1	Title:
2	Comparing predictions of fisheries bycatch using multiple spatiotemporal species distribution
3	model frameworks
4	
5	Authors and affiliations:
6	Brian C. Stock ^{1*} , Eric J. Ward ² , Tomoharu Eguchi ³ , Jason E. Jannot ⁴ , James T. Thorson ⁴ , Blake
7	E. Feist ² , Brice X. Semmens ¹
8	
9	*Corresponding: Brian Stock, b1stock@ucsd.edu, +1 425-919-7879
10	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UCSD
11	9500 Gilman Drive, mail code 0202
12	La Jolla, CA 92093
13	¹ Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California
14	92093 USA, b1stock@ucsd.edu, bsemmens@ucsd.edu
15	² Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries
16	Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, 2725 Montlake Blvd E,
17	Seattle, WA 98112 USA, eric.ward@noaa.gov, blake.feist@noaa.gov
18	³ Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and
19	Atmospheric Administration, 8901 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037 USA,
20	tomo.eguchi@noaa.gov
21	⁴ Fisheries Resource Assessment and Monitoring Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center,
22	National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, WA
23	98112 USA, jason.jannot@noaa.gov, james.thorson@noaa.gov
24	

Page 1

25 Abstract

Spatiotemporal predictions of bycatch (i.e. catch of non-targeted species) have shown promise as 26 27 dynamic ocean management tools for reducing bycatch. However, which spatiotemporal model 28 framework to use for generating these predictions is unclear. We evaluated a relatively new 29 method, Gaussian Markov random fields (GMRFs), with two other frameworks, generalized 30 additive models (GAMs) and random forests. We fit geostatistical delta-models to fisheries 31 observer by catch data for six species with a broad range of movement patterns (e.g. highly 32 migratory sea turtles vs. sedentary rockfish) and bycatch rates (percent of observations with non-33 zero catch, 0.3-96.2%). Random forests had better interpolation performance than the GMRF and 34 GAM models for all six species, but random forests performance was more sensitive when 35 predicting data at the edge of the fishery (i.e. spatial extrapolation). Using random forests to 36 identify and remove the 5% highest bycatch risk fishing events reduced the bycatch-to-target 37 species catch ratio by 34% on average. All models considerably reduced the bycatch-to-target 38 ratio, demonstrating the clear potential of species distribution models to support spatial fishery 39 management.

40

41 Keywords: fisheries bycatch, dynamic ocean management, spatiotemporal model, species
42 distribution model, GAM (generalized additive model), GMRF (Gaussian Markov random field),
43 INLA (integrated nested Laplace approximations), random forest, Hawaii longline fishery, U.S.
44 West Coast groundfish fishery

45

46 Introduction

Bycatch—catch of non-targeted species—occurs in nearly every commercial and recreational 47 fishery, and in many cases is a serious environmental and economic problem (Alverson et al. 48 49 1994; Davies et al. 2009; NMFS 2016). For high-profile protected species such as loggerhead sea 50 turtles (*Caretta caretta*), even extremely low bycatch rates can result in population impacts and 51 fisheries closures (Howell et al. 2015). Some species sustain highly valuable targeted fisheries 52 but are considered by catch in others, resulting in litigation and economic losses (e.g. chinook 53 salmon bycatch in the Alaska pollock fishery, Ianelli and Stram 2015). Bycatch of undesired and 54 unprotected species is also concerning because it reduces fishing efficiency and threatens 55 ecosystem biodiversity (Boyce 1996; FAO 1995; Kelleher 2005). Thus, for a variety of reasons, 56 the fishing community is interested in tools to reduce bycatch.

57 One such tool are maps of relative by catch risk (e.g. probability or density) produced by species distribution models (SDMs). SDMs have seen rapid development in the last decade to 58 59 meet critical conservation and resource management needs to understand how species 60 distributions change in time and space (Parmesan and Yohe 2003; Sumaila et al. 2011; Pinsky et 61 al. 2013). Accordingly, there is now a wide range of SDMs available to ecologists and fisheries 62 scientists for fitting data on species presence/absence and abundance (Phillips et al. 2006; Illian 63 et al. 2013; Conn et al. 2015; Golding and Purse 2016). SDMs have shown promise as tools for 64 dynamic ocean management (DOM), which adapts to changing biological, oceanographic, or 65 economic conditions faster than traditional, static, time and area closures (Breivik et al. 2016; 66 Dunn et al. 2016; Eguchi et al. 2017; Hazen et al. 2016; Howell et al. 2008, 2015; Lewison et al. 67 2015). It is not clear, however, what SDM framework is most appropriate to use to support such 68 tools. Further, because by catch species vary from commonly to rarely caught, by catch datasets

offer a wide range of occurrence rates and densities. Thus, in addition to providing guidance for
spatial bycatch management, large bycatch datasets are excellent testbeds for evaluating SDM

71 performance more generally.

72 Species distribution models (SDMs)

SDMs can be coarsely divided into parametric, semiparametric, and nonparametric
approaches. Generalized linear models (GLMs) are one of the simplest parametric approaches
used to understand species distributions and their relationships with biotic and abiotic covariates
(Venables and Dichmont 2004). GLMs predict the response variable, *Y_i* (species
presence/absence or abundance at location *i*), by specifying a probability distribution and link

78 function:

79 $Y_i \sim \text{distribution with mean } \mu_i, \quad g(\mu_i) = \eta_i,$

80 with linear predictor

81

$$\eta_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta},\tag{1}$$

82 where X_i is a vector of covariate values for location *i*, and β is a vector of coefficients to be 83 estimated. GLMs can permit nonlinear relationships between the covariates and response by including transformations of the covariates, e.g. polynomial terms $\eta_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_{1i} + \beta_2 \mathbf{X}_{1i}^2 + \beta_2 \mathbf{X}_{1i}^2$ 84 $\beta_3 X_{1i}^3 + \cdots$, or by discretizing continuous covariates and treating them as categorical variables. 85 86 Generalized additive models (GAMs) extend the GLM framework by allowing the linear 87 predictor to include smooth functions of the covariates (Guisan and Thuiller 2005; Wood 2017). 88 GAMs are often referred to as semiparametric, since the smoothers do not have a specified 89 functional form but do have associated parameters that are estimated using penalized likelihood (Wood 2011; Guélat and Kéry 2018). The ability of GAMs to incorporate complex, non-linear 90 91 covariate effects, as well as improvements to computing power and software, has led to their

92 wide adoption in fisheries and ecology in the last decade (Becker et al. 2014; Leathwick et al.

- 93 2006; Li and Pan 2011; Watson et al. 2009). Extending the linear predictor in Equation 1 to
- 94 include a 2-dimensional spline, f(), on the geographical coordinates of location i, s_i , specifies a 95 GAM:
- 96

$$\eta_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + f(\mathbf{s}_i). \tag{2}$$

97 Equation 2 is estimated by penalized likelihood maximization, which balances smoothness and 98 fit to the data by penalizing the curvature (i.e. integral of the squared second derivative) of $f(\mathbf{s_i})$ 99 (Wood 2017). Kammann and Wand (2003) refer to Equation 2 as a 'geoadditive' model, and have 100 shown that this is mathematically equivalent to explicitly modeling spatial correlation with 101 random effects, **u**:

102

$$\eta_i = (\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{u})_i \tag{3}$$

103 (Diggle et al. 1998; Kneib et al. 2008; Péron et al. 2011; Fahrmeir et al. 2013; Guélat and Kéry
104 2018). When the spatial random effects are assumed to follow a zero-mean multivariate normal
105 distribution, Equation 3 can be written as:

106
$$\eta_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{s}_i), \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{s}) \sim \text{MVN}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}),$$
(4)

107 where ε is a Gaussian field (Kneib et al. 2008). Analogous to how the curvature of the spline is 108 penalized when estimating the GAM, the correlation function that defines Σ acts as a penalized 109 spatial smoother in the Gaussian field model—nearby locations are more highly correlated, and 110 thus more smoothed, than distant locations (Fahrmeir et al. 2013). Gaussian fields are attractive 111 because they directly model spatial correlation, but applications have historically been limited to 112 smaller datasets because inverting the covariance matrix, Σ , makes them computationally intense 113 (Lindgren et al. 2011). In summary, both the GAM and Gaussian field model account for spatial 114 autocorrelation not explained by environmental covariates, are semiparametric, mathematically

115 equivalent, and typically fit using penalized likelihood that optimizes spatial smoothing.

116 Gaussian fields are defined in continuous space but can be approximated by discrete Gaussian Markov random fields (GMRFs, Lindgren et al. 2011). GMRFs have increasingly been 117 used to model species distributions as advances in computing power and software 118 119 implementation have allowed ecologists to apply them to large datasets. Among other 120 advantages, the GMRF approach can be implemented by integrated nested Laplace approximation, which is faster than other methods of Bayesian inference (i.e. Markov chain 121 122 Monte Carlo) and allow GMRF approximations of Gaussian fields to be computationally feasible 123 (Rue et al. 2009). GMRF models have shown promise in assessing relationships between habitat and distribution (Illian et al. 2013), the effects of interspecific relationships such as density 124 125 dependence (Thorson et al. 2015c), as well as the relationships between multiple co-occurring 126 taxa (Ward et al. 2015). From a quantitative standpoint, GMRF models have been shown to 127 estimate population abundance trends with greater precision and accuracy compared to non-128 spatial models (Thorson et al. 2015b). 129 Clearly, GMRFs are intimately related to GAMs, since GMRFs approximate the 130 Gaussian field model (Eqn. 4), which is an alternative parameterization of the GAM in Equation 131 2. The spatial smoothing terms for both GAMs and GMRFs can be defined on a sphere or differ 132 according to spatial direction (anisotropy can be included in GAMs by using tensor product 133 smooths, and Σ can be both non-stationary and anisotropic in GMRFs). GAMs and GMRFs 134 differ, however, in two regards. First, the spatial smoothing term appears as a mean trend for GAMs and as a covariance matrix for GMRFs. This distinction may not be important for 135 136 modelling species distributions, and researchers may prefer the method that reflects their view of 137 how spatial autocorrelation arises in the problem at hand. For instance, GMRFs would be the

138 more natural framework if the spatial variation remaining after including environmental 139 covariates is considered random. Second, and more importantly, the different parameterizations lead to different estimation methods and software implementations. Since spatial models for 140 141 large datasets contain many parameters, numerically efficient implementations are crucial 142 (Fahrmeir et al. 2013). Several R packages fit GAMs, the most popular being 'mgcy,' which uses 143 generalized cross-validation to estimate smooth terms by default (Wood 2017). GMRFs can be fit via 'INLA,' which uses a Bayesian framework and estimates models by integrated nested 144 Laplace approximation (Lindgren and Rue 2015). In theory, 'mgcv' and 'INLA' should be quite 145 146 similar. In practice, however, differences in approximation methods, runtime, convergence 147 criteria, ease of use, and default settings may impact model predictions.

