

Balancing yield with resilience and conservation objectives in harvested predator-prey communities

Eric Tromeur, Nicolas Loeuille

▶ To cite this version:

Eric Tromeur, Nicolas Loeuille. Balancing yield with resilience and conservation objectives in harvested predator-prey communities. Oikos, 2017, 126 (12), pp.1780-1789. 10.1111/oik.03985 . hal-01649839

HAL Id: hal-01649839 https://hal.science/hal-01649839

Submitted on 27 Nov 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Balancing yield with resilience and conservation objectives in harvested
2	predator-prey communities
3	
4	Eric Tromeur ^{1,2,a} , Nicolas Loeuille ^{2,b}
5	
6	¹ AgroParisTech, Univ Paris-Saclay, 16 rue Claude Bernard, 75231, Paris, France
7	
8	² Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Univ Paris Diderot, Univ Paris-Est
9	Créteil, CNRS, INRA, IRD, Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences of Paris
10	(iEES Paris), 7 quai St Bernard, 75252, Paris, France
11	
12	^a ORCID: 0000-0003-0620-7902; Email: <u>eric.tromeur@agroparistech.fr</u>
13	
14	^b ORCID: 0000-0001-9588-6542; Email: <u>nicolas.loeuille@upmc.fr</u>

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

15 Abstract

16 The global overexploitation of fish stocks is endangering many marine food webs. 17 Scientists and managers now call for an ecosystem-based fisheries management, able 18 to take into account the complexity of marine ecosystems and the multiple ecosystem 19 services they provide. By contrast, many fishery management plans only focus on 20 maximizing the productivity of harvested stocks. Such practices are suggested to 21 affect other ecosystem services, altering the integrity and resilience of natural 22 communities. Here we show that while yield-maximizing policies can allow for 23 coexistence and resilience in predator-prey communities, they are not optimal in a 24 multi-objective context. We find that although total prey and predator maximum 25 yields are higher with a prey-oriented harvest, focusing on the predator improves 26 species coexistence. Also, moderate harvesting of the predator can enhance resilience. 27 Furthermore, increasing maximum yields by changing catchabilities improves 28 resilience in predator-oriented systems, but reduces it in prev-oriented systems. In a 29 multi-objective context, optimal harvesting strategies involve a general trade-off 30 between yield and resilience. Resilience-maximizing strategies are however 31 compatible with quite high yields, and should often be favored. Our results further 32 suggest that balancing harvest between trophic levels is often best at maintaining 33 simultaneously species coexistence, resilience and yield.

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

34 Introduction

35 The overexploitation of fish stocks is a global phenomenon that has major impacts on 36 the structure and the functioning of marine ecosystems (Pauly et al. 1998, Worm et al. 37 2009). It has been shown to reduce the numbers of top predators such as sharks 38 (Myers et al. 2007), thus triggering trophic cascades that compromise the 39 conservation of marine biodiversity (Pauly et al. 1998, Estes et al. 2011) and affect its 40 global functioning. Resulting biodiversity losses impair the delivery of ocean 41 ecosystem services, altering the resilience and the productivity of fisheries (Worm et 42 al. 2006). As a consequence, scientists are now calling for a consistent ecosystem-43 based fisheries management (EBFM), able to tackle the complexity of multispecies 44 fisheries, and to balance multiple ecosystem services (Pikitch et al. 2004, Bennett et 45 al. 2009).

46 However, many fisheries only focus on a single service, namely the productivity of the fishery. As a result, the maximum sustainable vield (hereafter 47 48 MSY), has become the most common management target in world fisheries (Mace 49 2001). This reference point corresponds to the maximum level of catches that can be 50 harvested from a fish stock while allowing the stock to regenerate. However, MSY 51 targets generally rely on single-species assessments (Larkin 1977), which in 52 multispecies contexts has been found to deteriorate the structure of marine ecosystems 53 (Walters et al. 2005). This may in turn have far-reaching consequences on other 54 ecosystem services such as ecosystem regulation and biomass preservation (Bennett 55 et al. 2009). The compatibility of yield-maximizing strategies with the principles of 56 ecosystem-based management is thus in question. This issue is particularly pressing 57 given ecological network structures, where harvesting a species can affect other 58 interacting species.

59	First, maximizing catches of a given species can endanger other trophic levels
60	through indirect density-dependent effects. Predator species are particularly sensitive
61	as they compete with harvesters for prey (Christensen 1996). Such indirect effects of
62	prey harvesting have been empirically suggested to reduce predator numbers in
63	multispecies fisheries (Pauly 1979, Trites et al. 1997, Essington and Munch 2014).
64	Collapse of predator populations can also directly result from predator harvest (Myers
65	and Worm 2003). As a consequence of the competition between predator species and
66	harvesters, the culling of predator species has also been proposed to increase the
67	productivity of some fisheries (Yodzis 1994).
68	Accordingly, former theoretical studies suggested that maximizing prey yield
69	requires culling predators (May et al. 1979, Beddington and Cooke 1982, Legović et
70	al. 2010, Kar and Ghosh 2013), except if the predator can rely on other resources or if
71	the trophic interaction is ratio-dependent (Larkin 1966, Kar and Ghosh 2013). On the
72	contrary, if the predator is the only harvested species, harvesting it at MSY enables
73	the coexistence of prey and predator species (Legović et al. 2010, Kar and Ghosh
74	2013). Harvesting both prey and predator species to reach a multispecies MSY can
75	enable the coexistence of the two species if the predator species is productive enough
76	and can sustain sufficient harvesting levels (Larkin 1966, May et al. 1979, Matsuda
77	and Abrams 2006, Kar and Ghosh 2013).
78	Second, yield-maximizing strategies can impact the resilience of the harvested
79	food webs. Resilience is generally construed as the ability of food webs to recover
80	from disturbances (McCann 2000). Empirical evidence usually suggests that

