limited payoff' reproductive scheme of a (former) archetypical top predator. *Fish and Fisheries*, 14, 424–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12002>
- Bayraktarov, E., Saunders, M. I., Abdullah, S., Mills, M., Beher, J., Possingham, H. P., ... Lovelock, C. E. (2016). The cost and feasibility of marine coastal restoration. *Ecological Applications*, 26, 1055–1074. <https://doi.org/10.1890/15-1077>
- Beck, M. W., Heck Jr, K. L., Able, K. W., Childers, D. L., Eggleston, D. B., Gillanders, B. M., ... Weinstein, M. P. (2001). The identification, conservation, and management of estuarine and marine nurseries for fish and invertebrates: A better understanding of the habitats that serve as nurseries for marine species and the factors that create site-specific variability in nursery quality will improve conservation and management of these areas. *BioScience*, 51, 633–641. <https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568>
- Beechie, T., Beamer, E., & Wasserman, L. (1994). Estimating coho salmon rearing habitat and smolt production losses in a large river basin, and implications for habitat restoration. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 14, 797–811. [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8675\(1994\)014<0797:ecsrha>2.3.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8675(1994)014<0797:ecsrha>2.3.co;2)
- Bell, J. D., Watson, R. A., & Ye, Y. (2017). Global fishing capacity and fishing effort from 1950 to 2012. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18, 489–505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12187>
- Berghe, E. P., & Gross, M. R. (1989). Natural selection resulting from female breeding competition in a Pacific salmon (coho: *Oncorhynchus kisutch*). *Evolution*, 43, 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1989.tb04212.x>
- Blanchfield, P. J., & Ridgway, M. S. (2005). The relative influence of breeding competition and habitat quality on female reproductive success in lacustrine brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 62, 2694–2705. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f05-176>
- Bradford, M. J., & Irvine, J. R. (2000). Land use, fishing, climate change, and the decline of Thompson River, British Columbia, coho salmon. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 57, 13–16. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f99-283>
- Branch, T. A., Jensen, O. P., Ricard, D., Ye, Y., & Hilborn, R. (2011). Contrasting global trends in marine fishery status obtained from catches and from stock assessments. *Conservation Biology*, 25, 777–786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01687.x>
- Breitburg, D. L., Hondorp, D. W., Davias, L. A., & Diaz, R. J. (2009). Hypoxia, nitrogen, and fisheries: Integrating effects across local and global landscapes. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 1, 329–349. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163754>
- Britten, G. L., Dowd, M., & Worm, B. (2016). Changing recruitment capacity in global fish stocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 134–139. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1504709112>
- Brown, C., Fulton, E., Possingham, H., & Richardson, A. (2012). How long can fisheries management delay action in response to ecosystem and climate change? *Ecological Applications*, 22, 298–210.
- Brown, C., Jupiter, S., Lin, H., Albert, S., Klein, C., Maina, J., ... Mumby, P. (2017). Habitat change mediates the response of coral reef fish populations to terrestrial run-off. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 576, 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12221>
- Brown, C. J., & Trebilco, R. (2014). Unintended cultivation, shifting base-lines, and conflict between objectives for fisheries and conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 28, 677–688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12267>
- Brown, C. J., White, C., Beger, M., Grantham, H. S., Halpern, B. S., Klein, C. J., ... Possingham, H. P. (2015). Fisheries and biodiversity benefits

- of using static versus dynamic models for designing marine reserve networks. *Ecosphere*, 6, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1890/ES14-00429.1>
- Burroughs, B. A., Hayes, D. B., Klomp, K. D., Hansen, J. F., & Mistak, J. (2010). The effects of the Stronach Dam removal on fish in the Pine River, Manistee County, Michigan. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 139, 1595–1613. <https://doi.org/10.1577/t09-056.1>
- Christensen, V., Coll, M., Piroddi, C., Steenbeek, J., Buszowski, J., & Pauly, D. (2014). A century of fish biomass decline in the ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 512, 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps10946>
- Ciannelli, L., Bailey, K., & Olsen, E. M. (2014). Evolutionary and ecological constraints of fish spawning habitats. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 72, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu145>
- Claissie, J. T., Pondella, D. J., Love, M., Zahn, L. A., Williams, C. M., Williams, J. P., & Bull, A. S. (2014). Oil platforms off California are among the most productive marine fish habitats globally. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111, 15462–15467. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411477111>
- Clark, M. R., Althaus, F., Schlacher, T. A., Williams, A., Bowden, D. A., & Rowden, A. A. (2015). The impacts of deep-sea fisheries on benthic communities: A review. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 73, i51–i69. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv123>
- Collie, J., Hiddink, J. G., van Kooten, T., Rijnsdorp, A. D., Kaiser, M. J., Jennings, S., & Hilborn, R. (2017). Indirect effects of bottom fishing on the productivity of marine fish. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18, 619–637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12193>
- Connolly, R. M., Jenkins, G., & Loneragan, N. (1999). Links between seagrass dynamics and fisheries sustainability. In A. J. Butler, & P. Jernakoff (Eds.), *Seagrass in Australia* (pp. 36–68). Canberra, Australia: CSIRO Marine Research.