148 Most nonparametric approaches ecologists use to model species distributions have 149 evolved from machine learning algorithms (Hastie et al. 2009; Olden et al. 2008). These datadriven approaches include random forests (RF, Breiman 2001; Cutler et al. 2007), MaxEnt 150 151 (Phillips et al. 2006; Phillips and Dudík 2008), and support vector machines (Drake et al. 2006). 152 In this analysis we highlight RF because 1) data in our application—fisheries bycatch—contain 153 true absences, whereas MaxEnt is designed for presence-only data, and 2) RF is widely used and 154 has shown good predictive performance in SDM testing (Prasad et al. 2006; Marmion et al. 155 2009; Scales et al. 2016). The RF algorithm predicts the response by constructing *m* regression 156 (or classification) trees and averaging their predictions (Breiman 2001). Each individual tree 157 begins with all observations and then iteratively partitions the data by splitting along one covariate (e.g. depth > 100 m versus depth ≤ 100 m), choosing the covariate and split point that 158 159 minimizes the sums of squares error at each node (where the predicted response at each node is 160 the mean of observations within the node, Breiman et al. 1984). The process continues until each 161 terminal node contains less than a specified number of observations. Individual trees are simple and computationally cheap but are also unstable (i.e. sensitive to slight alterations in the data) 162 and sub-optimal at prediction (i.e. they are "weak learners"), because they only allow rectangular 163 partitions of covariate space. The RF algorithm increases predictive performance by reducing the 164 165 correlation between trees, which is accomplished via two processes: 1) fitting each tree to a 166 bootstrap sample of the original data, and 2) at each split, randomly selecting a subset of covariates to consider (Kuhn and Johnson 2013). This works because reducing the correlation 167 between individual trees reduces the correlation of their errors, which therefore reduces the 168 predictive error of their average, the RF estimate. 169

170 Random forests are popular because they are simple to use (few parameters to tune and 171 the default values work well in most cases), robust to the inclusion of many non-informative 172 covariates generate accurate predictions, designed to not overfit, and seamlessly accommodate missing data (Biau and Scornet 2016). Compared to parametric and semiparametric models, RF 173 174 will often have better out-of-sample (i.e. cross-validated) prediction performance due to their 175 ability to estimate more complex patterns, as non-linearity and interactions are inherent in their 176 construction (Elith and Leathwick 2009). However, this data-driven complexity does come at the 177 cost of model interpretability, and this is one of the main factors limiting the adoption of RF and machine learning methods more generally-by ecologists (Olden et al. 2008). Three other 178 179 disadvantages of RF are the difficulty of generating uncertainty estimates with well-understood 180 properties, analyzing model diagnostics, and specifying constraints on model fit (e.g., we may wish yearly estimates to be independent, which can be specified in parametric models). 181 182 Study objectives

183

The primary objective of this paper is to compare the performance of GAMs, GMRFs

and RF in a predictive framework using cross-validation (Kuhn and Johnson 2013; Roberts et al.

185 2017). There has been an increased emphasis in ecology on evaluating and selecting models

186 based on their ability to predict out-of-sample data (Hooten and Hobbs 2015), and one of the

187 advantages of this approach is that nonparametric and parametric models can be compared (Ward

188 et al. 2014). While each of these model frameworks have individually been applied to understand

189 spatiotemporal trends in fisheries bycatch (GAMs: Becker et al. 2014; Hazen et al. 2016;

190 McCracken 2004; Watson et al. 2009; GMRFs: Breivik et al. 2016, 2017; Cosandey-Godin et al.

191 2015; RFs: Carretta et al. 2017; Eguchi et al. 2017; Pons et al. 2009), their predictive

192 performance has not been tested in a comparative study.

Our next objective is to evaluate the utility of using SDM predictions of bycatch risk as a tool to reduce bycatch in fisheries. Beyond abstract performance metrics, we compare the models' capabilities to reduce the bycatch-to-target species catch ratio, create spatial bycatch risk maps, and estimate effects of covariates.

197 The final objective of our analysis is to evaluate model transferability, the ability to 198 extrapolate, or predict beyond the range of observed data. Traditional cross-validation only 199 measures a model's ability to interpolate, i.e. estimate values within the range of observations, 200 because it randomly chooses data to withhold for testing. SDMs that are more data-driven and 201 complex have been shown to have better interpolation performance but be worse at spatial 202 extrapolation (Araújo and Rahbek 2006; Heikkinen et al. 2012; Randin et al. 2006). In other 203 words, one model may have higher predictive performance in the core fishing area with abundant data, yet underperform other models in areas with sparse sampling coverage. Since we wish to 204 205 evaluate using SDM predictions of bycatch risk as a spatial management tool, it is important to 206 assess how sensitive the predictions are to spatial location. Predictions in areas with few data are

207 more sensitive to model misspecification and overfitting, and therefore caution is especially

208 warranted for complex, nonparametric approaches such as RF (Merow et al. 2014).

209 Methods

210 Fisheries observer data

211 Collecting reliable by catch data depends on fisheries observer programs, where on-board 212 observers enumerate and record the species caught (as well as fishing location, gear type, time, 213 and other relevant information). To explore the performance of species distribution models 214 across taxa, we used two datasets from United States fisheries observer programs in the Pacific Ocean with high observer coverage. The first dataset was from the West Coast Groundfish 215 216 Observer Program (WCGOP) at the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC, Bellman et al. 217 2010). The WCGOP dataset contained records of 42 786 commercial bottom trawls from 2003-218 2012 off the west coast of the USA, primarily targeting groundfish such as Dover sole 219 (*Microstomus pacificus*), thornyheads (*Sebastolobus* spp.), sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*), and 220 rockfish (Sebastes spp., Fig. 1a). Observers recorded haul duration, location, date, time, depth, 221 gear type, and catch (which includes at-sea discarded bycatch; for details see NWFSC 2016). 222 Observer coverage was approximately 20% from 2003-2010 under limited access management, 223 with 100% coverage starting in 2011 with the transition to an individual fishing quota (IFQ) 224 system. In the pre-IFQ era, fishermen were not permitted to land rebuilding species (i.e. 225 populations declared overfished with management plans to rebuild to sustainable levels), so we 226 defined by catch as only at-sea discards. Under the IFQ system fishermen can land a low quota of 227 rebuilding species, so we considered by catch to be the sum of discarded and retained catch for 228 non-target species.



The second dataset was from the Hawaii longline (HILL) fishery, monitored by the

Page 10

230 Pacific Islands Regional Observer Program (PIROP 2014), which has recorded fishing location, 231 date, time, sea surface temperature (SST), gear characteristics, and catch of longline sets from 232 1994-2014. The Hawaii longline fleet is divided into two sectors, one targeting tuna (*Thunnus* spp.) and the other swordfish (Xiphias gladius), with distinct gear configurations and 233 234 spatiotemporal effort patterns, both of which affect interaction rates with by catch species (Li and 235 Pan 2011). We modeled 16 714 observations from the shallow-set swordfish fishery in 1994-236 2001 and 2005-2014 (Fig. 1b), distinguishing between sets targeting swordfish and tuna by the 237 number of hooks between surface floats (following Li and Pan 2011). Concerns over bycatch of 238 protected species, particularly of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and leatherback sea turtles 239 (Dermochelys coriacea), motivated the closure of the swordfish fishery from 2001 to 2004. This 240 led to two important differences between the data from 1994-2001 and 2005-2014. First, sea 241 turtle by catch rates have been an order of magnitude lower in the later period, the result of stricter regulations and modifying hooks (J to circle hooks) and bait types (squid to fish; Gilman 242 243 et al. 2007). Second, observer coverage increased from roughly 5% to 100% (Howell et al. 244 2008).

245 Model performance may be linked to species' movement patterns, because species that 246 move less (or whose movement patterns do not change in time) may not need a spatiotemporal 247 model. Instead, a time-constant spatial model may be adequate. To ascertain whether differences 248 in SDM performance were related to movement pattern or bycatch rate (i.e. % observations with 249 non-zero catch), we selected three bycatch species from each dataset: blue shark (Prionace 250 glauca), loggerhead sea turtle, and leatherback sea turtle from the Hawaii longline fishery, and 251 Pacific halibut (Hippoglossus stenolepis), darkblotched rockfish (Sebastes crameri), and 252 yelloweye rockfish (Sebastes ruberrimus) from the West Coast groundfish trawl fishery. These

253 species widely differ in their bycatch rates (96.2%, 0.7%, 0.3%, 28.9%, 17.9%, and 1.4%,

respectively), habitat preferences, and movement patterns. For instance, rockfish are relatively
sedentary and closely associated with rocky bottom habitat, whereas halibut exhibit seasonal and
long-distance migrations (Skud 1977; Gunderson 1997). In contrast to the groundfish, blue
sharks and sea turtles inhabit the open ocean and range much more widely (Benson et al. 2011;
Kobayashi et al. 2008; Nichols et al. 2000).

While both datasets include periods with 100% observer coverage, they also span periods 259 260 with partial coverage. This is relevant since the models assume that the data represent a random 261 sample of the studied fishery, i.e. each fishing event has an equal probability of being observed. For several reasons, it is difficult for observer programs to achieve random sampling: a list of 262 263 trips and their departures often does not exist far in advance, certain vessels may not be able to 264 accommodate observers, observers may not always be available, and fisher behavior can change 265 when observers are on board (Hall 1999; Liggins et al. 1997; McCracken 2004). The WCGOP 266 data from years with 20% coverage are likely to be representative of the fishery, because the WCGOP stratified sampling by port group, vessel, and 2-month blocks with the goals of 267 sampling all vessels for two months in each year and discouraging changes to fishing behavior 268 269 when observers were on-board (NWFSC 2006). It is less likely that this was true for the 1994-270 2001 HILL data. Nevertheless, we included data from periods with partial coverage because 271 there were very few observations of non-zero catch for rarely encountered species in the years 272 with full coverage (yelloweye rockfish: 38, loggerhead turtle: 89, leatherback turtle: 82), and in 273 many cases, by catch of these 'rare-event' species are often of highest management concern 274 (Martin et al. 2015).