81 harvesting reduces the resilience of marine ecosystems. Hsieh et al. (2006) found for

82 instance that fishing increases variability in the abundance of harvested species. This

83 effect has been interpreted as the result of changes in the size structure of fish

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

84	populations (Anderson et al. 2008, Kuparinen et al. 2016). In predator-prey
85	communities, harvesting predators has also been shown to promote regime shifts
86	towards persistently low predator populations (Estes et al. 2011), as shown with cod
87	in the Baltic Sea (Gardmark et al. 2014). Likewise, the resilience of coral
88	communities can be affected by the harvest of herbivorous fish (Mumby et al. 2013,
89	2016). A local stability analysis of a coastal fish community based on empirical data
90	also revealed a destabilizing effect of predator decline over time (Britten et al. 2014).
91	Theoretical studies have shown that the resilience of harvested predator-prey
92	food webs is highly dependent on the relative intensity of prey and predator harvest.
93	In many studies, increasing the rate of prey harvesting leads to less stable predator-
94	prey dynamics (Brauer and Soudack 1979a, May et al. 1979). The impact of predator
95	harvest is less clear however. Increasing the rate of harvest has been found to
96	destabilize the dynamics of the system (Brauer and Soudack 1979b, May et al. 1979),
97	which is coherent with the view that predators tend to stabilize ecosystems
98	(Christensen 1996, Rooney et al. 2006). However, harvesting predators has also been
99	found to stabilize the dynamics of the system (Brauer and Soudack 1979b, Plank and
100	Law 2012). This latter result is coherent with the assumption that a decreased energy
101	flux relative to the predator loss rate increases the resilience of the system to
102	perturbations (Rosenzweig 1971, Rip and McCann 2011).
103	In the present work, we intend to discuss management from a simple point of
104	view, accounting for multiple ecosystem services. We not only assess the productivity
105	of the fishery (ressource supply ecosystem service), a classical target of MSY models,
106	but also the integrity of the community (maintenance of all species, a conservation
107	target) and its resilience. To allow for a more thorough mathematical analysis,
108	resilience is measured as the time it takes for the system to come back to equilibrium

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

109	after a small disturbance. We investigate the effects of maximizing yield on one of the
110	two interacting species and on the whole community. We explore synergies and trade-
111	offs between yield, conservation and resilience that arise from different harvesting
112	strategies. More specifically, we predict: (1) from a conservation point of view, as
113	predator populations limit potential prey yields, yield-maximizing strategies can be
114	expected to deplete predator populations, resulting in a trade-off between yield and
115	conservation objectives. (2) This in turn could affect resilience; in particular,
116	increased prey harvests can be expected to reduce resilience, while the effects of
117	predator harvest remain unclear. Thus, trade-offs are also likely to arise between
118	resilience and yield and to depend on the relative intensities of prey and predator
119	harvest. (3) That given these two trade-off axes, one may only need to sacrifice a little
120	yield compared to MSY targets, to allow a better and more integrative management of
121	marine ecosystems (in line with Pretty Good Yield concepts (Hilborn 2010)).
122	Our results indeed highlight a general trade-off between yield and resilience
123	that depends on the relative harvesting intensities of prey and predator species, and
124	suggest that a sensible strategy meeting all three targets usually balances the
125	harvesting between predator and prey species.
126	
127	Methods

128 Model

To allow for a tractable analysis of relevant management strategies, we consider a simple Lotka-Volterra model of predator-prey dynamics where the two species are harvested (we however consider an additional model with a type II functional

132 response in the Supplementary Material). This model can be written as:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dN}{dt} = rN\left(1 - \frac{N}{K}\right) - \gamma NP - q_N EN\\ \frac{dP}{dt} = e\gamma NP - mP - q_P EP \end{cases}$$
(1)

where *N* and *P* are the respective densities of the prey and predator species, *r* is the prey intrinsic growth rate, *K* its carrying capacity, γ is the attack rate of the predator, *e* the efficiency of conversion of prey into predator, and *m* the predator natural mortality rate. Predator and prey species are harvested with a single fishing effort *E* and with respective catchabilities q_N and q_P . In fisheries, this would mean that a single fleet harvests multiple species at once, which is the case of most fishing fleets such as trawlers.

140

141 Equilibrium

142 At the equilibrium, the variations of densities in time (Eq. (1)) are set to zero. A trivial 143 equilibrium exists where the two populations are extinct. This trivial equilibrium is 144 stable provided the effort remains below the growth rate of the prey species, given its 145 catchability ($E < r/q_N$, see Appendix 1 in Supplementary Material). Otherwise, prey 146 population increases when rare. In the single-species equilibrium, the density of the 147 prey is equal to $N^* = K(1 - q_N E/r)$, while the predator remains extinct. This 148 equilibrium is feasible and stable if the harvesting effort is smaller than the maximum 149 effort the prey can sustain $(E < r/q_N)$ and larger than the maximum effort the 150 predator can sustain $(E > r(e\gamma K - m)/(rq_P + e\gamma Kq_N))$. This latter limit decreases 151 with predator and prey catchabilities and predator mortality as these parameters 152 undermine predator growth, and increases with the growth rate of the prey. If 153 $e\gamma K < m$, the predator is extinct even in a unharvested system. Finally, a coexistence 154 equilibrium also exists:

$$N^* = \frac{m + q_P E}{e\gamma} \quad ; \quad P^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left[r \left(1 - \frac{(m + q_P E)}{e\gamma K} \right) - q_N E \right] \tag{2}$$

This equilibrium is feasible and stable if the harvesting effort is smaller than the maximum effort the predator can sustain ($E < r(e\gamma K - m)/(rq_P + e\gamma Kq_N)$)). From Eq. (2), prey density positively depends on predator harvest, as harvesting relaxes the top-down control exerted by predators. The density of the predator species is negatively correlated with the intensity of prey and predator harvesting. Thus, harvesting predator populations increases prey density and decreases predator density, while harvesting prey populations only decreases predator density.