- Costello, C., Ovando, D., Clavelle, T., Strauss, C. K., Hilborn, R., Melnychuk, M. C., ... Leland, A. (2016). Global fishery prospects under contrasting management regimes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 5125–5129. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1520420113>
- Costello, C., Ovando, D., Hilborn, R., Gaines, S. D., Deschenes, O., & Lester, S. E. (2012). Status and solutions for the world's unassessed fisheries. *Science*, 338, 517–520. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1223389>
- Craig, J. K. (2012). Aggregation on the edge: Effects of hypoxia avoidance on the spatial distribution of brown shrimp and demersal fishes in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 445, 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09437>
- De'ath, G., Fabricius, K. E., Sweatman, H., & Puotinen, M. (2012). The 27-year decline of coral cover on the Great Barrier Reef and its causes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 17995–17999. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1208909109>
- Deines, A. M., Bunnell, D. B., Rogers, M. W., Bennion, D., Woelmer, W., Sayers, M. J., ... Beard, T. D. (2017). The contribution of lakes to global inland fisheries harvest. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 15, 293–298. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1503>, doi:10.1002/fee.1503
- Dethier, M. N., Toft, J. D., & Shipman, H. (2016). Shoreline armoring in an inland sea: Science-based recommendations for policy implementation. *Conservation Letters*, 10, 626–633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12323>, doi:10.1111/conl.12323
- Dudgeon, D., Arthington, A. H., Gessner, M. O., Kawabata, Z.-I., Knowler, D. J., L ev eque, C., ... Sullivan, C. A. (2006). Freshwater biodiversity: Importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. *Biological Reviews*, 81, 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793105006950>
- Duke, N. C., Meynecke, J.-O., Dittmann, S., Ellison, A. M., Anger, K., Berger, U., ... Dahdouh-Guebas, F. (2007). A world without mangroves? *Science*, 317, 41–42. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.317.5834.41b>
- Eigaard, O. R., Bastardie, F., Hintzen, N. T., Buhl-Mortensen, L., Buhl-Mortensen, P., Catarino, R., ... Rijnsdorp, A. D. (2017). The footprint of bottom trawling in European waters: Distribution, intensity, and seabed integrity. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 74, 847–865. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw194>
- FAO (2016). *The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2016*. 200.