275 Environmental covariates

276 In addition to the locations of observed fishing, we considered several covariates that may help 277 explain the likelihood of bycatch events. For the WCGOP dataset, we included fishing depth, day of year, sea surface temperature (SST) anomaly, distance to rocky habitat, size of nearest rocky 278 279 patch, predicted occurrence from survey data, and whether the trawl occurred in or near a 280 Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA). RCAs are large areas along the U.S. West Coast closed to 281 fishing designed primarily to reduce by catch of overfished rockfish, such as two of the species we considered. RCA boundaries have changed by and within years, and are defined by latitude, 282 283 date, and depth (NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region 2015). Trawls were determined to be inside or outside of an RCA based on the trawl date, average position of trawl start and end, and bottom 284 285 depth (calculated via bathymetry from NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information 286 2015). We included linear and quadratic terms for fishing depth and SST anomalies following 287 Shelton et al. (2014). Depth was recorded by on-board observers, while SST anomalies were measured via satellite. For each trawl, we collected daily SST anomalies on a 0.25° grid and used 288 289 bilinear interpolation to create SST anomalies corresponding to each trawl location 290 (http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/, Reynolds et al. 2007). Rocky habitat data were from NMFS 291 (2013), calculated as per Shelton et al. (2014). Finally, we used the above covariates to fit a 292 geostatistical binomial GLMM to fisheries-independent trawl survey data (Bradburn et al. 2011, 293 modeled as in Shelton et al. 2014), and applied this model to predict by catch occurrence at the 294 fishing times and locations in the observer dataset. These survey-predicted occurrence 295 probabilities were included as another linear covariate. All environmental covariates were centered before model estimation. 296

The only available environmental covariate for the HILL dataset was observer-recorded
SST, and therefore we fit the HILL models with covariates of standardized SST, SST², and day of

299 year.

300 Statistical models

As is common for species distribution data, five of the six species exhibited large proportions of zero catches. We followed the hurdle- or delta-model approach to this complication, which is commonly applied in ecology and fisheries (Pennington 1983; Maunder and Punt 2004). Deltamodels separate the observed catches, Y_i , into two processes: a 'binomial' component for the probability of non-zero catch, π_i , and a 'positive' component for the mean catch density given the catch is non-zero, μ_i :

307
$$Z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i)$$
$$Y_i \sim Z_i h(\mu_i)$$
(5)

308 where Z_i is a binary variable that equals 1 if the species was caught and 0 if it was not, and h() is 309 a distribution to be specified (e.g. lognormal, gamma). Splitting the modeling into these two 310 components can be advantageous because different mechanisms may affect one component but 311 not the other (e.g. a habitat quality covariate may be a significant predictor of catch rate, but not 312 occurrence).

313 We applied a total of eight delta-models with varying spatial structure to each of the six 314 species included in our analysis (Table 1). Bycatch of yelloweye rockfish, loggerhead turtles, and 315 leatherback turtles were extremely rare events (0.3-1.4% non-zero observations) with too few 316 multiple-individual catches to meaningfully fit the positive component. All analyses were 317 conducted using R v3.4.1 (R Core Team 2017), with the following libraries: 'mgcv' was used to 318 implement GLMs and GAMs (v1.8-17, Wood 2017); 'randomForest' (v4.6-12, Liaw and Wiener 319 2002), 'DMwR' (v0.4.1, Torgo 2010), and 'forestFloor' (v1.9.5, Welling et al. 2016) were used to 320 fit RFs; and 'INLA' was used to fit the GMRF models (v0.0-1485844051, Lindgren and Rue 321 2015). We assessed model fit with plots of covariate-response relationships, predicted versus

322 observed response in out-of-sample data, spatial residual maps, and spatial correlograms

323 (Moran's I, package 'ncf' v1.2-5, Bjørnstad and Falck 2001). Code to fit each of the models is

324 provided at https://github.com/brianstock/spatial-bycatch.

325 Our first model was a delta-GLM with linear and quadratic effects of the environmental 326 covariates (which are intrinsically spatially correlated), but without any spatial terms—neither 327 geographic coordinates nor spatial autocorrelation for residual errors. As in Guélat and Kéry 328 (2018), the delta-GLM served as a baseline that allowed us to evaluate the value of adding spatial terms in the subsequent models, which were fit using the same covariates and only differ 329 330 in how they include spatial information. The delta-GLM fits the observed bycatch in fishing event *i*, Y_i , as in Eqns. 1 and 5, with binomial component determining the probability of non-zero 331 332 bycatch, π_i :

333
$$Z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i), \\ \text{logit}(\pi_i) = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\alpha},$$
(6)

and positive component for the mean catch density given the catch is non-zero, μ_i :

335
$$Y_i \sim Z_i \operatorname{Gamma}(\mu_i, k), \\ \log(\mu_i) = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$
(7)

336 where X_i is a vector of covariate values for location *i*, α and β are vectors of coefficients to be 337 estimated, and k is the shape parameter of the gamma distribution. The gamma distribution is 338 appropriate for positive, right-skewed data, and therefore is commonly used in the positive component of delta-models for fisheries catch (Lecomte et al. 2013; Stefánsson 1996). While we 339 340 would not expect the GLM to outperform the models with explicit spatial terms, it is possible 341 that the (spatially-structured) environmental covariates could explain most of spatial structure in 342 the response. In that case, including spatial terms in the model (i.e. a 2-d spline as in Eqn. 2 or 343 covariance matrix as in Eqn. 4) would be unnecessary.

We fit two delta-GAM models that extend Eqns. 6 and 7 by adding a 2-dimensional spline, f(), on the geographical coordinates of location *i*, **s**_i, to both the binomial and positive components, as in Eqn. 2:

347

$$Z_{i} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_{i}),$$

$$\log_{i}(\pi_{i}) = \mathbf{X}_{i}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + f_{Z}(\mathbf{s}_{i}),$$

$$Y_{i} \sim \text{Gamma}(\mu_{i}, k),$$

$$\log(\mu_{i}) = \mathbf{X}_{i}\boldsymbol{\beta} + f_{Y}(\mathbf{s}_{i}).$$
(8)

The first, "GAM-CONSTANT," includes one 2-d spline constant across years, with an offset
(fixed effect) for each year. This allows the mean bycatch probability and density to vary
temporally and spatially, but in the same pattern each year. The second, "GAM-YEAR," fits an
independent 2-d spline for each year, which allows the spatial pattern to vary between years
(Table 1).

353 As for the GAMs, we fit two delta-GMRF models which extend Eqns. 6 and 7 by

estimating the covariance between observed locations, s_i , as in Eqn. 4:

$$Z_{i} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_{i}),$$

$$\log it(\pi_{i}) = \mathbf{X}_{i}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{s}_{i}),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{s}) \sim \text{MVN}(0, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1}),$$

$$Y_{i} \sim \text{Gamma}(\mu_{i}, k),$$

$$\log(\mu_{i}) = \mathbf{X}_{i}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{s}_{i}),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{s}) \sim \text{MVN}(0, \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}}^{-1}),$$
(9)

356 where both Qz^{-1} and Qy^{-1} are defined to approximate stationary, isotropic Matérn covariances,

357
$$\operatorname{Cov}(\mathbf{s_1}, \mathbf{s_2}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu)} (\kappa \|\mathbf{s_1} - \mathbf{s_2}\|)^{\nu} K_{\nu}(\kappa \|\mathbf{s_1} - \mathbf{s_2}\|),$$

358 K_v is the modified Bessel function of the second kind and order v > 0, κ is the spatial scale

359 parameter, and $\mathbf{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ () and $\mathbf{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ () represent the estimated spatial fields using random effects. We used

360 the default Matérn smoothness, v = 1, and priors on parameters as implemented in R-INLA

361 (Lindgren and Rue 2015). Analogous to the GAM-CONSTANT and GAM-YEAR models, we fit

362 a "GMRF-CONSTANT" model with one random field constant across all years, and a "GMRF-YEAR" model with a random field estimated for each year (Table 1). As for GAM-CONSTANT, 363 the GMRF-CONSTANT model includes fixed effect terms for each year, which allow for an 364 increase or decrease in the mean bycatch probability and density for each year while assuming 365 the spatial pattern is constant across years. The GMRF-YEAR model uses the simplest 366 367 spatiotemporal option in R-INLA, 'exchangeable,' which refers to the spatiotemporal structure— 368 the random fields in all years are uniformly correlated (as opposed to an autoregressive 369 spatiotemporal structure where nearby years are more correlated than distant years). 370 To include spatiotemporal effects in RFs, we added year (treated as a factor), latitude, and 371 longitude as covariates. For the positive component of the delta-model, we fit only one RF 372 model: "RF-BASE," following the original RF algorithm as described by Breiman (2001) and 373 implemented in the 'randomForest' R package (Liaw and Wiener 2002). For the binomial component, we also fit two modifications to the original RF algorithm designed to improve 374 375 performance on imbalanced class data (i.e. proportions of 0s and 1s very unequal), because 376 several species showed strong class imbalance (e.g., yelloweye rockfish had 99.7% tows with 377 zero catch and only 0.3% tows with non-zero catch). Training a RF on such severely imbalanced 378 class data tends to produce models that predict the majority class well but performs poorly on the 379 minority class (Kuhn and Johnson 2013). The first approach was to *down-sample* the majority 380 class observations (e.g. 0s, tows with zero catch for yelloweye rockfish) when training the RF 381 such that each tree used a stratified bootstrap sample of the data with equal numbers of majority and minority (e.g. 1s, tows with non-zero catch for yelloweye rockfish) class observations. We 382 383 implemented down-sampling in the "RF-DOWN" model, setting the sample size equal to one-384 sixth the number of minority class observations. The second approach, "RF-SMOTE" (Synthetic

385 Minority Over-sampling Technique, Chawla et al. 2002), combined down-sampling of the 386 majority class with over-sampling of the minority class. Simply over-sampling the minority class with replacement overfits the RF to the specific observed minority data and typically does not 387 388 significantly improve prediction of the minority class. Instead, SMOTE creates synthetic 389 minority class samples by generating random linear combinations of nearby observed minority 390 samples, i.e. if X_1 and X_2 are nearest neighbors with $X_1 = {SST_1, Lat_1, Lon_1}$ and $X_2 = {SST_2, Lat_1, Lon_1}$ Lat₂, Lon₂, draw p from Uniform(0,1) and create $\mathbf{X}_{syn} = \{p(SST_1 - SST_2) + SST_2, p(Lat_1 - Lat_2)\}$ 391 392 $+ Lat_2, p(Lon_1 - Lon_2) + Lon_2$.