163 Maximum sustainable yield

164 We now determine the management allowing for maximum sustainable yield (MSY).

165 When both populations are exploited, assuming that individuals of both species are

166 valued equivalently, this strategy satisfies

$$\max_{E} (q_N E N^* + q_P E P^*)$$
(3)

167 As specific scenarios, we also study simpler situations in which only one of the two

168 species is exploited. In that case, one of the catchabilities is set to zero. If the

169 computed effort leads to the extinction of one of the two species, a new effort is

170 computed for the remaining species. For precise MSY computations, see Appendix 1.

171

172 Resilience

173 We wish to measure how harvesting impacts the resilience of the system, understood

as the ability of a system to sustain perturbations (here, small variations of densities

- around the equilibrium). To do this, we compute the leading eigenvalue λ_m of the
- 176 Jacobian matrix at the equilibrium, that is the eigenvalue with the largest real part.

177 The return time to the equilibrium after a small perturbation is then (Pimm and

178 Lawton 1978, Loeuille 2010):

$$\tau = \frac{1}{-Re(\lambda_m)} \tag{4}$$

179 A large return time to the equilibrium suggests a low resilience in the face of180 perturbations.

181

182 **Results**

183 Prey harvest

184 We first consider the case in which the prey species is the only harvested species.

185 Increasing harvesting efforts then leads to a decrease in predator density while prey

186 density remains (Eq (2), Fig. 1a). As predation pressure decreases with reduced

187 predator densities, higher prey yields can be harvested with increased efforts. Prey

188 catches increase linearly until the predator goes to extinction. It follows that to

189 maximize prey yields, it is necessary to first cull predator populations, by increasing

190 the harvesting effort up to the point at which the predator goes extinct. After the

191 extinction of the predator, the effort must be readjusted to $r/(2q_N)$ to reach the

192 monospecific prey MSY (see Appendix 1). As reaching MSY implies to cull the

193 predator, there is a clear trade-off between maximizing yields and promoting

194 community conservation.

For low to intermediate harvesting efforts, the resilience of the community remains unaffected (Fig. 1b). However, close to predator extinction, the resilience of the community shrinks abruptly as the return time to the equilibrium soars. As shown in Appendix 1, this is due to a spiral-to-node bifurcation of the stable equilibrium. Here, resilience and conservation objectives are then aligned. Right after the shift in

200 dynamics, yield can only be increased at the expense of resilience, indicating a trade-201 off between these two objectives.

202

203 Predator harvest

204	We now consider the case in which the predator is the only harvested species.
205	Increasing harvesting efforts on predator leads to a decrease in predator density and to
206	an increase in prey density due to diminished top-down control (Eq. (2), Fig. 2a).
207	Catches can be maximized for efforts twice as small as the effort leading to predator
208	extinction (see Appendix 1). In that case, maximization of fishery productivity is thus
209	a sustainable strategy as it enables the coexistence of the two interacting species.
210	The return time to equilibrium first decreases with increasing efforts,
211	indicating a stabilization of the system (Fig. 2b). Then after a spiral-to-node
212	bifurcation, the return time rises close to the extinction of the predator, indicating a
213	reduced resilience. Given the resilience profile, an effort exists that maximizes the
214	resilience of the community, hereafter called <i>resilience maximizing yield</i> (RMY).
215	The harvesting effort at RMY can be above (Fig. 2a-b) or below (Fig. 2c-d)
216	the effort at MSY. When the yield-maximizing effort is below the resilience-
217	maximizing effort (Fig. 2a-b), the resilience at MSY is always higher than the
218	resilience of an unharvested system. On the other hand, when the yield-maximizing
219	effort is above the resilience-maximizing effort (Fig. 2c-d), then the MSY-harvested
220	system can be less resilient than the unharvested system (Fig. 2d). Thus, while MSY
221	harvesting is always sustainable in this case (in the sense that it guarantees
222	coexistence), it can still induce resilience losses.
223	The yield-maximizing policy is more likely to be destabilizing if the predator

has a low recovery potential and if its prey is subject to intense intraspecific

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

225 competition. In fact, as shown in Appendix 1, the effort at MSY is above the effort at 226 RMY if $m > (4e\gamma K - r)/(4 + r/e\gamma K)$. This expression tells us that harvesting at MSY a predator with a low maximum growth rate $e\gamma K$ and a high mortality m is 227 228 more likely to destabilize the system. Note also that when the prey growth rate r is 229 high, harvesting at MSY is also more likely to be destabilizing. The opposite effects of prev growth rate r and prev carrying capacity K indicate that if prev populations 230 are subject to intense intraspecific competition (defined by the rate r/K). MSY likely 231 232 destabilizes the system. Understanding the implications of MSY for resilience thereby requires a simultaneous study of predator and prev life-histories. 233 As long as the efforts at MSY and RMY do not coincide, between these 234 235 efforts, yield cannot be increased without reducing resilience and vice versa. A trade-236 off between yield and resilience therefore exists. Managers that desire more resilient 237 yields may thus choose to depart from the classical MSY strategy and give up some

238 yield to gain resilience, effectively making a compromise between MSY and RMY239 strategies.

240

241 Simultaneous harvest of predators and prey

242 We now consider the full system as described by Eq. (2). In this case, it is possible to

243 find parameter sets for which maximizing the total yield is compatible with

coexistence (Fig. 3, see also Appendix 1 for detailed analytical explanations).

For increasing prey catchabilities, the total maximum yield rises (Fig. 3a, see

analytical demonstration in Appendix 1). However, the MSY effort also gets closer to

the effort at which the predator population collapses. This underlines the fact that

248 MSY strategies in this multispecies context become increasingly risky from a

249 conservation point of view for high prey catchabilities.