- Ferrari, R., McKinnon, D., He, H., Smith, R., Corke, P., González-Rivero, M., ... Upcroft, B. (2016). Quantifying multiscale habitat structural complexity: A cost-effective framework for underwater 3D modelling. *Remote Sensing*, 8, 113. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8020113>
- Gilby, B. L., Olds, A. D., Peterson, C. H., Connolly, R. M., Voss, C. M., Bishop, M. J., ... Schlacher, T. A. (2018). Maximizing the benefits of oyster reef restoration for finfish and their fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12301>
- Graham, N., & Nash, K. (2013). The importance of structural complexity in coral reef ecosystems. *Coral Reefs*, 32, 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-012-0984-y>
- Gregory, S. V., & Bisson, P. A. (1997). Degradation and loss of anadromous salmonid habitat in the Pacific Northwest. In D. J. Stouder, P. A. Bisson, & R. J. Naiman (Eds.), *Pacific salmon & their ecosystems* (pp. 277–314). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Grol, M. G., Nagelkerken, I., Rypel, A. L., & Layman, C. A. (2011). Simple ecological trade-offs give rise to emergent cross-ecosystem distributions of a coral reef fish. *Oecologia*, 165, 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1833-8>
- Gustafson, R. G., Waples, R. S., Myers, J. M., Weitkamp, L. A., Bryant, G. J., Johnson, O. W., & Hard, J. J. (2007). Pacific salmon extinctions: Quantifying lost and remaining diversity. *Conservation Biology*, 21, 1009–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00693.x>
- Haas, H. L., Rose, K. A., Fry, B., Minello, T. J., & Rozas, L. P. (2004). Brown Shrimp on the edge: Linking habitat to survival using an individual-based simulation model. *Ecological Applications*, 14, 1232–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1890/03-5101>
- Hall, S. J., Hilborn, R., Andrew, N. L., & Allison, E. H. (2013). Innovations in capture fisheries are an imperative for nutrition security in the developing world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110, 8393–8398. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1208067110>
- Hall, C. J., Jordaan, A., & Frisk, M. G. (2011). The historic influence of dams on diadromous fish habitat with a focus on river herring and hydrologic longitudinal connectivity. *Landscape Ecology*, 26, 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-010-9539-1>
- Halpern, B. S., Ebert, C. M., Kappel, C. V., Madin, E. M. P., Micheli, F., Perry, M., ... Walbridge, S. (2009). Global priority areas for incorporating land-sea connections in marine conservation. *Conservation Letters*, 2, 189–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2009.00060.x>
- Halpern, B. S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K. A., Kappel, C. V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., ... Watson, R. (2008). A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science*, 319, 948–952. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1149345>
- Hamilton, R. J., Almany, G. R., Brown, C. J., Pita, J., Peterson, N. A., & Choat, J. H. (2017). Logging degrades nursery habitat for an iconic coral reef fish. *Biological Conservation*, 210, 273–280.
- Hamilton, S. E., & Casey, D. (2016). Creation of a high spatio-temporal resolution global database of continuous mangrove forest cover for the 21st century (CGMFC-21). *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 25, 729–738. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12449>
- Hecky, R. E., Mugidde, R., Ramlal, P. S., Talbot, M. R., & Kling, G. W. (2010). Multiple stressors cause rapid ecosystem change in Lake Victoria. *Freshwater Biology*, 55, 19–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02374.x> [In English].
- Heery, E. C., Bishop, M. J., Critchley, L. P., Bugnot, A. B., Airoidi, L., Mayer-Pinto, M., ... Dafforn, K. A. (2017). Identifying the consequences of ocean sprawl for sedimentary habitats. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 492, 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2017.01.020>
- Hiddink, J. G., Jennings, S., Sciberras, M., Szostek, C. L., Hughes, K. M., Ellis, N., ... Kaiser, M. J. (2017). Global analysis of depletion and recovery of seabed biota after bottom trawling disturbance. *Proceedings*

- of the National Academy of Sciences, 114, 8301–8306. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618858114>
- Hilborn, R., Hively, D. J., Jensen, O. P., & Branch, T. A. (2014). The dynamics of fish populations at low abundance and prospects for rebuilding and recovery. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 2141–2151. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu035>
- Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Mumby, P. J., Hooten, A. J., Steneck, R. S., Greenfield, P., Gomez, E., ... Hatzioiols, M. E. (2007). Coral reefs under rapid climate change and ocean acidification. *Science*, 318, 1737–1742. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1152509>
- Hutchings, J. A., Minto, C., Ricard, D., Baum, J. K., & Jensen, O. P. (2010). Trends in the abundance of marine fishes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 67, 1205–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f10-081>
- Hutchinson, G. E. (1978). *An introduction to population biology*, 1st ed.. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jackson, J., Donovan, M., Cramer, K., & Lam, V. (2014). *Status and trends of Caribbean coral reefs 1970–2012*, 1st ed.. Washington, DC: Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network.