393 *Performance metrics*

394 We performed 5-fold cross-validation repeated 10 times, which allowed us to evaluate 395 semiparametric and nonparametric SDMs' predictive error on new data (Shmueli 2010; Kuhn 396 and Johnson 2013). We blocked by year (rather than systematically excluding a given year) to account for temporal structure and mimic predictive performance for cases where a random 397 398 subset of samples in a given year are not observed (Roberts et al. 2017). Thus, we generated 50 399 test/train splits, where each selects 20% of the data from each year to reserve for testing, and fits 400 the models on the remaining 80% training data. After fitting the models to training data, we used 401 the fitted models to predict by catch probability (binomial component of the delta-model) and 402 density (positive component of the delta-model) at the test locations. This gave us predicted and 403 observed values to compare parametric and nonparametric model performance: area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) scores for the binomial component, and root-404 405 mean-square error (RMSE) for the positive component. AUC can be interpreted as the 406 expectation that a model ranks a uniformly drawn random positive (bycatch event) as more likely 407 than a uniformly drawn random negative (non-bycatch event), and higher values indicate better

408 performance (Hand 2009). We tested for significance across- and within-species using Tukey's409 HSD test.

410 Use as tools to reduce bycatch

411 Since AUC and RMSE are abstract metrics of model performance, we calculated a more 412 tangible measure: how much each of the models could possibly reduce the bycatch-to-target 413 species catch ratio if it were used to identify and remove high bycatch risk fishing events. In other words, what does an AUC performance gap of 0.03 mean in terms of bycatch reduction 414 415 (keeping catch of the target species constant)? For each species and model fit, we rank-ordered 416 the bycatch probabilities predicted by the binomial component, identified the X% of fishing 417 events with the highest bycatch probabilities (X% from 0-10%), removed both bycatch and target 418 catch from those events, and calculated the resultant change in bycatch-to-target species catch 419 ratio.

420 To be useful bycatch management tools, models also need to generate reasonable spatial 421 predictions, covariate effects, and pass diagnostic checks on spatial autocorrelation and residual 422 patterns. To investigate spatial predictions and their uncertainty, we calculated the posterior mean 423 and variance at each point on a prediction grid, using the R package 'mgcv' for GLMs and 424 GAMs (Wood 2017), and 'INLA' for GMRFs (Lindgren and Rue 2015). It is not possible to 425 calculate posterior distributions for RF, but we calculated standard errors using the infinitesimal 426 jackknife estimator ('randomForestCI', Wager et al. 2014). To compare covariate effects, we 427 plotted marginal posterior distributions for GLMs, GAMs, and GMRFs. To visualize RF covariate effects, we used feature contributions calculated by the 'forestFloor' package (Welling 428 429 et al. 2016). Lastly, we investigated the models' abilities to reduce spatial autocorrelation using 430 spline correlograms ('ncf', Bjornstad and Falck 2001) and binned residual plots.

431 Transferability

432 In order to evaluate model transferability, i.e. spatial extrapolation performance, we 433 conducted a second cross-validation blocking on spatial data density. Whereas our first cross-434 validation procedure partitioned the data into training and testing sets *randomly*, here we 435 constructed test/train splits by ordering fishing locations relative to data density. We calculated a 436 bivariate kernel density estimate at each of the observed fishing locations ('bkde2D' function in 'KernSmooth' R package) and sequentially used the lowest 0.5%, 1%, 2%, 5%, 10%, and 20% 437 density locations as test datasets. We then fit the models using only the core, data-rich area of 438 439 each fishery, and computed AUC and RMSE for model predictions at the test locations in sparsely sampled areas. 440

441 **Results**

442 *Performance metrics*

443 Across the six species, RF provided better by catch predictions than both GAMs and GMRFs in the binomial (higher AUC, Fig. 2a) and positive (lower RMSE, Fig. 2b) components 444 445 of the delta-model. However, the magnitude of this performance advantage varied by species, 446 and in some cases the within-species differences were not significant. GMRFs outperformed 447 GAMs in the binomial component for the three species with moderate-high bycatch rates (p < p448 0.05, Tukey's HSD; darkblotched rockfish, Pacific halibut, and blue shark in Fig. 2a), but 449 differences in AUC were not significant for the three rarely caught species (p > 0.05, Tukey's 450 HSD; yelloweye rockfish, loggerhead turtle, and leatherback turtle in Fig. 2a). The variability in model performance among cross-validation runs was similar within a given species but varied 451 452 greatly between species; variability in the binomial component was lowest for species with 453 moderate by catch rates (darkblotched rockfish and Pacific halibut in Fig. 2a), and in the positive 454 component it was lowest for species with high bycatch rates (blue shark in Fig. 2b).

455 RF modifications designed for data with imbalanced classes, down-sampling and SMOTE, outperformed the original RF algorithm for the four species with high or low bycatch 456 rates (Fig. A1). Of the semiparametric models, GMRF-YEAR that allowed for time-varying 457 458 spatial effects performed the best (Figs. 2 and A2), whereas the binomial GAM-YEAR that 459 estimated 2-d splines by year failed to converge. For rare bycatch species with few positive occurrences, such as yelloweye rockfish, GMRF models that allowed for time-varying spatial 460 461 effects offered no improvement over the time-constant spatial models (Fig. A2). For these 462 species, the estimated GMRF spatial field was less complex than for species with higher bycatch rates (Fig. A3). 463

464 Use as tools to reduce bycatch

When using the models to identify and remove high bycatch risk fishing events, RF also performed best. Averaged across the six species, RF reduced the bycatch-to-target species catch ratio by 8% when removing 1% of fishing effort, 34% when removing 5% of fishing effort, and 50% when removing 10% of fishing effort (Fig. 3). Bycatch predictability as measured by bycatch-to-target ratio reduction generally agreed with the traditional performance metrics (AUC and RMSE) and varied substantially among the six species (Fig. A4).

Bycatch risk maps produced by each of the models were similar in some respects. Taking blue shark bycatch density an example, all models predicted higher and more variable bycatch in the northwest area of the fishery, and lower bycatch between 25-30°N and 205-220°E (Fig. 4ad). Maps revealed artifacts of their construction: the mesh triangulation is evident in the GMRF variance (Fig. 4g), and the sharp gradients in the RF mean (Fig. 4d) and variance (Fig. 4h) are a consequence of RF trees splitting on latitude and longitude. As expected, the uncertainty of 477 GMRF predictions was lower in areas of high data density (compare Figs. 1b and 4g).

Uncertainty in RF predictions did not follow this trend—RF variance was extremely high above
41.5°N and moderately high between 30-33°N (Fig. 4h). However, this was consistent with the
data, as there were few observed sets north of 41.5°N and these had higher and more variable
bycatch (Fig. A5).

All models estimated similar covariate effects, as demonstrated for darkblotched rockfish (Fig. 5). The main covariate effects were as expected: probability of bycatch increased with higher survey-predicted occurrence, increased for tows inside or near RCAs, and showed an optimal depth range of 100-250 fathoms.

486 For all species, residuals were typically more variable between cross-validation fits as 487 model complexity increased (RF > GMRF > GAM > GLM, Figs. S1-S18). Most models did not 488 exhibit spatial patterns in residuals, although residuals in the positive component of the deltamodel were larger and more variable for blue shark and Pacific halibut north of 40°N and 47°N, 489 490 respectively (Figs. S1-S2, S11-S12). GMRFs and GAMs had similarly lower residual spatial 491 autocorrelation compared to the baseline GLMs, with one exception where the GMRF reduced 492 spatial autocorrelation more than the GAM (blue shark positive model, Fig. A6). RF generally 493 had the lowest spatial autocorrelation, and it was negative instead of positive at short distances. 494 The Hawaii longline species had greater decorrelation distances than the West Coast groundfish 495 species (distance at which spatial autocorrelation goes to zero, 40 km vs. 5 km, Fig. A6). 496 **Transferability**

497 As expected, all models performed worse at spatial extrapolation compared to
498 interpolation, i.e. worse at predicting locations outside the core area of the fishery when trained
499 using observations in areas of highest data density (Fig. 6). GLMs and GAMs generally

500 performed worse in this test than GMRFs and RFs. GMRFs had lower RMSE than RFs in the 501 positive component of the delta-model but there was no difference in AUC in the binomial component (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, p = 0.91 for AUC_{GMRF} \neq AUC_{RF}, p = 0.003 for 502 503 $RMSE_{GMRF} \neq RMSE_{RF}$). Compared to GMRFs, RF performance was also more sensitive to 504 withholding data at the edge of the fishery (Fig. 6). The degree to which this was true, however, 505 differed widely between species. For instance, the performance of both models was stable for 506 some species (e.g. darkblotched rockfish in binomial component, blue shark in positive 507 component), indicating that both models captured relevant spatial environment-bycatch 508 relationships in the core area of the fishery and that these relationships remained valid at the edge 509 of the fishery.

510 **Discussion**

511 Our results demonstrate the clear potential of species distribution models to predict fishing activity with higher bycatch rates. While the models' performance varied considerably, even the 512 513 worst performer (GLM without latitude and longitude) achieved AUC from 0.68-0.86 (Fig. 2) 514 and reduced bycatch-to-target catch ratios on average by 25% for a 5% reduction in fishing effort 515 (Fig. 3). Random forests performed the best, achieving cross-validated AUC above 0.89 for all 516 three West Coast groundfish species (Fig. 2) and reducing bycatch-to-target ratios by 34% for a 517 5% reduction in fishing effort averaged across the six species (Fig. 3). When extrapolating 518 beyond the geographic range of the data, however, RFs were more sensitive to which data were 519 withheld and performed similar to, or worse than, GMRFs (Fig. 6). This is consistent with previous work documenting that more data-driven, complex SDMs can have better interpolation 520 521 performance but be worse at spatial extrapolation (Heikkinen et al. 2012; Randin et al. 2006). 522 Our results beg the question: if RFs are expected to have higher interpolation accuracy,