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

250	On the contrary, for increasing predator catchabilities, the total maximum
251	yield is reduced (Fig. 3c, see analytical demonstration in Appendix 1). Thus, a prey-
252	oriented effort is more likely to bring higher maximum yields than a predator-oriented
253	effort. The distances between the MSY effort and the effort at which the predator
254	population collapses are not affected by predator catchabilities. As demonstrated in
255	Appendix 1, increasing predator catchabilities actually decreases extinction risk at
256	MSY. Thus, while a predator-oriented harvest is less productive than a prey-oriented
257	harvest at MSY, it appears to lower the risk of breaking community coexistence,
258	facilitating the conservation objective. There is then a trade-off between a prey-
259	oriented harvest with high yields but high risks in terms of conservation and a
260	predator-oriented harvest with lower yields but higher sustainability.
261	When increasing prey catchabilities, the minimum return time to equilibrium
262	is also increased (Fig. 3b). On the contrary, for increasing predator catchabilities, the
263	minimum return time to equilibrium is slightly reduced (Fig. 3d). Thus, a predator-
264	oriented effort is potentially more resilient than a prey-oriented effort. As a result, a
265	prey-oriented harvest is more likely to be more productive and less resilient than a
266	predator-oriented harvest, which can be less productive but more resilient to
267	perturbations.

The relationship between yield and resilience at MSY is illustrated for varying prey and predator catchabilities in Figure 4. Increasing prey catchability augments the total yield at MSY (Fig. 4a), while increasing predator catchability reduces the total yield at MSY (Fig. 4b). As pointed out before, prey-oriented systems are thus more productive than predator-oriented systems at MSY.

273 Effects of varying prey and predator catchabilities on system resilience are
274 however not monotonic. Increasing prey catchability from low values first increases

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

275 resilience. Likewise, starting from high values, decreasing predator catchability 276 increases resilience. Thus, in a predator-oriented fishery with high predator 277 catchabilities and low prey catchabilities, turning towards a more prey-oriented 278 harvest both increases yield and resilience: there is a synergy between yield and 279 resilience at MSY. For higher prey catchabilities and lower predator catchabilities, the 280 situation is reversed, and a trade-off appears between yield and resilience at MSY: 281 focusing on prey at the expense of predator harvest leads to small increases in yield 282 and strong decreases in resilience. Conversely, in a prev-oriented fishery with high 283 yield and low resilience at MSY, turning towards a more predator-oriented harvest 284 might increase resilience at the expense of yield.

285 These results have direct implications in terms of management. Let us for 286 instance consider a predator-oriented harvest, with a low prey-to-predator catchability 287 ratio. As increasing this ratio can bring higher yield and resilience at MSY, it can be expected to increase up to the point at which the trade-off between yield and 288 289 resilience appears. The manager then has to decide whether to increase yield at the 290 expense of resilience or not. Note that the trade-off front is quite sharp on Figure 4. 291 Therefore, past the breaking point, a small increase in yield would induce an 292 important decrease in resilience. A prudent manager could be expected to choose an 293 intermediate ratio, that is a balanced harvesting between prev and predator species. 294 We now move from this view, centered on MSY strategies, to a more global 295 set of strategies that consider all possibilities from MSY to RMY. That is, from a 296 management primarily directed at productivity to one devoted to maintaining system 297 stability. We have shown in Figure 2 that the yield-maximizing and the resilience-298 maximizing equilibria are generally reached for different efforts. In between, it is 299 impossible to increase yield without decreasing resilience, and vice versa. All

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

300 equilibria between MSY and RMY strategies thus denote a trade-off between yield 301 and resilience. In Figure 5, we compute all these equilibria for different prev (Fig. 5a) 302 and predator (Fig. 5b) catchabilities, thereby illustrating the set of possible states. For 303 each catchability value (i.e., each shade of grey), the dotted line traces out the 304 equilibria between MSY and RMY, with effort varying along the line. Thus, MSY 305 equilibria in Figure 5 trace out the same curves as in Figure 4. From any state among 306 these dotted lines, it is possible to reach any other state, by changing the catchabilities 307 or the fishing effort. In particular, both yield and resilience can be improved, until we 308 reach the external part of the set (thick dark-gray line in Fig. 5), where yield cannot be 309 increased without decreasing resilience and vice versa. This border part of the set, on 310 which no further improvement of yield or resilience is possible, is called a Pareto 311 frontier.

312 This Pareto frontier denotes a global trade-off between yield and resilience, 313 that is associated with a trade-off between a prev-oriented harvest and a predator-314 oriented harvest: for low prey catchabilities or high predator catchabilities, a small 315 yield is associated with a high resilience, while for higher prev catchabilities or lower 316 predator catchabilities, resilience is decreased as the total yield is increased. As this 317 trade-off is concave, at high yields resilience can be highly increased without losing 318 much yield, while at high resilience yields can be highly increased without losing 319 much resilience.

Analysis of the Pareto frontier may help to guide the management of the harvested system. Without knowing the preferences of the managers however, it is impossible to define a single optimal strategy. If a manager is only interested in yield, the optimal state would be to maximize catches at the expense of resilience and then put the predator population at risk. This strategy is denoted by the letter A in Figure 5.

This can be done by focusing harvest on prey and harvesting the system at MSY. Now if a manager is only interested in resilience, the best target is a focus on predator to reach RMY (letter C in Figure 5). But as the manager can be expected to seek a balance between resilience and yield, he may want to increase yield until resilience losses are acceptable. The breaking point of the Pareto frontier (letter B in Figure 5) can then be an optimal solution, which corresponds to focusing harvest on prey and reaching RMY.

