

Appendix I1:

Model Comparisons: Aggregated Catch Data for the "18" Scenarios

William Stockhausen

31 August, 2018

Model fits to aggregated catch data

Fits to the aggregated catch data available to the model(s) are presented in this section. Not all of the fits presented are necessarily included in the parameter optimization for each model; some fits to datasets for a particular model may be included for comparison purposes with other models which include those data in their optimization. The reader should consult the main assessment document to determine which fits are included in the optimization for any particular model.




Figure 1: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey biomass for NMFS (all by XM). Observed time period.




Figure 2: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey biomass for NMFS (all by XM). Observed time period.




Figure 3: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey biomass for NMFS (males by XS). Observed time period.




Figure 4: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey biomass for NMFS (females by XMS). Observed time period.




Figure 5: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey biomass for NMFS (females by XMS). Recent time period.




Figure 6: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey biomass for NMFS (males by X).




Figure 7: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey biomass for NMFS (males by X). Observed time period.




Figure 8: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey biomass for NMFS (males by X). Recent time period.




Figure 9: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey biomass for NMFS (females by XM).




Figure 10: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey biomass for NMFS (females by XM). Observed time period.




Figure 11: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey abundance for NMFS (all by XM). Observed time period.




Figure 12: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey abundance for NMFS (all by XM). Observed time period.




Figure 13: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey abundance for NMFS (males by XS). Observed time period.




Figure 14: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey abundance for NMFS (females by XMS). Observed time period.




Figure 15: Comparison of observed and predicted male survey abundance for NMFS (males by X). Observed time period.




Figure 16: Comparison of observed and predicted female survey abundance for NMFS (females by XM). Observed time period.

Fishery retained catch biomass

Fits




Figure 17: Comparison of observed and predicted male retained catch biomass for TCF.

Fishery retained catch abundance

Fits




Figure 18: Comparison of observed and predicted male retained catch abundance for TCF.

Fishery total catch biomass

Fits




Figure 19: Comparison of observed and predicted total male catch biomass for TCF.




Figure 20: Comparison of observed and predicted total female catch biomass for TCF.




Figure 21: Comparison of observed and predicted total male catch biomass for SCF.




Figure 22: Comparison of observed and predicted total female catch biomass for SCF.




Figure 23: Comparison of observed and predicted total all sex catch biomass for GTF.




Figure 24: Comparison of observed and predicted total male catch biomass for RKF.




Figure 25: Comparison of observed and predicted total female catch biomass for RKF.