

Recreational For-Hire Trends in Release Methods and Barotrauma  
Assessment of Hogfish (*Lachnolaimus maximus*) using a Fisheries-  
Dependent At-Sea Observer Program

Leonardo Eguia, Zachary Siders, Debra Murie

SEDAR94-DW-16

18 July 2025

*Updated: 31 July 2025*

*2 September 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:

Eguia, Leonardo, Zachary Siders, Debra Murie. 2025. Recreational For-Hire Trends in Release Methods and Barotrauma Assessment of Hogfish (*Lachnolaimus maximus*) using a Fisheries-Dependent At-Sea Observer Program. SEDAR94-DW-16. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. 35 pp.

Recreational For-Hire Trends in Release Methods and  
Barotrauma Assessment of Hogfish (*Lachnolaimus maximus*)  
using a Fisheries-Dependent At-Sea Observer Program

Leonardo Eguia<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Zachary Siders<sup>1</sup>, and Debra Murie<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, School of Forest, Fisheries, & Geomatic Sciences,  
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.*

<sup>2</sup> *Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Fish and Wildlife Research  
Institute, 100 Eighth Avenue SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701*

*\*Corresponding Author: Leonardo.eguia@myfwc.com*

In preparation for

SEDAR 94 Florida Hogfish

July 28, 2025

## INTRODUCTION

Historically, hogfish (*Lachnolaimus maximus*) have been primarily harvested by private recreational spearfishers until recent years (Davis 1976; McBride 2001; SEDAR 2013; Collins and McBride 2015, NOAA 2025) and for this reason, previous stock assessments (SEDAR 06, SEDAR 37, SEDAR 37 Update) did not have sufficient recreational hook-and-line data to inform a dedicated fishery within the model. Additionally, due to the shallow depths where hogfish are caught on hook-and-line, it was assumed that discard mortality would likely be low (McBride 2001), and hogfish were therefore assumed to have a 10% discard mortality rate (SEDAR 2017). Since SEDAR 37, hook-and-line catch and effort of hogfish have increased substantially, according to angler reports (Eguia, pers. obs.), as well as state and federal surveys (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) 2024b, NOAA 2025). Despite this emerging fishery, there has been no published research that describes the effect that hook-and-line fishing has on hogfish.

Since 2009, the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute's (FWRI) Fisheries Dependent Monitoring (FDM) group initiated an at-sea observer program (FWC 2024a), which collects data while aboard participating for-hire vessels (headboats and private charter boats). At-sea observer data eliminates recall bias, which is common in dockside surveys done at the end of a fishing day. The primary focus of the at-sea observer program, therefore, is to collect accurate discard data, including numbers and species caught, whether fish were harvested or released, length measurements, barotrauma assessment, release condition (if discarded) as well as location, water depth, and bottom type at each fishing site. In addition, certain discarded reef fish, including hogfish, are opportunistically tagged with conventional dart tags statewide to

estimate unique discard mortality rates. In an effort to better understand discards from the for-hire fleet, the at-sea observer program began collecting barotrauma data in July of 2022, using an ordered numerical coding system, ranging from 0 (absent) to 4 (catastrophic), based on external symptoms present (Table 1).

Since 2009, 650 discarded Hogfish have been tagged in the at-sea observer program, but only 15 recaptures have been reported. Of the 15 recaptures, 7 were reported as Red Grouper (*Epinephelus morio*) and 1 was smaller than when initially tagged; therefore, only 7 recaptures provided usable data. Only 1 hogfish was recaptured while an observer was onboard. Discard mortality rates have been estimated for other reef fish species using a conventional tag-recapture method when tag return rates are adequate (Sauls 2014; Ayala 2020; Vecchio et al. 2022), but a reliable and robust discard mortality rate for hogfish cannot be estimated from only seven tag returns. However, due to the comprehensive nature of the data collected by the at-sea observer program, it is possible to analyze the general disposition of hogfish and the degree of barotrauma associated with the emerging hook-and-line fishery.

Our specific objectives were to summarize trends in the for-hire fleet targeting hogfish and to determine environmental variables that influence the degree of observed barotrauma symptoms. Frequencies of discard methods, depth of capture, and barotrauma scores were summarized to provide insight into effort and angler behavior towards barotrauma mitigation. A Bayesian ordinal regression model was conducted to estimate barotrauma based on several predictor variables collected by the at-sea observer program. These estimates can provide insight into the nature of catching

hogfish on hook-and-line and, in combination with frequencies of discard methods and barotrauma observed, can inform the discard mortality model for this species.

