SEDAR 84 Public Comment

SEDAR84-RW-01

25 July 2025

This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination peer review. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy.

Please cite this document as:

2025. SEDAR 84 Public Comment. SEDAR84-RW-01. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. 1 pp.

Submitted By	Comment
First Name: Vanessa Last Name: Ramirez Email: vramirez.fsm@gmail.com	Good agregation area at the southwest Region in Cabo Rojo PR Fishermens reporting samples from 2#up close to shore at Boqueron y Combate area inside 2 miles or less from coast
First Name: Virginia Last Name: Shervette Email: shervette@gmail.com	15 July 2025 Public Comment provided by Dr. Jesús Rivera Hernández and Dr. Virginia Shervette on the US Caribbean Stoplight Parrotfish – St. Croix Section III: Assessment Process Report The use of a maximum estimated longevity value of 30 y was done in ERROR due to a misreading of the scientific literature and using that value under the current stated justification is in direct conflict with employing a scientifically rigorous stock assessment process. As members of the SEDAR data workshop group and the Assessment Panel for St. Croix Stoplight Parrotfish, Drs. Rivera Hernández and Shervette provided extensive feedback on the draft of Section III Assessment Process Report. We noted in our comments that the report contained a factual error that was not corrected and remains in the report document and was inappropriately utilized in the stock assessment models made available to the public. Specifically, the following statement on page 15, IS NOT CORRECT and egregiously misrepresents the scientific literature: “In contrast, a tagging study in Bonaire indicated a potential maximum longevity of 30 years (Choat et al., 2003).” This is important because the use of a potential maximum longevity of 30 y for stoplight parrotfish is based on a MISUNDERSTANDING of an incorrect interpretation; therefore, it is a meaningless and arbitrary value with no actual documentation or research to back it up. The statement is not factual and the value should not have been used for the following reasons: 1. Choat et al., (2003) – the paper cited for the value - did not conduct a tagging study in Bonaire on stoplight parrotfish and should not be cited as the source of such a study. 2. A mark recapture study on stoplight parrotfish was conducted in Bonnaire and reported on in van Rooij et al (1995) and van Rooij and Videler (1997) but those studies DID NOT indicate a potential maximum longevity of 30 years for stoplight parrotfish. Van Rooij and Videler (1997) utilized repeated visual censuses, that included marked fish, to model growth and mortality rates for stoplight parrotfish at the monitoring sites of their Bonnaire work. Van Rooij et al (1995) utilized the mark re-capture size data to model growth of different life phases and social categories for understanding trade-offs between growth and reproduction. NO WHERE IN either van Rooij papers did they conclude that stoplight parrotfish could attain a maximum estimated age of 30 y. 3. The study design of van Rooij and Videler (1997) and van Rooij et al (1995) was employed to obtain estimates of size-specific mortality, sex change, territory acquisition probability, and stage-structured growth efficiencies; their study design did not set out to document a maximum age estimate and it is an egregious misuse of the survivorship
First Name: Virginia Last Name: Shervette Email: shervette@gmail.com	Public Comment provided by Dr. Jesús Rivera Hernández and Dr. Virginia Shervette on the US Caribbean Stoplight Parrotfish – St. Croix Section III: Assessment Process Report The use of a maximum estimated longevity value of 30 y was done in ERROR due to a misreading of the scientific literature and using that value under the current stated justification is in direct conflict with employing a scientifically rigorous stock assessment process. As members of the SEDAR data workshop group and the Assessment Panel for St. Croix Stoplight Parrotfish, Drs. Rivera Hernández and Shervette provided extensive feedback on the draft of Section III Assessment Process Report. We noted in our comments that the report contained a factual error that was not corrected and remains in the report document and was inappropriately utilized in the stock assessment models made available to the public. Specifically, the following statement on page 15, IS NOT CORRECT and egregiously misrepresents the scientific literature: “In contrast, a tagging study in Bonaire indicated a potential maximum longevity of 30 years (Choat et al., 2003).” This is important because the use of a potential maximum longevity of 30 y for stoplight parrotfish is based on a MISUNDERSTANDING of an incorrect interpretation; therefore, it is a meaningless and arbitrary value with no actual documentation or research to back it up. The statement is not factual and the value should not have been used for the following reasons: 1. Choat et al., (2003) – the paper cited for the value - did not conduct a tagging study in Bonaire on stoplight parrotfish and should not be cited as the source of such a study. 2. A mark recapture study on stoplight parrotfish was conducted in Bonnaire and reported on in van Rooij et al (1995) and van Rooij and Videler (1997) but those studies DID NOT indicate a potential maximum longevity of 30 years for stoplight parrotfish. Van Rooij and Videler (1997) utilized repeated visual censuses, that included marked fish, to model growth and mortality rates for stoplight parrotfish at the monitoring sites of their Bonnaire work. Van Rooij et al (1995) utilized the mark re-capture size data to