523 why ever use GMRFs or GAMs? This is a decidedly relevant concern given the significant 524 research investment in these modeling approaches (Becker et al. 2014; Thorson and Barnett 2017). RF will generally have better out-of-sample prediction, largely due to its ability to 525 incorporate nonlinear and interaction effects of covariates inherently (i.e., without user 526 527 specification). In addition, RF models are much simpler and quicker to both write code for and 528 run. Contrary to references describing RFs as "black boxes" (Prasad et al. 2006; Cutler et al. 2007; Elith and Leathwick 2009; Evans and Cushman 2009; Kuhn and Johnson 2013), there are 529 530 methods for investigating RF model structure, including covariate effects and interactions (Fig. 531 5, Welling et al. 2016). In a similar vein, it is possible to calculate prediction variance and confidence intervals for RF (Fig. 4, Meinshausen 2006; Wager et al. 2014), despite older 532 533 ecological literature stating otherwise (Cutler et al. 2007; Olden et al. 2008), or using ad-hoc 534 substitutes such as the standard deviation of individual tree predictions (Smoliński and Radtke 535 2017). Additionally, promising theoretical work may soon widen the ability to use RFs for 536 statistical inference by developing asymptotically normal, unbiased point estimates with valid 537 confidence intervals (Mentch and Hooker 2017; Wager and Athey 2017). In many cases, RF's 538 performance advantage is probably sufficient to warrant its use over other semiparametric 539 methods. Yet, there may be several cases where semiparametric methods are preferred. 540 Semiparametric frameworks like GMRFs and GAMs have clear advantages over machine 541 learning algorithms such as RF. First, they can be derived from probability theory and therefore 542 allow for traditional statistical inference on their mean response predictions. GMRF estimates 543 full posterior distributions for the response variable (in this study, probability and/or expected 544 amount of bycatch) everywhere in the spatial domain. This enables us, for instance, to use a 545 GMRF model to identify regions that are above/below a threshold probability (i.e. risk level) of a 546 defined by catch quantity. By contrast, developing statistical inference based on RF is an active 547 area of research (Biau and Scornet 2016). Thus, GMRF models may be preferred for applications 548 where estimates of model uncertainty are decidedly important, such as using models to produce 549 annual estimates of bycatch (expanded from the observed to unobserved fleet). Second, GMRFs 550 and GAMs explicitly estimate covariate effects with uncertainty intervals, facilitating ecological 551 interpretation of factors significantly affecting the response (Fig. 5). Third, GMRF models are particularly well-suited to incorporate spatial ecological processes, such as movement or spatial 552 553 variation in mortality, condition, or observation error (Carson and Flemming 2014; Illian et al. 554 2013; Thorson et al. 2017). RFs, on the other hand, are based solely on observations without taking into consideration the data generating process. Fourth, GAMs and GMRFs produce 555 556 smoothed spatial predictions that are more likely ecologically plausible, whereas RF spatial 557 predictions appear rectangular by default due to splits on the geographical coordinates. This can 558 be mediated, however, by including transformations of the coordinates, fitting a linear model 559 within each node instead of taking the mean (Quinlan 1992, 1993), or including buffer distances 560 as covariates (Hengl et al. 2018). Fifth, RFs can simultaneously have high interpolation accuracy 561 and lower extrapolation accuracy (Fig. 6b). This matters if SDM predictions of bycatch risk are 562 to be used as a spatial management tool, where predictions in areas with sparse or no sampling 563 coverage may be most important. Finally, GMRFs and GAMs can be easily specified to produce 564 independent or exchangeable estimates of a given quantity (e.g., total predicted bycatch in 565 different years), while it is unclear how to assign a specific dependence-structure on factors in a 566 RF model. This is important when using estimates from a spatial model as input in a secondary 567 model, for example, where the secondary model assumes that estimates are independent among 568 years. In situations where these concerns are inconsequential, however, RF are likely the better

method for spatial bycatch prediction—they are faster and have better predictive performance
than the alternatives. Even when probabilistic conclusions are required, RF may be useful in an
exploratory manner given their ease of use, speed, and ability to identify nonlinear and
interaction covariate effects for later inclusion in semiparametric models.
On a more detailed level, the six species differed widely in their predictability. The West
Coast groundfish species were more predictable than the Hawaii longline species, likely because
we included several more relevant environmental covariates (WCGOP: sea surface temperature,

576 depth, rocky habitat, in/near RCA, and survey-predicted occurrence; HILL: sea surface

577 temperature) and the WCGOP dataset had 2.5 times the number of observations (WCGOP: 42

578 786; HILL: 16 714). The HILL models' performance could presumably be improved by

579 incorporating more satellite-based environmental covariates capable of explaining the species'

580 distributions, such as chlorophyll and SST-derived frontal indices (Nieto et al. 2017). Among the

581 West Coast species, Pacific halibut was more difficult to predict than the two rockfish species,

582 despite having more positive bycatch occurrences for the models to fit. One possible explanation

583 is that adult halibut move more and have less strict habitat associations than rockfish, decreasing

their predictability (Skud 1977; Gunderson 1997). Among the Hawaii longline species,

585 loggerhead turtles were much easier to predict than leatherback turtles and blue sharks, perhaps

586 because they have stronger SST-based habitat preferences where the fishing occurs (Howell et al.

587 2015). Indeed, the loggerhead-temperature association is the basis for TurtleWatch, a decade-

588 long effort to reduce turtle bycatch by providing fishermen with dynamic recommendations of

589 high bycatch risk areas to avoid in the Central Pacific (Howell et al. 2008). Despite plausible life

590 history explanations for some among-species differences in predictability, however, the

advantage of fitting time-varying vs. time-constant models appeared to be primarily driven by

the species' bycatch rates. In other words, there was little difference in model performance for rare bycatch species (yelloweye rockfish, loggerhead turtle, and leatherback turtle) and greater differences between models for common bycatch species (darkblotched rockfish, Pacific halibut, and blue shark, Figs. 2a and A3).

596 Given their good predictive performance overall, SDMs could be used to support spatial 597 bycatch management, whether static (e.g. design habitat closures to be semi-permanent, such as 598 the Pacific Leatherback Conservation Area along the U.S. West Coast; 50 CFR Part 660) or 599 dynamic in time (e.g. closures change every year, month, week, etc., such as the Loggerhead 600 Turtle Conservation Area along the Southern California Bight, 72FR 31756; Fig. 7, as in Dunn et al. 2016). If so, they should be compared to and integrated with existing tools that aim to reduce 601 602 bycatch by producing risk maps; examples include Eguchi et al. (2017), TurtleWatch (Howell et 603 al. 2008, 2015), and WhaleWatch (Hazen et al. 2016; Breivik et al. 2016). Both TurtleWatch and 604 WhaleWatch are based on satellite telemetry observations and known habitat preferences of sea 605 turtles and blue whales, in contrast to the models developed here that rely exclusively on 606 fisheries observer data. Fisheries observer datasets cover many more bycatch species than those 607 with satellite tagging programs, which means that SDMs based on fisheries observer data may be 608 more widely applicable than those based solely on satellite telemetry, especially for species with 609 moderate to high bycatch rates. However, we found that SDMs were less effective at predicting 610 rare bycatch events (e.g. yelloweye rockfish, loggerhead turtle, and leatherback turtle in Fig. 2a). 611 Bycatch occurs when non-target species and fishing gear co-occur, both of which are affected by 612 various factors, such as environmental conditions, economics, and behavior (Soykan et al. 2014). 613 Consequently, using fishery observer data combined with animal movement data would provide 614 a comprehensive dataset to develop predictive models of bycatch, and this may be a prudent

615 approach for species with low bycatch rates.

616 Future efforts to use spatial models to predict fisheries bycatch risk should carefully 617 consider the hierarchical structure common to observer datasets with less than 100% coverage. In the typical case where observers are placed on vessels on a trip-by-trip basis and then observe all 618 619 sets within a trip, the sets are likely not independent (e.g. sets within the same trip, and trips on 620 the same vessel may be correlated). As done in this study, including spatiotemporal correlation structure will account for some of the correlation between sets within a trip because they are 621 622 presumably closer together in time and space. One approach is to include the nested data 623 structure in the model as random effects (Candy 2004; Thorson et al. 2015b), although this can be more complicated than it first appears (e.g. captains and crew transfer between vessels in the 624 625 Hawaii longline fishery, making it unclear whether including a vessel effect is appropriate). 626 Roberts et al. (2017) make an excellent case for an alternative approach, using block crossvalidation to account for spatial, temporal, and group dependence structure when validating and 627 628 selecting models. A related issue with the delta-models used here is that they assume two 629 independent processes determine the probability and amount of bycatch (i.e., the binomial and 630 positive components of the delta-model). Thorson (2018) and Cantoni et al. (2017) both recently 631 demonstrated that this is unlikely to be true, and proposed solutions that include parameters 632 allowing for dependence between the binomial and positive components. Another relatively 633 simple approach is to use the compound Poisson-gamma, or Tweedie distribution, which Stock et 634 al. (2019) used in a spatial bycatch analysis and outperformed the equivalent delta-GAM. All of these solutions should improve spatiotemporal by catch predictions in the future. 635 636 Finally, just as single-species fisheries management paints a rosier picture than can truly

637 be implemented, the results presented here are unrealistic in their treatment of multispecies

- 638 fisheries because bycatch prediction cannot be optimized for each individual species
- 639 simultaneously. These results are still useful if fisheries managers are particularly concerned
- 640 about a single species, but less so if reducing bycatch of multiple species is the objective. Both
- 641 RF and GMRF models have multivariate extensions that could fruitfully be applied to
- 642 multispecies spatial bycatch prediction, and future work should investigate this possibility
- 643 (Thorson et al. 2015*a*; Ishwaran and Kogalur 2018; Thorson and Barnett 2017).