- Jardine, T. D., Pusey, B. J., Hamilton, S. K., Pettit, N. E., Davies, P. M., Douglas, M. M., ... Bunn, S. E. (2012). Fish mediate high food web connectivity in the lower reaches of a tropical floodplain river. *Oecologia*, 168, 829–838. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-011-2148-0>
- Katwijk, M. M., Thorhaug, A., Marbà, N., Orth, R. J., Duarte, C. M., Kendrick, G. A., ... Verduin, J. J. (2016). Global analysis of seagrass restoration: The importance of large-scale planting. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 53, 567–578. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12562>
- Krumhansl, K. A., Okamoto, D. K., Rassweiler, A., Novak, M., Bolton, J. J., Cavanaugh, K. C., ... Byrnes, J. E. (2016). Global patterns of kelp forest change over the past half-century. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 13785–13790. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1606102113>
- Lee, S. Y. (2004). Relationship between mangrove abundance and tropical prawn production: A re-evaluation. *Marine Biology*, 145, 943–949. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-004-1385-8>
- Loneragan, N. R. (1999). River flows and estuarine ecosystems: Implications for coastal fisheries from a review and a case study of the Logan River, southeast Queensland. *Austral Ecology*, 24, 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-9993.1999.00975.x>
- Loneragan, N., Kangas, M., Haywood, M., Kenyon, R., Caputi, N., & Sporer, E. (2013). Impact of cyclones and aquatic macrophytes on recruitment and landings of tiger prawns *Penaeus esculentus* in Exmouth Gulf, Western Australia. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 127, 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2013.03.024>
- Louhi, P., Vehanen, T., Huusko, A., Mäki-Petäys, A., & Muotka, T. (2016). Long-term monitoring reveals the success of salmonid habitat restoration. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 73, 1733–1741. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2015-0546>
- Mace, P. M. (2001). A new role for MSY in single-species and ecosystem approaches to fisheries stock assessment and management. *Fish and Fisheries*, 2, 2–32. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-2979.2001.00033.x>
- Maxwell, P. S., Pitt, K. A., Olds, A. D., Rissik, D., & Connolly, R. M. (2015). Identifying habitats at risk: Simple models can reveal complex ecosystem dynamics. *Ecological Applications*, 25, 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.1890/14-0395.1>
- McCain, J. S. P., Rangeley, R. W., Schneider, D. C., & Lotze, H. K. (2016). Historical abundance of juvenile commercial fish in coastal habitats: Implications for fish habitat management in Canada. *Marine Policy*, 73, 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.08.009>
- Melnichuk, M. C., Peterson, E., Elliott, M., & Hilborn, R. (2017). Fisheries management impacts on target species status. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114, 178–183. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1609915114>
- Milner, N., Elliott, J., Armstrong, J., Gardiner, R., Welton, J., & Ladle, M. (2003). The natural control of salmon and trout populations in streams. *Fisheries Research*, 62, 111–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-7836\(02\)00157-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-7836(02)00157-1)
- Mora, C., Myers, R., Coll, M., Libralato, S., Pitcher, T., Sumaila, R., ... Worm, B. (2009). Management effectiveness of the world's marine fisheries. *PLoS Biology*, 7, e1000131. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000131>
- Muhling, B. A., Lamkin, J. T., Alemany, F., García, A., Farley, J., Ingram, G. W., ... Carrion, R. L. (2017). Reproduction and larval biology in tunas, and the importance of restricted area spawning grounds. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 27, 697–732. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-017-9471-4>
- Muhling, B. A., Lee, S.-K., Lamkin, J. T., & Liu, Y. (2011). Predicting the effects of climate change on bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) spawning habitat in the Gulf of Mexico. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 68, 1051–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsr008>
- Mumby, P. J., Edwards, A. J., Ernesto Arias-González, J., Lindeman, K. C., Blackwell, P. G., Gall, A., ... Llewellyn, G. (2004). Mangroves enhance the biomass of coral reef fish communities in the Caribbean. *Nature*, 427, 533–536. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02286>
- Nagelkerken, I. (2009). Evaluation of nursery function of mangroves and seagrass beds for tropical decapods and reef fishes: Patterns and underlying mechanisms. In I. Nagelkerken (Ed.), *Ecological connectivity among tropical coastal ecosystems* (pp. 357–399). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Neubauer, P., Jensen, O. P., Hutchings, J. A., & Baum, J. K. (2013). Resilience and recovery of overexploited marine populations. *Science*, 340, 347–349. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230441>
- Nordlund, L. M., Unsworth, R. K., Gullström, M., & Cullen-Unsworth, L. C. (2017). Global significance of seagrass fishery activity. *Fish and Fisheries*, 19, 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12259>