332 Most MSY points are not situated on the global Pareto frontier, while all RMY 333 points are. Thus, if we include resilience among the objectives of a fishery, MSY does 334 not appear to be the best-suited harvesting strategy. Consider for instance a system 335 where only the predator is harvested at MSY (Fig. 5a): to improve both yield and 336 resilience and reach the Pareto frontier, one may slightly increase harvesting pressure 337 on prey and adjust the effort to maximize resilience. But as the point at which MSY 338 and RMY coincide is situated on the frontier, balancing harvest between trophic 339 levels can in any case be considered an optimal strategy.

340 As we show in Appendix 2, our main results are not specific to the linear 341 functional response we use here. We investigated a Rosenzweig-MacArthur model 342 characterized by a non-linear (Holling type II) functional response. Our conclusions regarding the impact of predator harvest or joint prev and predator harvest on 343 344 resilience are similar in both models (compare Fig. A2b and A2c with Fig. 2 and 3). 345 Note however that contrary to the linear case, prev harvest can increase resilience (Fig 346 A2a). We also observe similar relationships between yield and resilience (compare Fig. A3 with Fig. 5), regardless of the functional response. Particularly, the trade-off 347 348 between a prey-oriented fishery with high yield and low resilience and a predator-349 oriented fishery with low yield and high resilience remains when using non-linear

- 350 functional responses. In both models, balancing harvest between predator and prey
- thus allows for a simultaneous management of the two objectives.
- 352
- 353

354 Discussion

355 Focusing harvest on predator favors conservation at MSY

356 Our results stress potential conservation issues of yield-maximizing policies in trophic

- 357 communities. We find that maximizing prey yield results in the extinction of predator
- 358 populations, in agreement with previous studies (May et al. 1979, Beddington and
- Cooke 1982, Legović et al. 2010, Kar and Ghosh 2013). On the contrary, maximizing
- 360 predator yield is compatible with species coexistence, as shown in Legović et al.
- 361 (2010), Kar and Ghosh (2013). In more complex communities however, single-
- 362 species MSY policies may induce many indirect effects that deteriorate the structure
- 363 of harvested communities (Walters et al. 2005). Maximizing total yields, or reaching
- 364 multispecies MSY, has thus been suggested as a potential ecosystem-based alternative

to single-species MSY (Mueter and Megrey 2006).

366 Along these lines, we show that when both prey and predator species are 367 harvested, it is possible to implement strategies that conciliate both productivity 368 objectives and the conservation of predators and prev, thus reconciling "resource 369 supply" with ecosystem services that are directly linked with the maintenance of 370 biodiversity (Costanza et al. 1997). Such management strategies are consistent with 371 other theoretical analyzes (May et al. 1979, Kar and Ghosh 2013). Yet depending on 372 parameters, the MSY effort can still be very close to the extinction effort, so that 373 harvesting becomes risky and any implementation error could lead to species loss. We 374 argue in particular that maximizing total yield is more sustainable with a predator-

oriented harvest than with a prey-oriented harvest, as the predator extinction risk islower.

377

378 Focusing harvest on prey increases maximum yields

379 Our results also show that multispecies maximum yields are higher with a 380 prey-oriented harvest than with a predator-oriented harvest, consistently with findings 381 from Beddington and Cooke (1982). This also is coherent with the assumption that 382 catches decrease with the trophic level (Christensen 1996). If maintaining all 383 populations is not considered a priority, the solution is again to cull down predator 384 species to maximize prey yields (Yodzis 1994). Yet this culling strategy is not 385 considered in depth here as we assume that maintaining coexistence is a prerequisite 386 to any ecosystem-based management strategy.

387 Our results hinge on the assumption that individuals of each species are valued equivalently. A common hypothesis in multispecies MSY studies is that each species 388 389 has the same value per unit biomass (Mueter and Megrey 2006, Kar and Ghosh 2013). 390 In such conditions, predatory fish usually having larger body sizes may be expected to 391 have a higher value than prey individuals. A straightforward way to consider 392 differential valuation in our model could be to weight equation (3) by introducing the 393 prices of predators and prev explicitly. If predators have higher prices than prev, 394 maximizing profits instead of yield, to reach what is usually called a *maximum* 395 economic yield policy (Clark 2006), would then imply a larger focus on predators. In 396 general, maximizing aggregate profits is likely to lead to a dominant harvesting of the 397 most productive and valuable species (as suggested in Clark 2006). While we do not 398 capture this explicitly, note that we analyze differences in catchabilities of the two 399 species that can be expected to reflect differential valuations. Indeed, fishermen are

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

supposed to preferentially target species with high productivity and value. In that
sense, our results already partly reflect the consequences of a differential valuation of
prey and predator species.

403

404 *Moderate predator harvesting favors resilience*

405 Next to the maintenance of the community and the productivity of the fishery, 406 our analysis also focuses on resilience criteria. Indeed, given current global changes and generalized human impacts, marine ecosystems face many disturbances (Lejeusne 407 408 et al. 2010) and their ability to sustain such disturbances (resistance) and to get back 409 to their initial state (resilience) has become an important focus in ecosystem 410 management in general (Côté and Darling 2010) and in fisheries in particular (Hsieh 411 et al. 2006, Barnett and Baskett 2015). Resilience is especially important to 412 fishermen, whose activity may then rely on stable catches and profits in time 413 (Armsworth and Roughgarden 2003). Given a fast pace of disturbances, a non 414 resilient system that would take a long time to go back to equilibrium would undergo 415 a new perturbation before it can get back to its state. This accumulation of 416 disturbances could maintain the system in a transient state, possibly threatening the 417 overall ecosystem functioning and associated ecosystem services. Incorporating 418 resilience-oriented objectives in fisheries management is therefore highly needed 419 given this global context. 420 Yet, defining and measuring resilience remains challenging (McCann 2000). 421 Our measure of resilience as a return time to equilibrium is simple enough to allow a 422 complete mathematical analysis. It can however be difficult to assess empirically 423 (Donohue et al. 2016). Nevertheless, Britten et al. (2014) did evaluate the return time 424 to equilibrium of a coastal fish community by using the approach developed by Ives