644

645 Acknowledgements

- T. Todd Jones, Summer Martin, Don Kobayashi, Eric Forney, and Marti McCracken shared
- 647 valuable knowledge of the Hawaii longline fishery and observer program. BCS received support
- 648 from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-
- 649 1144086. BCS also received support from the NMFS Protected Species Toolbox and benefited
- 650 from discussions at two NMFS Protected Species Assessment Workshops. This work used the
- 651 Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), supported by National
- 652 Science Foundation grant number ACI-1053575.
- 653

654 **References**

- Alverson, D. L., Freeberg, M. H., Murawski, S. A., and Pope, J. G. 1994. A global assessment of
 fisheries bycatch and discards. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No. 339. FAO, Rome. 233 p.
- Aguirre-Gutiérrez, J., Carvalheiro, L. G., Polce, C., van Loon, E. E., Raes, N., Reemer, M., and
- Biesmeijer, J. C. 2013. Fit-for-purpose: species distribution model performance depends on
- evaluation criteria Dutch hoverflies as a case study. PLoS ONE 8:e63708.
- Araújo, M.B. and Rahbek, C. 2006. How does climate change affect biodiversity? Science
 313:1396-1397.
- Barbet-Massin, M., Jiguet, F., Albert, C. H., and Thuiller, W. 2012. Selecting pseudo-absences
 for species distribution models: how, where and how many? Methods in Ecology and
 Evolution 3:327–358.
- Becker, E. A., Forney, K. A., Foley, D. G., Smith, R. C., Moore, T. J., and Barlow, J. 2014.
 Predicting seasonal density patterns of California cetaceans based on habitat models.
 Endangered Species Research 23:1–22.
- Bellman, M. A., Heery, E., and Majewski, J. 2010. Observed and estimated total bycatch of
 green sturgeon in the 2002-2008 U.S. West Coast groundfish fisheries. West Coast
 Groundfish Observer Program. NWFSC, 2725 Montlake Blvd E., Seattle, WA 98112.
- Benson, S. R., Eguchi, T., Foley, D. G., Forney, K. A., Bailey, H., Hitipeuw, C., Samber, B. P.,
 Tapilatu, R. F., Rei, V., Ramohia, P., and Pita, J. 2011. Large-scale movements and high-use
 areas of western Pacific leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*. Ecosphere 2(7):1-27.
- Biau, G., and Scornet, E. 2016. A random forest guided tour. TEST 25:197–227.
- Bjørnstad, O. N., and Falck, W. 2001. Nonparametric spatial covariance functions: estimation
 and testing. Environmental and Ecological Statistics 8:53-70.
- Boyce, J. R. 1996. An economic analysis of the fisheries bycatch problem. Journal of
 Environmental Economics and Management 31(3):314-336.
- 679 Bradburn, M. J., Keller, A. A., and Horness, B. H. 2011. The 2003 to 2008 U.S. West Coast
- bottom trawl surveys of groundfish resources off Washington, Oregon, and California:
- estimates of distribution, abundance, length, and age composition. U.S. Dept. Commer.,
- 682 NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-114, 323p.
- 683 Breiman, L. 2001. Random forests. Machine Learning 45:5–32.
- Breiman, L., Friedman, J., Olshen, R. A., and Stone, C. J. 1984. Classification and regression
 trees. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.
- 686 Breivik, O. N., Storvik, G., and Nedreaas, K. 2016. Latent Gaussian models to decide on spatial

- closures for bycatch management in the Barents Sea shrimp fishery. Canadian Journal of
 Fisheries and Aquatic Science 73:1271–1280.
- Breivik, O. N., G. Storvik, and K. Nedreaas. 2017. Latent Gaussian models to predict historical
 bycatch in commercial fishery. Fisheries Research 185:62-72.
- 691 Candy, S. G. 2004. Modelling catch and effort data using generalised linear models, the Tweedie
 692 distribution, random vessel effects and random stratum-by-year effects. CCAMLR Science
 693 11:59-80.
- Cantoni, E., J. M. Flemming, and A. H. Welsh. 2017. A random-effects hurdle model for
 predicting bycatch of endangered marine species. The Annals of Applied Statistics
 11(4):2178-2199.
- Carretta, J. V., J. E. Moore, and K. A. Forney. 2017. Regression tree and ratio estimates of
 marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California drift gillnet fishery: 1990 2015. NOAA Tech. Memo., NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-568. 83 p.
- Carson, S., and J. M. Flemming. 2014. Seal encounters at sea: A contemporary spatial approach
 using R-INLA. Ecological Modelling 291:175–181.
- Chawla, N. V., K. W. Bowyer, L. O. Hall, and W. P. Kegelmeyer. 2002. SMOTE: synthetic
 minority over-sampling technique. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research 16:321–357.
- Conn, P.B., D. S. Johnson, J. M. Ver Hoef, M. B. Hooten, J. M. London, and P. L. Boveng. 2015.
 Using spatiaotemporal statistical models to estimate animal abundance and infer ecological
 dynamids from survey counts. Ecological Monographs 85(2):235–252.
- Cosandey-Godin, A., E. T. Krainski, B. Worm, and J. M. Flemming. 2015. Applying Bayesian
 spatiotemporal models to fisheries bycatch in the Canadian Arctic. Canadian Journal of
 Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 72:186–197.
- Cutler, D. R., T. C. Edwards Jr., K. H. Beard, A. Cutler, K. T. Hess, J. Gibson, and J. J. Lawler.
 2007. Random forests for classification in ecology. Ecology 88:2783–2792.
- Davies, R. W. D., S. J. Cripps, A. Nickson, and G. Porter. 2009. Defining and estimating global
 marine fisheries bycatch. Marine Policy 33(4):661-672.
- Diggle, P. J., J. A. Tawn, and R. A. Moyeed. 1998. Model-based geostatistics. Journal of the
 Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics) 47(3):299-350.
- 716 Dormann, C. F., J. M. McPherson, M. B. Araújo, R. Bivand, J. Bolliger, G. Carl, R. G. Davies, A.
- 717 Hirzel, W. Jetz, W. D. Kissling, I. Kühn, R. Ohlemuller, P. R. Peres-Neto, B. Reineking, B.
- 718 Schroder, F. M. Schurr, and R. Wilson 2007. Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation
- in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. Ecography 30(5):609-628.

- Drake, J. M., C. Randin, and A. Guisan. 2006. Modelling ecological niches with support vector
 machines. Journal of Applied Ecology 43:424–432.
- Dunn, D. C., S. M. Maxwell, A. M. Boustany, and P. N. Halpin. 2016. Dynamic ocean
 management increases the efficiency and efficacy of fisheries management. Proceedings of
 the National Academy of Sciences 113:668–673.
- Eguchi, T., S. R. Benson, D. G. Foley, and K. A. Forney. 2017. Predicting overlap between drift
 gillnet fishing and leatherback turtle habitat in the California Current Ecosystem. Fisheries
 Oceanography 26(1):17-33.
- Elith, J., Graham, C. H., Anderson, R. P., Dudik, M., Ferrier, S., Guisan, A., Hijmans, R. J.,
- Huettmann, F., Leathwick, J. R., Lehmann, A., Li, J., Lohmann, L. G., Loiselle, B. A.,
- 730 Manion, G., Moritz, C., Nakamura, M., Nakazawa, Y., Overton, J. M., Peterson, A. T.,
- 731 Phillips, S. J., Richardson, K., Scachetti-Pereira, R., Schapire, R. E., Soberon, J., Williams,
- 732 S., Wisz, M. S., and Zimmermann, N. E. 2006. Novel methods improve prediction of
- species' distributions from occurrence data. Ecography 29:129–151.
- Elith, J., and Graham, C. H. 2009. Do they? How do they? WHY do they differ? On finding
 reasons for differing performances of species distribution models. Ecography 32(1):66-77.
- Elith, J., and Leathwick, J. R. 2009. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and
 prediction across space and time. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics
 40:677–697.
- Evans, J. S., and Cushman, S. A. 2009. Gradient modeling of conifer species using random
 forests. Landscape Ecology 24(5):673-683.
- Fahrmeir, L., Kneib, T., Lang, S., and Marx, B. 2013. Nonparametric regression. Pages 413–533
 in Regression: models, methods and applications. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- 743 FAO. 1995. Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Rome, FAO. 41 p.
- Gilman, E., Kobayashi, D., Swenarton, T., Brothers, N., Dalzell, P., and Kinan-Kelly, I. 2007.
 Reducing sea turtle interactions in the Hawaii-based longline swordfish fishery. Biological
 Conservation 139:19–28.
- Golding, N., and Purse, B. V. 2016. Fast and flexible Bayesian species distribution modelling
 using Gaussian processes. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 7(5): 598-608.
- Guélat, J., and Kéry, M. 2018. Effects of spatial autocorrelation and imperfect detection on
 species distribution models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 9(6):1614-1625.
- Guisan, A., and Thuiller, W. 2005. Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple
 habitat models. Ecology Letters 8:993–1009.

- Gunderson, D. R. 1997. Spatial patterns in the dynamics of slope rockfish stocks and their
 implications for management. Fishery Bulletin 95:219–230.
- 755 Hall, M.A. 1999. Estimating the ecological impacts of fisheries: what data are needed to estimate
- bycatches? In Nolan, C.P. (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Integrated*
- 757 *Fisheries Monitoring*. Paper presented at The International Conference on Integrated
- Fisheries Monitoring, Sydney, Australia, 1-5 February (pp. 175-184). Rome: FAO.
- Hand, D.J. 2009. Measuring classifier performance: a coherent alternative to the area under the
 ROC curve. Machine Learning 77(1):103-123.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. 2009. The elements of statistical learning. 2nd edition.
 Springer New York.
- Hazen, E. L., Palacios, D. M., Forney, K. A., Howell, E. A., Becker, E., Hoover, A. L., Irvine, L.,
 Deangelis, M., Bograd, S. J., Mate, B. R., and Bailey, H. 2016. WhaleWatch: a dynamic
 management tool for predicting blue whale density in the California Current. Journal of
 Applied Ecology 54(5):1415-1428.
- Heikkinen, R. K., Marmion, M., and Luoto, M. 2012. Does the interpolation accuracy of species
 distribution models come at the expense of transferability? Ecography 35(3):276-288.
- Hengl, T., Nussbaum, M., Wright, M. N., and G. B. Heuvelink. 2018. Random Forest as a
 generic framework for predictive modeling of spatial and spatio-temporal variables. PeerJ
 Preprints e26693v1.
- Hooten, M. B., and Hobbs, N. T. 2015. A guide to Bayesian model selection for ecologists.
 Ecology 85:3–28.
- Howell, E. A., Hoover, A., Benson, S. R., Bailey, H., Polovina, J. J., Seminoff, J. A., and Dutton,
 P. H. 2015. Enhancing the TurtleWatch product for leatherback sea turtles, a dynamic
 habitat model for ecosystem-based management. Fisheries Oceanography 24:57–68.
- Howell, E. A., Kobayashi, D. R., Parker, D. M., Balazs, G. H., and Polovina, J. J. 2008.
 TurtleWatch: a tool to aid in the bycatch reduction of loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* in
 the Hawaii-based pelagic longline fishery. Endangered Species Research 5:267–278.
- Ianelli, J. N., and Stram, D. L. 2015. Estimating impacts of the pollock fishery bycatch on
 western Alaska Chinook salmon. ICES Journal of Marine Science 72:1159–1172.
- Illian, J. B., Martino, S., Sørbye, S. H., Gallego-Fernández, J. B., Zunzunegui, M., Esquivias, M.
 P., and Travis, J. M. J. 2013. Fitting complex ecological point process models with
- integrated nested Laplace approximation. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 4:305–315.

