Supplementary Table 8 for 1 2 Identifying Management Actions that Promote Sustainable Fisheries 3 4 Michael C. Melnychuk, Hiroyuki Kurota, Pamela M. Mace, Maite Pons, Cóilín Minto, Giacomo 5 Chato Osio, Olaf P. Jensen, Carryn L. de Moor, Ana M. Parma, L. Richard Little, Daniel Hively, 6 Charmane E. Ashbrook, Nicole Baker, Ricardo O. Amoroso, Trevor A. Branch, Christopher M. 7 Anderson, Cody S. Szuwalski, Julia K. Baum, Tim McClanahan, Yimin Ye, Alessandro Ligas, 8 Jilali Bensbai, Grant G. Thompson, John DeVore, Arni Magnusson, Bjarte Bogstad, Edward 9 Wort, Jake Rice, Ray Hilborn 10 11 Correspondence to: mmel@u.washington.edu 12 13 This PDF file is provided separately from other Supplementary Information. 14

Supplementary Table 8 | Summary of comparisons between sensitivity analyses and main run of results. See Supplementary Note 2 for details.

Analysis	Sample size (number of stocks) for analyses of U/U_{REF} and B/B_{REF} :		Coefficient estimate (SE) for: r ₁ , rebuilding plan (immediate) r ₂₊ , rebuilding plan (persistent) s, stock-level management intensity n, national-level management intensity		Visual comparison with Figs. 3-5 and Supplementary Figure 8
	separate (Figs. 3, 4)	together (Fig. 5)	$U/U_{ m REF}$	$B/B_{ m REF}$	
Main run	288	277	r ₁ : -0.799 (0.039) r ₂₊ : -0.022 (0.010) s: -0.030 (0.013) n: -0.045 (0.011)	r ₁ : -0.006 (0.015) r ₂₊ : 0.064 (0.008) s: 0.012 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.009)	
Sensitivity 1—reference points (no SP fits)	248	203	r ₁ : -0.196 (0.038) r ₂₊ : -0.023 (0.011) s: -0.018 (0.014) n: -0.052 (0.013)	r ₁ : -0.003 (0.017) r ₂₊ : 0.059 (0.009) s: 0.014 (0.012) n: 0.026 (0.011)	 Fig. 3 similar for B/B_{REF}, differences for U/U_{REF} (see Supplementary Note 2) Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar for B/B_{REF}, differences for U/U_{REF} (see Supplementary Note 2) Fig. 5 differences (see Supplementary Note 2)
Sensitivity 2— time series length (min. 20 yrs)	254	242	r ₁ : -0.791 (0.039) r ₂₊ : -0.023 (0.010) s: -0.030 (0.013) n: -0.042 (0.011)	r ₁ : 0.005 (0.014) r ₂₊ : 0.063 (0.008) s: 0.010 (0.011) n: 0.023 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar

Analysis	Sample size (number of stocks) for analyses of U/U_{REF} and B/B_{REF} :		Coefficient estimate (SE) for: r ₁ , rebuilding plan (immediate) r ₂₊ , rebuilding plan (persistent) s, stock-level management intensity n, national-level management intensity		Visual comparison with Figs. 3-5 and Supplementary Figure 8
	separate (Figs. 3, 4)	together (Fig. 5)	$U/U_{ m REF}$	$B/B_{ m REF}$	
Sensitivity 3a—ARIMA structure (p =0, q =0)	288	277	r ₁ : -0.788 (0.041) r ₂₊ : -0.008 (0.020) s: -0.042 (0.026) n: -0.042 (0.022)	r ₁ : -0.010 (0.016) r ₂₊ : 0.064 (0.007) s: 0.012 (0.010) n: 0.022 (0.009)	Fig. 3 similar (wider confidence limits) Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar
Sensitivity 3b—ARIMA structure $(p=1, q=0)$	288	277	$\begin{split} r_1 &: -0.800 \ (0.041) \\ r_2 &: -0.007 \ (0.016) \\ s &: -0.040 \ (0.021) \\ n &: -0.045 \ (0.018) \end{split}$	r ₁ : -0.003 (0.015) r ₂₊ : 0.063 (0.008) s: 0.012 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar
Sensitivity 3c— ARIMA structure (p=2, q=0)	288	277	r ₁ : -0.829 (0.040) r ₂₊ : -0.010 (0.015) s: -0.035 (0.019) n: -0.048 (0.016)	r ₁ : -0.004 (0.015) r ₂₊ : 0.063 (0.008) s: 0.012 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar
Sensitivity 3d—ARIMA structure (p =0, q =1)	288	277	r ₁ : -0.816 (0.040) r ₂₊ : -0.009 (0.014) s: -0.036 (0.019) n: -0.047 (0.016)	r ₁ : -0.004 (0.015) r ₂₊ : 0.063 (0.008) s: 0.012 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar

Analysis	Sample size (number of stocks) for analyses of U/U_{REF} and B/B_{REF} :		Coefficient estimate (SE) for: r ₁ , rebuilding plan (immediate) r ₂₊ , rebuilding plan (persistent) s, stock-level management intensity n, national-level management intensity		Visual comparison with Figs. 3-5 and Supplementary Figure 8
	separate (Figs. 3, 4)	together (Fig. 5)	$U/U_{ m REF}$	$B/B_{ m REF}$	
Sensitivity 4a—regional weighting (proportional to $n_{r,RAMLDBfull}$)	288	277	r ₁ : -0.843 (0.040) r ₂₊ : -0.029 (0.011) s: -0.030 (0.013) n: -0.045 (0.012)	r ₁ : -0.008 (0.016) r ₂₊ : 0.075 (0.009) s: 0.005 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar
Sensitivity 4b—regional weighting (proportional to $n_{r,RAMLDBsub}$)	288	277	$\begin{split} r_1 &: -0.903 \ (0.040) \\ r_{2+} &: -0.031 \ (0.011) \\ s &: -0.031 \ (0.013) \\ n &: -0.042 \ (0.011) \end{split}$	r ₁ : -0.010 (0.017) r ₂₊ : 0.077 (0.009) s: 0.004 (0.011) n: 0.022 (0.010)	Fig. 3 similar Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure 8 similar Fig. 5 similar