425 et al. (2003). But such an assessment is not relevant in unstable systems characterized 426 by transient or oscillatory dynamics. A broader definition of resilience as the ability to 427 absorb changes and still persist is then needed (Holling 1973). Such other measures 428 include variability (coefficient of variation over time) and persistence (maintenance of 429 the structure of the system after a specified amount of time) (Donohue et al. 2016). 430 Our analysis brings together contrasting views regarding the effects of 431 predator harvesting on resilience. On the one hand, we show that for low harvesting 432 pressures, harvesting the predator as a sole or joint target can bring resilience to the system. This is coherent with the *principle of energy flux* (Rosenzweig 1971, Rip and 433 434 McCann 2011), which states that decreased energy fluxes, relative to the consumer loss rate, makes consumer-resource interactions more stable. A similar result has been 435 436 found in marine ecosystems by (Plank and Law 2012).

437 On the other hand, we show that when harvesting at MSY brings the predator 438 species close to extinction, the system abruptly becomes less resilient. Thus, when the predator population is reduced to low levels, then the principle of energy flux does not 439 440 hold anymore and harvesting the predator species becomes destabilizing. This is 441 coherent with the assumption that predator species are stabilizing (Christensen 1996, 442 Rooney et al. 2006), and with the finding by (Britten et al. 2014) based on empirical 443 data that predator declines reduce the stability of coastal fish communities. The 444 sudden decrease in resilience close to the collapse of the predator population implies a 445 critical slowing down in the recovery ability of the disturbed system (Scheffer et al. 446 2009). Slow return times to equilibrium, in addition to low predator densities, could make the predator population particulary vulnerable to an accumulation of 447 448 perturbations.

449

450 Managing yield and resilience at MSY by balancing predator and prey exploitation 451 By comparing yield and resilience at MSY, we uncover synergies and trade-452 offs between these two services, with important consequences in terms of 453 management. We show that in a predator-oriented mixed fishery, turning towards a 454 more prey-oriented harvest can first increase both yield and resilience at MSY. 455 However, such a strategy eventually leads to increased yield at the expense of 456 resilience, implying a trade-off between these two services. As giving up small yields 457 can bring much resilience, managers can be expected to choose intermediate prev and 458 predator catchabilities, resulting in a balanced harvest between trophic levels. 459 Balancing harvest between trophic levels has recently been advanced as an 460 alternative to the classical selective paradigm in fisheries (Zhou et al. 2010). It has 461 notably been shown to improve maximum yields in multispecies fisheries (Garcia et 462 al. 2012, Jacobsen et al. 2013). The consequences of balanced harvesting for the stability of size-structured fish populations have also been assessed (Rochet and 463 Benoit 2012, Law et al. 2012). These studies suggest that a balanced harvest could be 464 465 more productive and stabilizing than selectively harvesting either small fish (mostly 466 prey fish) or big fish (mostly predator fish). Our results offer a more nuanced view by 467 showing that balancing harvest is not always a win-win solution, but rather an optimal 468 strategy along a trade-off that balances yield and resilience. 469

470 Beyond MSY: trading off yield and resilience in harvested trophic communities

Our results show the existence of a global trade-off between yield and
resilience in mixed predator-prey fisheries, represented by a Pareto-optimality frontier
between these services. Different parts of this frontier can be reached by changing
prey and predator catchabilities, but also the intensity of harvest. Thus, the trade-off

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

between yield and resilience is indicative of a trade-off between a predator-oriented
harvest with low yields but high resilience and a prey-oriented harvest with high
yields but potentially low resilience.

478 Interestingly, yield-maximizing strategies are almost never found on the optimality frontier and thus often revealed to be suboptimal when considering 479 480 multiple objectives. This concurs with Beddington and Cooke (1982), who argue that 481 maximum yields should be reduced to account for the stability of harvested systems. 482 It is also coherent with empirical claims that harvest reduces the resilience of fish stocks (Hsieh et al. 2006, Anderson et al. 2008). As a result, strict MSY policies do 483 484 not seem to fit into the multi-objective framework of ecosystem-based management 485 (Bennett et al. 2009). This is especially true in multispecies communities in which emergent properties such as resilience are highly constrained by interactions between 486 487 species.

488 On the contrary, resilience-maximizing policies are always found to be optimal in this multi-objective context. To improve yield without losing much 489 490 resilience, managers can be expected to focus harvest on prey with low efforts, in 491 order to maximize resilience. In that case, balancing yield and resilience would imply 492 to focus harvest on prey with a low harvesting intensity. This strategy could bring 493 higher yields than a balanced harvesting, without losing much resilience. Therefore, 494 some level of selectivity can also be beneficial if harvesting pressures are reduced. 495 This is coherent with the claim that favoring a targeted exploitation of fish stocks 496 below maximum sustainable yields could be more efficient than a balanced harvest 497 (Froese et al. 2015). In that sense, maximum sustainable yields can still serve as 498 useful reference points to implement ecosystem-based fisheries management, as long 499 as other objectives are taken into account (Hilborn 2010).

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

500

501 For the sake of a complete analysis, we proposed here the study of a simple 502 model. We notably assumed a linear functional response for predators, which 503 typically leads to stable equilibria. Other functional responses are however possible, 504 and may involve unstable and oscillatory states. To check whether our results can be 505 extended to such dynamics, we numerically investigated a Rosenzweig-MacArthur 506 model, characterized by a type-II functional response (see Appendix 2). Consistent 507 with other studies (e.g., Ghosh et al. 2014), maximizing predator-only or aggregate 508 prey and predator catches decreases oscillations and often leads the system to a stable 509 state. Investigation of these stable states shows consistent relationships between yield 510 and resilience. In particular, the existence of a general trade-off between yield and 511 resilience turns out to be robust when considering a non-linear functional response. 512 Further complexities such as age- or size-structure of the harvested 513 populations could also affect the generality of our conclusions. Resilience losses are 514 for instance known to occur in the context of fisheries-induced disruption of size-515 structure (Rochet and Benoit 2012). Also in complex food webs with many direct and 516 indirect interactions between species (Bascompte et al. 2005), the relationship 517 between yield and resilience may be strongly dependent on the structure of the food 518 web. Investigating the relevance of our results for more complex systems such as 519 structured populations or food webs is an interesting challenge for future research. 520 This concerns in particular our finding that a balanced harvesting between predator 521 and prey can reconcile resilience maximization with high yields.

