Is Corroborating Ages a Valid Concept in (Walleye pollock, *Theragra chalcogramma*) Fish Age Determination?

Daniel K. Kimura¹, Alexander V. Buslov², Betty J. Goetz¹, Christopher M. Gburski¹, and Craig R. Kastelle¹ ¹Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Seattle, WA 98115-6349 / ²Kamchatka Research Institute of Fisheries & Oceanography, Kamchatniro, 18 Naberezhnyaya, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Russia 683602

Age Determination Criteria Corroboration Versus Validation



Corroboration and validation can be thought of as a continuum providing stronger or weaker evidence supporting fish age determination criteria.

The above definitions suggest that corroboration and validation really constitute a continuum of evidence supporting the ageing criteria being used on a particular species. Not only does the strength of corroborative-validation methods differ intrinsically (i.e., by method), the quality of the study may vary due to other factors including the quality of data and the experimental design.

Should age researchers pursue corroboration of fish ages? To answer this question we look at three corroboration studies of otolith ages from walleye pollock.

Study 1. Age Corroboration using Marginal Increment Analysis

This study documents the annual nature of otolith growth through the year, by documenting the faster, summer opaque growth, and the slower winter hyaline growth.

To do this we used edge type data for all ages collected by an experienced age reader from 1989 to 2002. We categorized this data into four edge categories: (1) a full increment of opaque growth or a hyaline zone on the edge (Fig. 1a), (2) slight opaque edge growth beyond the last hyaline zone, (3) an opaque edge with $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ the opaque growth of the previous opaque increment (Fig. 1b), (4) an opaque edge with $\frac{1}{2}$ to a full year's opaque growth on the edge.



Categories 1 and 3 are the critical edge categories. If the marks we are interpreting as annular are truly annular, we should see a flip flop of the proportion of each type during the year (Fig. 1c).

Photograph of an otolith from a 3 yr-old with an edge category of 1 collected March 16^{th} .

Photograph of an otolith from a 3 yr-old with an edge category of 3 collected June 7th.

Plot showing the proportions of otolith specimens having an edge category of 1 or 3.

Study 2. Age Corroboration using the Strong 1978 Year Class

Fish age determination can be corroborated if a strong year class can be followed over time. This indicates that the ageing criteria being used is providing correct ages.

The 1978 year class in the eastern Bering Sea is perhaps the strongest year class of walleye pollock on record (Ianelli, 2002). It showed up well as 1 yr-olds in summer length frequencies in both the bottom trawl survey (Fig. 2a) and the acoustic-midwater trawl survey (Fig. 2b) in 1979 (Bakkala and Wespestad, 1983). The age frequencies from survey samples from 1982 to 1991 also show the predominance of the 1978 year class (Fig. 2c). In interpreting these data, it should be noted that age samples were length stratified on a vessel basis so that tails of the distribution were over sampled.

Study 3. Age Corroboration by Comparing Otolith Ages with Vertebra Ages

The basis of age corroboration using an additional hard structure is that if both structures provide similar ages, then the ageing criteria used on each structure is corroborated.

Two age readers made independent readings of otoliths and vertebrae. In this study age structures were randomized so that knowledge of otolith age was not known when reading vertebrae. Reader 1 (Fig. 3a) was experienced in ageing walleye pollock using both otoliths and vertebrae. Reader 2 (Fig. 3b) was extremely experienced in ageing pollock using otoliths, but had never before aged vertebra.









Cross-tabulation of walleye pollock otolith and vertebra ages generated by Reader 2.



Graphs showing samples aged from annual summer bottom trawl surveys in the eastern Bering Sea. The red category depicts the age class from the extraordinarily strong 1978 year class. The strength of this year class was quite visible from age 4 yr to 13 yr.

Conclusions

- Examinations of definitions of age corroboration and validation suggest that these terms really constitute a continuum of evidence supporting the ageing criteria being used on a particular species and not necessarily two separate classifications.
 - Study 1: Age Corroboration using Marginal Increment Analysis provided strong indication that presumed annuli are being formed on an annual basis.

- Study 2: Age Corroboration using the Strong 1978 Year Class indicates that the otolith ageing criteria successfully followed this year class from ages 4 yr to 13 yr.
 - Study 3: Age Corroboration by Comparing Otolith Ages with Vertebra Ages showed that in general ages read using the whole vertebra centrum gave ages similar to otolith ages.
- Taken together these corroborative studies give considerable confidence in the otolith ageing criteria (mixed surface and cut and burn) being used for walleye pollock.
- A corroborative study might be more useful in arguing basic reasonableness of the age data where large differences in ageing criteria are conjectured, rather than the finer interpretation of annular zones.
- Should age researchers pursue corroboration of fish ages? Yes, we conclude that corroborative studies can contribute greatly to a scientific evaluation of age determination criteria.

REFERENCES

- Bakkala, R.G., and V.G. Wespestad. 1983. Walleye pollock. p1-37. In Bakkala, R.G., and L.L. Low (editors) Condition of Groundfish Resources in the Eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Region in 1982. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/NWC-42. 187p.
- Ianelli, J. 2002. Walleye pollock. *In* Appendix A, Stock assessment and fishery evaluation report for the groundfish resources of the eastern Bering Sea/ Aleutian Islands regions, North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 West 4th Ave., Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501.
- Kalish, J.M., R.J. Beamish, E.B. Brothers, J.M. Casselman, R.I.C.C. Francis, H. Mosegaard, J. Panfili, E.D. Prince, R.E. Thresher, C.A. Wilson, and P.J. Wright. 1995. Glossary for otolith studies. P723-729. *In* Secor, D.H., J.M. Dean, and S.E. Campana (editors) Recent Developments in Fish Otolith Research. University of South Carolina Press, 735p.