Ishwaran, H., and Kogalur, U. B. 2018. Random forests for survival, regression and classification (RF-SRC). R package version 2.6.1.

- Kammann, E. E., and Wand, M. P. 2003. Geoadditive models. Journal of the Royal Statistical
 Society: Series C (Applied Statistics) 52(1):1-18.
- Kelleher, K. 2005. Discards in the world's marine fisheries: An update. FAO Fisheries Technical
 Paper. No. 470. Rome, FAO. 131p.
- Kneib, T., Müller, J., and Hothorn, T. 2008. Spatial smoothing techniques for the assessment of
 habitat suitability. Environmental and Ecological Statistics 15(3):343-364.
- Kobayashi, D. R., Polovina, J. J., Parker, D. M., Kamezaki, N., Cheng, I. J., Uchida, I., Dutton, P.
 H., and Balazs, G. H. 2008. Pelagic habitat characterization of loggerhead sea turtles, *Caretta caretta*, in the North Pacific Ocean (1997–2006): insights from satellite tag tracking
 and remotely sensed data. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 356(1):96114.
- Kuhn, M., and Johnson, K. 2013. Applied predictive modeling. Springer Science & Business
 Media, New York, NY.
- Leathwick, J. R., Elith, J., and Hastie, T. 2006. Comparative performance of generalized additive
 models and multivariate adaptive regression splines for statistical modelling of species
 distributions. Ecological Modelling 199:188–196.
- Lecomte, J. B., Benoît, H. P., Ancelet, S., Etienne, M. P., Bel, L., and Parent, E. 2013. Compound
 Poisson-gamma vs. delta-gamma to handle zero-inflated continuous data under a variable
 sampling volume. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 4(12):1159-1166.
- Lewison, R., Hobday, A. J., Maxwell, S., Hazen, E., Hartog, J. R., Dunn, D. C., Briscoe, D.,
 Fossette, S., O'Keefe, C. E., Barnes, M., Abecassis, M., Bograd, S., Bethoney, N. D.,
 Bailey, H., Wiley, D., Andrews, S., Hazen, L., and Crowder, L. B. 2015. Dynamic ocean
 management: Identifying the critical ingredients of dynamic approaches to ocean resource
- 810 management. BioScience 65:486–498.
- Li, S., and Pan, M. 2011. Fishing opportunities under the sea turtle interaction caps—a spatial
 bio-economic model for Hawaii-based longline swordfish fishery. SOEST 11-02. Joint
 Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research (JIMAR) Contribution 11-378.
- Liaw, A., and Wiener, M. 2002. Classification and regression by randomForest. R News 2:18–22.
- Liggins, G. W., Bradley, M. J., and Kennelly, S. J. 1997. Detection of bias in observer-based
 estimates of retained and discarded catches from a multi species trawl fishery. Fisheries
 Research 32(2):133-147.
- Lindgren, F., and Rue, H. 2015. Bayesian spatial modelling with R-INLA. Journal of Statistical
 Software 63:1–25.
- 820 Lindgren, F., Rue, H., and Lindström, J. 2011. An explicit link between Gaussian fields and

- 821 Gaussian Markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach.
- Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology 73:423–498.
- Marmion, M., Parviainen, M., Luoto, M., Heikkinen, R. K., and Thuiller, W. 2009. Evaluation of
 consensus methods in predictive species distribution modelling. Diversity and Distributions
 15(1):59-69.
- Martin, S. L., Stohs, S. M., and Moore, J. E. 2015. Bayesian inference and assessment for rareevent bycatch in marine fisheries: a drift gillnet fishery case study. Ecological Applications
 25(2):416-429.
- Maunder, M. N., and Punt, A. E. 2004. Standardizing catch and effort data: a review of recent
 approaches. Fisheries Research 70(2):141-159.
- McCracken, M. L. 2004. Modeling a very rare event to estimate sea turtle bycatch: Lessons
 learned. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-3. 30p.
- Meinshausen, N. 2006. Quantile regression forests. Journal of Machine Learning Research
 7:983–999.
- Mentch, L., and Hooker, G. 2017. Formal hypothesis tests for additive structure in random
 forests. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 26(3):589-597.
- 837 Merow, C., Smith, M. J., Edwards, T. C., Guisan, A., McMahon, S. M., Normand, S., Thuiller,
- W., Wüest, R. O., Zimmermann, N. E., and Elith, J. 2014. What do we gain from simplicity
 versus complexity in species distribution models? Ecography 37(12):1267-1281.
- (NMFS) National Marine Fisheries Service. 2013. Groundfish essential fish habitat synthesis: a
 report to the Pacific Fishery Management Council. Seattle, WA.
- (NMFS) National Marine Fisheries Service. 2016. U.S. National Bycatch Report First Edition
 Update 2 [Benaka, L. R., Bullock, D., Davis, J., Seney, E. E., and Winarsoo, H., Editors].
 U.S. Dep. Commer. 90 p.
- 845 (NWFSC) Northwest Fisheries Science Center. 2006. Observer coverage plan: Sampling plan
- and logistics for the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program. NOAA, West Coast
- Groundfish Observer Program, 2725 Montlake Blvd E, Seattle, WA. 10p.
- 848 http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.231.1675.
- (NWFSC) Northwest Fisheries Science Center. 2016. West Coast Groundfish Observer Program
 2016 catch share training manual. Seattle, WA.
- Nichols, W. J., Resendiz, A., Seminoff, J. A., and Resendiz, B. 2000. Transpacific migration of a
 loggerhead turtle monitored by satellite telemetry. Bulletin of Marine Science 67(3):937047
- 853 947.

- Nieto, K., Xu, Y., Teo, S. L. H., McClatchie, S., and Holmes, J. 2017. How important are coastal
 fronts to albacore tuna (Thunnus alalunga) habitat in the Northeast Pacific Ocean? Progress
 in Oceanography 150:62–71.
- NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region. 2015. Rockfish conservation areas.
- http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/fisheries/management/groundfish_closures/rockfis
 h_areas.html.
- NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information. 2015. U.S. Coastal Relief Model.
 https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/coastal/crm.html.
- Olden, J. D., Lawler, J. J., and Poff, N. L. 2008. Machine learning methods without tears: a
 primer for ecologists. The Quarterly Review of Biology 83:171–193.
- Parmesan, C., and Yohe, G. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts
 across natural systems. Nature 421:37–42.
- Pearce, J., and Ferrier, S. 2000. An evaluation of alternative algorithms for fitting species
 distribution models using logistic regression. Ecological Modelling 128:127–147.
- Pennington, M. 1983. Efficient estimators of abundance, for fish and plankton surveys.
 Biometrics 39:281–286.
- Péron, G., Ferrand, Y., Gossmann, F., Bastat, C., Guenezan, M., and Gimenez, O. 2011.
- Nonparametric spatial regression of survival probability: visualization of population sinks in
 Eurasian Woodcock. Ecology 92(8):1672-1679.
- Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., and Schapire, R. E. 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species
 geographic distributions. Ecological Modelling 190:231–259.
- 875 Phillips, S. J., and Dudík, M. 2008. Modeling of species distribution with Maxent: new
- extensions and a comprehensive evalutation. Ecography 31:161–175.
- (PIROP) Pacific Islands Regional Observer Program. 2014. Hawaii longline observer program
 observer field manual. Version LM.14.04. NOAA/IRC 1, 1845 Wasp Blvd. Bldg. 176,
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96818.
- Pons, M., Marroni, S., Machado, I., Ghattas, B., and Domingo, A. 2009. Machine learning
 procedures: an application to by-catch data of the marine turtles *Caretta Caretta* in the
 Southwestern Atlantic Ocean. Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT. 64(7):2443-2454.
- Pinsky, M. L., Worm, B., Fogarty, M. J., Sarmiento, J. L., and Levin, S. A. 2013. Marine taxa
 track local climate velocities. Science 341:1239–1242.
- Prasad, A. M., Iverson, L. R., and Liaw, A. 2006. Newer classification and regression tree
 techniques: bagging and random forests for ecological prediction. Ecosystems 9(2):181-

- 887 199.
- Quinlan, J. R. 1992. Learning with continuous classes. *In* 5th Australian Joint Conference on
 Artificial Intelligence, pp. 343–348.
- Quinlan, J. R. 1993. Combining instance-based and model-based learning. *In* Proceedings of the
 Tenth International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 236–243.
- R Core Team. 2017. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Randin, C. F., Dirnböck, T., Dullinger, S., Zimmermann, N. E., Zappa, M., and Guisan, A. 2006.
 Are niche-based species distribution models transferable in space? Journal of Biogeography
 33(10):1689-1703.
- Reynolds, R. W., Smith, T. M., Liu, C., Chelton, D. B., Casey, K. S., and Schlax, M. G. 2007.
 Daily high-resolution-blended analyses for sea surface temperature. Journal of Climate
 20:5473–5496.
- Roberts, D. R., Bahn, V., Ciuti, S., Boyce, M. S., Elith, J., Guillera-Arroita, G., Hauenstein, S.,
 Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., Schröder, B., Thuiller, W., Warton, D. I., Wintle, B. A., Hartig, F., and
 Dormann, C. F. 2017. Cross-validation strategies for data with temporal, spatial,
 hierarchical, or phylogenetic structure. Ecography 40(8):913-929.
- Rue, H., Martino, S., and Chopin, N. 2009. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian
 models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. Journal of the Royal Statistical
 Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology 71:319–392.
- Scales, K. L., Miller, P. I., Ingram, S. N., Hazen, E. L., Bograd, S. J., and Phillips, R. A. 2016.
 Identifying predictable foraging habitats for a wide-ranging marine predator using ensemble
 ecological niche models. Diversity and Distributions 22:212-224.
- Shelton, A. O., Thorson, J. T., Ward, E. J., and Feist, B. E. 2014. Spatial semiparametric models
 improve estimates of species abundance and distribution. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
 Aquatic Sciences 71:1655–1666.
- 913 Shmueli, G. 2010. To explain or to predict? Statistical Science 25:289–310.
- Skud, B. E. 1977. Drift, migration, and intermingling of Pacific halibut stocks. Scientific Report
 No. 63. International Pacific Halibut Commission, Seattle, WA.
- Smoliński, S., and Radtke, K. 2017. Spatial prediction of demersal fish diversity in the Baltic
 Sea: comparison of machine learning and regression-based techniques. ICES Journal of
 Marine Science 74:102–111.
- 919 Soykan, C. U., Eguchi, T., Kohin, S., and Dewar, H. 2014. Prediction of fishing effort