522	
523	References
524	Anderson, C. N. K. et al. 2008. Why fishing magnifies fluctuations in fish abundance.
525	- Nature 452: 835–839.
526	Armsworth, P. R. and Roughgarden, J. E. 2003. The economic value of ecological
527	stability Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 100: 7147-7151.
528	Barnett, L. A. K. and Baskett, M. L. 2015. Marine reserves can enhance ecological
529	resilience (P Mumby, Ed.) Ecol. Lett. 18: 1301-1310.
530	Bascompte, J. et al. 2005. Interaction strength combinations and the overfishing of a
531	marine food web Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 102: 5443-5447.
532	Beddington, J. R. and Cooke, J. G. 1982. Harvesting from a prey-predator complex
533	Ecol. Modell. 14: 155–177.
534	Bennett, E. M. et al. 2009. Understanding relationships among multiple ecosystem
535	services Ecol. Lett. 12: 1394–1404.
536	Brauer, F. and Soudack, A. C. 1979a. Stability regions in predator-prey systems with
537	constant-rate prey harvesting J. Math. Biol. 8: 55-71.
538	Brauer, F. and Soudack, A. C. 1979b. Stability regions and transition phenomena for
539	harvested predator-prey systems J. Math. Biol. 7: 319-337.
540	Britten, G. L. et al. 2014. Predator decline leads to decreased stability in a coastal fish
541	community Ecol. Lett. 17: 1518–1525.
542	Christensen, V. 1996. Managing fisheries involving predator and prey species Rev.
543	Fish Biol. Fish. 6: 417–442.
544	Clark, C. W. 2006. The worldwide crisis in fisheries: Economic models and human
545	behaviour Cambridge University Press.

546 Costanza, R. et al. 1997. The value of the world 's ecosystem services and natural

- 547 capital. Nature 387: 253–260.
- 548 Côté, I. M. and Darling, E. S. 2010. Rethinking ecosystem resilience in the face of
 549 climate change. PLoS Biol. 8: e1000438.
- 550 Donohue, I. et al. 2016. Navigating the complexity of ecological stability (F Adler,
- 551 Ed.). Ecol. Lett. 19: 1172–1185.
- 552 Essington, T. E. and Munch, S. B. 2014. Trade-offs between supportive and
- provisioning ecosystem services of forage species in marine food webs. Ecol.
 Appl. 24: 1543–1557.
- Estes, J. A. et al. 2011. Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. Science. 333: 301–
 306.
- 557 Froese, R. et al. 2015. A critique of the balanced harvesting approach to fishing. -
- 558 ICES J. Mar. Sci. in press.
- 559 Garcia, S. M. et al. 2012. Reconsidering the consequences of selective fisheries. -
- 560 Science. 335: 1045–1047.
- 561 Gardmark, A. et al. 2014. Regime shifts in exploited marine food webs: detecting
- 562 mechanisms underlying alternative stable states using size-structured community
- 563 dynamics theory. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 370: 20130262–20130262.
- 564 Ghosh, B. et al. 2014. Relationship between exploitation, oscillation, MSY and
- 565 extinction. Math. Biosci. 256: 1–9.
- 566 Hilborn, R. 2010. Pretty Good Yield and exploited fishes. Mar. Policy 34: 193–196.
- 567 Holling, C. S. 1973. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. Annu. Rev. Ecol.
- 568 Syst. 4: 1–23.
- 569 Hsieh, C. et al. 2006. Fishing elevates variability in the abundance of exploited
- 570 species. Nature 443: 859–862.
- 571 Ives, A. R. et al. 2003. Estimating community stability and ecological interactions

- from time-series data. Ecol. Monogr. 73: 301–330.
- 573 Jacobsen, N. S. et al. 2013. The consequences of balanced harvesting of fish
- 574 communities. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. in press.
- 575 Kar, T. K. and Ghosh, B. 2013. Impacts of maximum sustainable yield policy to prey-
- 576 predator systems. Ecol. Modell. 250: 134–142.
- 577 Kuparinen, A. et al. 2016. Fishing-induced life-history changes degrade and
- 578 destabilize harvested ecosystems. Sci. Rep. in press.
- 579 Larkin, P. A. 1966. Exploitation in a type of predator-prey relationship. J. Fish. Res.
- 580 Board Canada 23: 349–356.
- 581 Larkin, P. A. 1977. An epitaph for the concept of maximum sustained yield. Trans.
- 582 Am. Fish. Soc. 106: 1–11.
- Law, R. et al. 2012. On balanced exploitation of marine ecosystems: results from
 dynamic size spectra. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 69: 602–614.
- 585 Legović, T. et al. 2010. Maximum sustainable yield and species extinction in

586 ecosystems. - Ecol. Modell. 221: 1569–1574.

- 587 Lejeusne, C. et al. 2010. Climate change effects on a miniature ocean: the highly
- 588 diverse, highly impacted Mediterranean Sea. Trends Ecol. Evol. 25: 250–260.
- 589 Loeuille, N. 2010. Influence of evolution on the stability of ecological communities. -
- 590 Ecol. Lett. 13: 1536–1545.
- 591 Mace, P. M. 2001. A new role for MSY in single-species and ecosystem approaches
- to fisheries stock assessment and management. Fish Fish. 2: 2–32.
- 593 Matsuda, H. and Abrams, P. A. 2006. Maximal yields from multispecies fisheries
- systems: rules for systems with multiple trophic levels. Ecol. Appl. 16: 225–
 237.
- 596 May, R. M. et al. 1979. Management of multispecies fisheries. Science. 205: 267-

597 277.