- Orth, R. J., Carruthers, T. J., Dennison, W. C., & Williams, S. (2006). A global crisis for seagrass ecosystems. *AIBS Bulletin*, 56, 987–996. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2006\)56\[987:AGCFSE\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2006)56[987:AGCFSE]2.0.CO;2)
- Orth, R. J., Luckenbach, M. L., Marion, S. R., Moore, K. A., & Wilcox, D. J. (2006). Seagrass recovery in the Delmarva coastal bays, USA. *Aquatic Botany*, 84, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2005.07.007>
- Pauly, D., Hilborn, R., & Branch, T. A. (2013). Fisheries: Does catch reflect abundance? *Nature*, 494, 303–306. <https://doi.org/10.1038/494303a>
- Perry, C. T., Murphy, G. N., Kench, P. S., Smithers, S. G., Edinger, E. N., Steneck, R. S., & Mumby, P. J. (2013). Caribbean-wide decline in carbonate production threatens coral reef growth. *Nature Communications*, 4, 1402. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2409>
- Puig, P., Canals, M., Company, J. B., Martín, J., Amblas, D., Lastras, G., ... Calafat, A. M. (2012). Ploughing the deep sea floor. *Nature*, 489, 286. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11410>
- Reis, V., Hermoso, V., Hamilton, S. K., Ward, D., Fluet-Chouinard, E., Lehner, B., & Linke, S. (2017). A global assessment of inland wetland conservation status. *BioScience*, 67, 523–533. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix045>
- Ricard, D., Minto, C., Jensen, O. P., & Baum, J. K. (2012). Examining the knowledge base and status of commercially exploited marine species with the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment Database. *Fish and Fisheries*, 13, 380–398. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00435.x>
- Rochette, S., Rivot, E., Morin, J., Mackinson, S., Riou, P., & Le Pape, O. (2010). Effect of nursery habitat degradation on flatfish population: Application to Solea solea in the Eastern Channel (Western Europe). *Journal of Sea Research*, 64, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2009.08.003>
- Rogers, A., Harborne, A. R., Brown, C. J., Bozec, Y.-M., Castro, C., Chollett, I., ... Mumby, P. J. (2015). Anticipative management for coral reef ecosystem services in the 21st century. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 504–514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12725>
- Rose, G., & Kulka, D. (1999). Hyperaggregation of fish and fisheries: How catch-per-unit-effort increased as the northern cod (*Gadus morhua*)

- declined. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 56, 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f99-207>
- Rosenberg, A. A., Kleisner, K. M., Afflerbach, J., Anderson, S. C., Dickey-Collas, M., Cooper, A. B., ... Ye, Y. (2017). Applying a new ensemble approach to estimating stock status of marine fisheries around the world. *Conservation Letters*, 11(1), e12363. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12363>
- Sale, P. F., & Hixon, M. A. (2015). Addressing the global decline in coral reefs and forthcoming impacts on fishery yields. In S. A. Bortone (Ed.), *Interrelationships between corals and fisheries* (pp. 7–18). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Seitz, R. D., Wennhage, H., Bergström, U., Lipcius, R. N., & Ysebaert, T. (2014). Ecological value of coastal habitats for commercially and ecologically important species. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 648–665. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst152>
- Sheaves, M. (2017). How many fish use mangroves? The 75% rule an ill-defined and poorly validated concept. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18(4), 778–789. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12213>
- Sheaves, M., Brookes, J., Coles, R., Freckelton, M., Groves, P., Johnston, R., & Winberg, P. (2014). Repair and revitalisation of Australia's tropical estuaries and coastal wetlands: Opportunities and constraints for the reinstatement of lost function and productivity. *Marine Policy*, 47, 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.01.024>
- Shelton, A. O., Francis, T. B., Feist, B. E., Williams, G. D., Lindquist, A., & Levin, P. S. (2017). Forty years of seagrass population stability and resilience in an urbanizing estuary. *Journal of Ecology*, 105, 458–470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12682>
- Sundblad, G., Bergström, U., Sandström, A., & Eklöv, P. (2014). Nursery habitat availability limits adult stock sizes of predatory coastal fish. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 672–680. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst056>
- Szuwalski, C. S., & Hollowed, A. B. (2016). Climate change and non-stationary population processes in fisheries management. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 73, 1297–1305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv229>
- Szuwalski, C. S., & Thorson, J. T. (2017). Global fishery dynamics are poorly predicted by classical models. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18(6), 1085–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12226>