- 920 distributions using boosted regression trees. Ecological Applications 24(1):71-83.
- Stefánsson, G. 1996. Analysis of groundfish survey abundance data: combining the GLM and
 delta approaches. ICES Journal of Marine Science 53(3):577–588.
- Stock, B. C., Ward, E. J., Thorson, J. T., Jannot, J. E., and Semmens, B. X. 2019. The utility of
 spatial model-based estimators of unobserved bycatch. ICES Journal of Marine Science
 76:255–267.
- Sumaila, U. R., Cheung, W. W. L., Lam, V. W. Y., Pauly, D., and Herrick, S. 2011. Climate
 change impacts on the biophysics and economics of world fisheries. Nature Climate Change
 1:449–456.
- Thorson, J. T., and Barnett, L. A. K. 2017. Comparing estimates of abundance trends and
 distribution shifts using single- and multispecies models of fishes and biogenic habitat.
 ICES Journal of Marine Science 74:1311–1321.
- Thorson, J. T., Fonner, R., Haltuch, M. A., Ono, K., and Winker, H. 2017. Accounting for
 spatiotemporal variation and fisher targeting when estimating abundance from multispecies
 fishery data. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 74:1794–1807.
- Thorson, J. T., Scheuerell, M. D., Shelton, A. O., See, K. E., Skaug, H. J., and Kristensen, K.
 2015*a*. Spatial factor analysis: a new tool for estimating joint species distributions and
 correlations in species range. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 6:627–637.
- Thorson, J. T., Shelton, A. O., Ward, E. J., and Skaug, H. J. 2015b. Geostatistical deltageneralized linear mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices for
 West Coast groundfishes. ICES Journal of Marine Science 72:1297–1310.
- P41 Thorson, J. T., Skaug, H. J., Kristensen, K., Shelton, A. O., Ward, E. J., Harms, J. H., and
 P42 Benante, J. A. 2015*c*. The importance of spatial models for estimating the strength of
 P43 density dependence. Ecology 96:1202–1212.
- 944 Torgo, L. 2010. Data mining with R: Learning with case studies. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca945 Raton, FL.
- Venables, W. N., and Dichmont, C. M. 2004. GLMs, GAMs and GLMMs: an overview of theory
 for applications in fisheries research. Fisheries Research 70(2):319-337.
- Wager, S., and Athey, S. 2017. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using
 random forests. Journal of the American Statistical Association.
- Wager, S., Hastie, T., and Efron, B. 2014. Confidence intervals for random forests: the jackknife
 and the infinitesimal jackknife. Journal of Machine Learning Research 15:1625–1651.
- 952 Ward, E. J., Holmes, E. E., Thorson, J. T., and Collen, B. 2014. Complexity is costly: a meta-

- analysis of parametric and non-parametric methods for short-term population forecasting.Oikos 123:652–661.
- Ward, E. J., Jannot, J. E., Lee, Y. W., Ono, K., Shelton, A. O., and Thorson, J. T. 2015. Using
 spatiotemporal species distribution models to identify temporally evolving hotspots of
 species co-occurrence. Ecological Applications 25:2198–2209.
- Watson, J. T., Essington, T. E., Lennert-Cody, C. E., and Hall, M. A. 2009. Trade-offs in the
 design of fishery closures: Management of silky shark bycatch in the Eastern Pacific Ocean
 Tuna fishery. Conservation Biology 23:626–635.
- Welling, S. H., Refsgaard, H. H. F., Brockhoff, P. B., and Clemmensen, L. H. 2016. Forest floor
 visualizations of random forests. ArXiv e-prints. http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.09196.
- Wood, S. N. 2017. Generalized additive models: An introduction with R (2nd ed.). Chapman &
 Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.
- Wood, S. N. 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation
 of semiparametric generalized linear models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series
 B (Statistical Methodology) 73(1):3-36.

968

969 Data Accessibility

- 970 Unsummarized fisheries observer data are deemed confidential. Code to download and process
- 971 publicly available fisheries survey data, run each of the models, and replicate figures is provided
- 972 at https://github.com/brianstock/spatial-bycatch. Summarized reports of the fisheries observer
- 973 program data are available at:
- 974 https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/fram/observation/data products/data library.cfm
- 975 (U.S. West Coast groundfish) and http://www.fpir.noaa.gov/OBS/obs_hi_ll_ss_rprts.html
- 976 (Hawaii longline).
- 977

978 Author contributions

- 979 BCS, EW, TE, and BXS conceived of and designed the study with input from JJ, JT, and BF;
- 980 BCS, JJ, and BF curated the data; BCS performed the analysis with input from EW and BXS;
- 981 BCS, EW, and JT drafted the manuscript; all authors provided critical reviews.
- 982

Model	Parametric?	Computational intensity	R package	Inclusion of spatial locations
Generalized linear model (GLM)	Parametric			
GLM		Low	mgcv	None
Generalized additive model (GAM)	Semiparametric			
GAM-CONSTANT		Low	mgcv	+ s(Lat, Lon, k=100)
GAM-YEAR		Medium	mgcv	+ s(Lat, Lon, k=100, by=year)
Gaussian Markov random field (GMRF)	Semiparametric			
GMRF-CONSTANT		High	INLA	+ f(i, model=spde)
GMRF-YEAR		Very high	INLA	+ f(i, model=spde, group=year, control.group=list(model='exchangeable'))
Random forests (RF)	Nonparametric			
RF-BASE		Low	randomForest	+ Lat + Lon
RF-DOWN		Low	randomForest	+ Lat + Lon
RF-SMOTE		Low	caret	+ Lat + Lon

983

984 Table 1. Properties of the considered statistical models and how each model incorporates spatial 985 fishing locations. The GLM model serves as the baseline model-no spatial data included. GAM 986 models fit 2-d splines on geographical coordinates (i.e. latitude and longitude), either constant 987 across years (GAM-CONSTANT) or estimating a different spline for each year (GAM-YEAR). 988 Gaussian Markov random field (GMRF) models incorporate spatial locations by estimating the 989 covariance between locations as a random field (with stationary Matern covariance function). As 990 for GAMs, we fit GMRFs that estimate one random field kept constant across years (GMRF-991 CONSTANT) or estimate a random field for each year (GMRF-YEAR). RF is nonparametric and 992 thus only incorporates spatial locations by including covariates of latitude and longitude. All 993 models for a given species were fit using the same non-spatial covariates (habitat, depth, SST, 994 etc.). We used the R packages 'mgcv' (GLM and GAM), 'INLA' (GMRF), 'randomForest' (RF), 995 and 'caret' (RF-SMOTE).

Figure 1. Spatial extent of the two fisheries observer datasets. a) Fishing effort in the West Coast
groundfish trawl fishery from 2003 to 2012 (42,786 haul locations). b) Fishing effort in the
shallow-set Hawaii longline swordfish fishery from 1994 to 2014 (16,714 set locations).
Bivariate kernel density estimates of fishing effort were used to smooth the data ('bkde2D'
function in R package 'KernSmooth').

1001

1002 Figure 2. Predictive performance boxplots of the a) binomial and b) positive components of the 1003 delta-model on test data from 5-fold cross-validation repeated 10 times: a) AUC for the binomial 1004 component, and b) normalized RMSE for the positive component. Across species, random 1005 forests (RFs) outperformed GAMs and GMRFs (highest AUC, lowest RMSE). Significant (p < p1006 0.05, Tukey's HSD) within-species performance differences from RF and GMRF are denoted 1007 with black and blue asterisks, respectively. Only the best submodel, e.g. CONSTANT or YEAR, 1008 within each model class for each species is shown here (see Supplement). Species abbreviations: 1009 DBRK = darkblotched rockfish, PHLB = Pacific halibut, YEYE = yelloweye rockfish, LOGG = 1010 loggerhead turtle, LEATH = leatherback turtle, BLUE = blue shark. 1011

Figure 3. Bycatch-to-target species catch ratio achieved by using the binomial component of the delta-model to predict and remove fishing sets in the test data, relative to the bycatch-to-target ratio with no fishing sets removed. Lines show median of 50 cross-validation runs for each model class (5-fold CV repeated 10 times), averaged across the six species. Shaded areas are bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for the median. Random forest (RF) performed the best, reducing the bycatch-to-target ratio by 34% when removing 5% of fishing, and by 50% when removing 10% of fishing. As in Figure 2, only the best submodel within each model class (e.g. 1019 CONSTANT or YEAR) for each species is shown here.

1020



1041 as test datasets. Triangles show median model performance from 5-fold cross-validation runs

1042	with random test/train splits (Fig. 2). When extrapolating spatially, all models performed equal to
1043	or worse than when interpolating (i.e. points are lower AUC and higher RMSE than triangles at
1044	20% removed). Compared to GMRF, RF performance was more sensitive to withholding data at
1045	the edge of the fishery (i.e. regression lines have steeper slopes). Missing points and lines
1046	indicate the model failed to converge, as for GMRF with yelloweye rockfish. Species
1047	abbreviations: DBRK = darkblotched rockfish, PHLB = Pacific halibut, YEYE = yelloweye
1048	rockfish, LOGG = loggerhead turtle, LEATH = leatherback turtle, BLUE = blue shark.
1049	
1050	Figure 7. GMRF-YEAR random field for bycatch probability of darkblotched rockfish from
1051	2008 to 2012.
1052	
1053	Additional supplemental items may be found in the online version of this article:
1054	Supplemental Figures S1-S18. Maps of model residuals for all species for the binomial and
1055	positive components of the delta-model.
1056	Figure A1. Binomial component predictive performance (AUC) for the three random forest
1057	(RF) submodels for all six species.
1058	Figure A2. Binomial component predictive performance (AUC) for the two GMRF models:
1059	CONSTANT (white, one random field constant across years) and YEAR (grey, random
1060	field fit for each year).
1061	Figure A3. GMRF-CONSTANT random field for bycatch probability of the three U.S. West
1062	Coast groundfish species (DBRK = darkblotched rockfish, PHLB = Pacific halibut, and
1063	YEYE = yelloweye rockfish).

1064 Figure A4. Bycatch-to-target species catch ratio achieved for each species by using the

- 1065 binomial component of each delta-model to predict and remove fishing sets in the test
- 1066 data, relative to the bycatch-to-target ratio with no fishing sets removed.
- 1067 Figure A5. Distribution of blue shark bycatch by latitude.
- 1068 Figure A6. Spatial spline correlograms of residuals from the A) binomial and B) positive
- 1069 components of the delta-models.

1070



















1087 Figure 6.