- 598 McCann, K. S. 2000. The diversity-stability debate. Nature 405: 228–233.
- 599 Mueter, F. J. and Megrey, B. A. 2006. Using multi-species surplus production models
- 600 to estimate ecosystem-level maximum sustainable yields. Fish. Res. 81: 189–
- 601 201.
- Mumby, P. J. et al. 2013. Evidence for and against the existence of alternate attractors
 on coral reefs. Oikos 122: 481–491.
- Mumby, P. J. et al. 2016. High resilience masks underlying sensitivity to algal phase
 shifts of Pacific coral reefs. Oikos 125: 644–655.
- 606 Myers, R. A. and Worm, B. 2003. Rapid worldwide depletion of predatory fish
- 607 communities. Nature 423: 280–283.
- Myers, R. A. et al. 2007. Cascading effects of the loss of apex predatory sharks from a
 coastal ocean. Science. 315: 1846–1850.
- 610 Pauly, D. 1979. Theory and management of tropical multispecies stocks. ICLARM
 611 Stud. Rev. 1
- 612 Pauly, D. et al. 1998. Fishing down marine food webs. Science. 279: 860–863.
- Pikitch, E. K. et al. 2004. Ecosystem-based fishery management. Science. 305: 346–
 347.
- Pimm, S. L. and Lawton, J. H. 1978. On feeding on more than one trophic level. Nature 275: 542–544.
- Plank, M. J. and Law, R. 2012. Ecological drivers of stability and instability in marine
 ecosystems. Theor. Ecol. 5: 465–480.
- Rip, J. M. K. and McCann, K. S. 2011. Cross-ecosystem differences in stability and
 the principle of energy flux. Ecol. Lett. 14: 733–740.
- 621 Rochet, M.-J. and Benoit, E. 2012. Fishing destabilizes the biomass flow in the

- 622 marine size spectrum. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 279: 284–292.
- Rooney, N. et al. 2006. Structural asymmetry and the stability of diverse food webs. Nature 442: 265–269.
- Rosenzweig, M. L. 1971. Paradox of enrichment: destabilization of exploitation
 ecosystems in ecological time. Science. 171: 385–387.
- 627 Scheffer, M. et al. 2009. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. Nature 461:
 628 53–59.
- 629 Trites, A. W. et al. 1997. Competition between fisheries and marine mammals for
- 630 prey and primary production in the Pacific ocean. J. Northwest Atl. Fish. Sci.
- 631 22: 173–187.
- Walters, C. J. et al. 2005. Possible ecosystem impacts of applying MSY policies from
 single-species assessment. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 62: 558–568.
- 634 Worm, B. et al. 2006. Impacts of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services. -
- 635 Science. 314: 787–790.
- 636 Worm, B. et al. 2009. Rebuilding global fisheries. Science. 325: 578–585.
- 637 Yodzis, P. 1994. Predator-prey theory and management of multispecies fisheries. -
- 638 Ecol. Appl. 4: 51.
- 639 Zhou, S. et al. 2010. Ecosystem-based fisheries management requires a change to the
- 640 selective fishing philosophy. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 107: 9485–9489.
- 641
- 642

DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

643 **Figure legends**

644

645 Figure 1: Effects of prey harvesting. (a) Prey (gray dashed line) and predator (gray

646 dash-dotted line) densities at the equilibrium, and total catches (black line). (b) Return

647 time to the equilibrium after a perturbation. Shaded areas indicate that predators are

648 extinct. Parameters: $r = 1, K = 1, m = 0.1, e = 0.7, \gamma = 1.5, q_N = 0.1, q_P = 0.$



Figure 2: Effects of predator harvesting. (a,c) Prey (gray dashed line) and predator (gray dash-dotted line) densities at the equilibrium, and total catches (black line). (b,d) Return time to the equilibrium after perturbation. Shaded areas indicate that predators are extinct. Filled triangles indicate efforts that maximize catches (MSY) while empty triangles indicate efforts that maximize resilience (RMY). (a,b) Same parameters as Figure 1, except $q_N = 0$ and $q_P = 0.5$. (c,d) Idem, except m = 0.75.





Figure 3: Effects of a simultaneous harvesting of predators and prey. (a,c) Total catches for different (a) prey and (c) predator catchabilities. (b,d) Return time to equilibrium after a perturbation for different (b) prey and (d) predator catchabilities. Vertical lines indicate efforts at which the predator species goes to extinction. Filled triangles indicate MSY efforts while empty triangles indicate RMY efforts. (a,b) Same parameters as Figure 1, except: $q_N = (0, 0.1, 0.2)$, $q_P = 0.5$. (c,d) Idem, except: $q_N = 0.1$, $q_P = (0.5, 0.6, 0.7)$.



666

667







DOI: 10.1111/oik.03985

683 Figure 5: Relationship between yield and return time to equilibrium for varying prey 684 (a) and predator (b) catchabilities (log scale). Low to high catchabilities values are represented with colors ranging from black to light gray and applied to circles and 685 dotted lines. For each pair of catchabilities, MSY equilibria are shown with filled 686 circles and RMY equilibria are shown with empty circles. For each catchability value, 687 the dotted line traces out the equilibria between MSY and RMY, with effort varying 688 689 along the line. Thus, each pair of circles and associated lines represent a different 690 catchability parameter value. The thick dark-gray line shows the global Pareto frontier 691 between yield and resilience. Letters A, B and C respectively indicate global yield-692 maximizing, balanced and resilience-maximizing strategies. Parameters are similar to 693 Figure 4.