- Szuwalski, C. S., Vert-Pre, K. A., Punt, A. E., Branch, T. A., & Hilborn, R. (2015). Examining common assumptions about recruitment: A meta-analysis of recruitment dynamics for worldwide marine fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 16, 633–648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12083>
- Thorson, J. T., Branch, T. A., & Jensen, O. P. (2012). Using model-based inference to evaluate global fisheries status from landings, location, and life history data. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 69, 645–655. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f2012-016>
- Thorson, J. T., Cope, J. M., Branch, T. A., & Jensen, O. P. (2012). Spawning biomass reference points for exploited marine fishes, incorporating taxonomic and body size information. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 69, 1556–1568. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f2012-077>
- Thorson, J. T., Minto, C., Minto-Vera, C. V., Kleisner, K. M., & Longo, C. (2013). A new role for effort dynamics in the theory of harvested populations and data-poor stock assessment. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 70, 1829–1844. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2013-0280>
- Unsworth, R. K., & Cullen, L. C. (2010). Recognising the necessity for Indo-Pacific seagrass conservation. *Conservation Letters*, 3, 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263x.2010.00101.x>
- Unsworth, R. K., Nordlund, L. M., & Cullen-Unsworth, L. C. (2018). Seagrass meadows support global fisheries production. *Conservation Letters*, e12566. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12566>
- Vasconcelos, R. P., Eggleston, D. B., Le Pape, O., & Tulp, I. (2013). Patterns and processes of habitat-specific demographic variability in exploited marine species. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 638–647. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst136>
- Vert-pre, K. A., Amoroso, R. O., Jensen, O. P., & Hilborn, R. (2013). Frequency and intensity of productivity regime shifts in marine fish stocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110, 1779–1784. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1214879110>
- Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., ... Davies, P. M. (2010). Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity. *Nature*, 467, 555. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09440>
- Walters, C. J., Hilborn, R., & Parrish, R. (2007). An equilibrium model for predicting the efficacy of marine protected areas in coastal environments. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 64, 1009–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f07-072>
- Walters, C., & Maguire, J.-J. (1996). Lessons for stock assessment from the northern cod collapse. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 6, 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00182340>
- Walters, C. J., & Martell, S. J. (2004). *Fisheries ecology and management*. Princeton, NJ: University Press.
- Watling, L., & Norse, E. A. (1998). Disturbance of the seabed by mobile fishing gear: A comparison to forest clearcutting. *Conservation Biology*, 12, 1180–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1998.0120061180.x>
- Waycott, M., Duarte, C. M., Carruthers, T. J. B., Orth, R. J., Dennison, W. C., Olyarnik, S., ... Williams, S. L. (2009). Accelerating loss of seagrasses across the globe threatens coastal ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 12377–12381. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0905620106>
- Welcome, R. (2008). World prospects for floodplain fisheries. *Ecology & Hydrobiology*, 8, 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10104-009-0013-0>
- Welcome, R. L., Cowx, I. G., Coates, D., Bene, C., Funge-Smith, S., Halls, A., & Lorenzen, K. (2010). Inland capture fisheries. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 365, 2881–2896. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0168>
- Wen, C. K. C., Almany, G. R., Williamson, D. H., Pratchett, M. S., Mannerling, T. D., Evans, R. D., ... Jones, G. P. (2013b). Recruitment hotspots boost the effectiveness of no-take marine reserves. *Biological Conservation*, 166, 124–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.06.017s>
- Wen, C., Pratchett, M., Almany, G., & Jones, G. (2013a). Patterns of recruitment and microhabitat associations for three predatory coral reef fishes on the southern Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Coral Reefs*, 32, 389–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-012-0985-x>
- Worm, B., Hilborn, R., Baum, J. K., Branch, T. A., Collie, J. S., Costello, C., ... Zeller, D. (2009). Rebuilding global fisheries. *Science*, 325, 578–585. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1173146>
- Ye, Y., Cochrane, K., Bianchi, G., Willmann, R., Majkowski, J., Tandstad, M., & Carocci, F. (2013). Rebuilding global fisheries: The World Summit Goal, costs and benefits. *Fish and Fisheries*, 14, 174–185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2012.00460.x>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: Brown CJ, Broadley A, Adame MF, Branch TA, Turschwell MP, Connolly RM. The assessment of fishery status depends on fish habitats. *Fish Fish*. 2019;20: 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12318>