## **METHODS**

### *At-Sea Observer Trends*

Data collected by the FWRI at-sea observer program were summarized for trends in discard disposition, barotrauma assessment, and depths fished. All observed hogfish were scored as to whether they were kept or discarded, vented/not vented, and recompressed/not recompressed. Specifically, for the at-sea observer field data recording for all discarded hogfish, surface released fish were given a vent code of “N” and release condition that was not “R”; vented fish had a vent code of any value other than “N” and a release condition that was not “R”; and recompressed fish had a release condition of “R” and a vent code of “N”. Finally, vented and recompressed fish had a release condition of “R” and a vent code of any value other than “N”. Venting tools consisted of primarily hollow needles, but there were two hogfish vented with knives, and one vented with a different tool, likely a hook. Venting primarily occurred through the ventral region of the fish, but there was one observation of venting through the anus occurring. Descending devices (brand SeaQualizer) were used in almost every recompression event, but one hogfish was recompressed with a cage. Due to only one observation of a vented and recompressed hogfish in 2024, this field was included with the recompressed category. All hogfish were released using the method that was usually employed by the charter boat or headboat crews and at-sea observers did not

recommend nor interfere with the method used to release fish. Release methods were then summarized by year and by depth of capture.

Hogfish were also scored for external signs of barotrauma when possible. Barotrauma assessment included: Score = 0 included fish that exhibited no visible barotrauma symptoms; Score = 1 included fish that had visible bloating in the ventral region; Score= 2 included fish that had extruded organs outside the mouth or less than 1 inch of intestinal extrusion; Score = 3 included fish that had any combination of lower scores and/or stomachs extruding through operculum, exophthalmia (but still in contact with eye socket), and/or greater than 1 inch of intestinal extrusion; and a Score = 4 included fish that exhibited any symptoms from lower scores as well as severe exophthalmia (full eyeball extrusion past eye socket), scales raised, and blood leaching from body (Table 1). Barotrauma scores of 9 (or not checked) were omitted. Observer data that were filtered for observations of hogfish that included barotrauma assessment reduced the total observations from 1,928 to 612. Depth of capture was binned into four 10-m depth categories, including  $\leq 10$  m, 10-20 m, 20-30 m, and  $> 30$  m. Frequency tables were created of barotrauma assessment score as a function of depth of capture for all observed hogfish and for discarded hogfish from July 2022 through December 2024 using SAS (SAS Institute Inc. 2004).

### *Sea Temperature Alignment*

The at-sea observer program does not collect water temperature data aboard observed trips. Therefore, sea surface temperature (SST) and bottom temperature (BT) were incorporated from the HYbrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM). HYCOM is a high-resolution ocean circulation model developed by NOAA in collaboration with the

Naval Research Laboratory and academic peers (Halliwell 2004; Chassignet et al. 2007). Using the HYCOM-TSIS GOMb0.01 reanalysis product, temperature estimates were incorporated into the at-sea observer dataset by date, location (latitude and longitude to the nearest whole minute), and hour. This product has been validated with temperature data recorded in situ (Thorr et al. 2025) and contains temperature estimates at 1 km<sup>2</sup> resolution (HYCOM 2024).

### *Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model*

We used a Bayesian mixed effects ordinal logistic regression to predict barotrauma based on parameters collected from the at-sea observer survey and HYCOM. Due to the overlap between absent and minor barotrauma codes (Table 1) and low observations in each condition (Table 3), these codes were pooled into an absent/minor category (denoted by Barotrauma = 1) leaving us with four barotrauma scores. Small sample sizes in the regions other than Tampa Bay (SW = 2 observations, SE = 5 observations, and KY = 22 observations) were dropped, reducing total sample size to 580 observations.

Due to the sample size of hogfish observed in Fall and Winter (75% of observations with barotrauma assessment), temperature anomalies were calculated using the following formulae:

$$SST \text{ anomaly} = SST - \text{mean}(SST \text{ per season})$$

$$BT \text{ anomaly} = BT - \text{mean}(BT \text{ per season})$$

Seasons were denoted as follows: Spring consisted of March, April, and May, Summer consisted of June, July, and August, Fall consisted of September, October, and November, and Winter consisted of December, January, and February.

Predictor variables other than Depth were standardized using the *bestNormalize* package (Peterson and Cavanaugh 2020, Peterson 2021) in R (R Core Team, 2023). Capture depth was log transformed. We trialed several model structures (not included) using parameters described in Table 6, but arrived at a model (Equation 1) with fixed effects for capture depth ( $X_{Depth}$ ), fork length ( $X_{FL}$ ), capture season ( $X_{season}$ ), interactions between SST ( $X_{SSTanom}$ ) and BT anomalies ( $X_{BTanom}$ ) with capture season. We controlled for the repeated measures nature of the dataset with a random effect for at-sea sampler ( $X_{sampler}$ ) and a nested random effect of vessel ( $X_{vessel}$ ) within vessel type ( $X_{type}$ ).

$$S_i \sim \log(X_{i,Depth}) + X_{i,FL} + (X_{i,SSTanom} * X_{i,season}) + (X_{i,BTanom} * X_{i,season}) + (1|X_{i,sampler}) + (1|X_{i,vessel}/X_{i,type}) \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

The model was implemented using the *brms* package (Bürkner 2017, 2018, 2021) using default priors, which set flat priors for parameters and a mean of 3 and standard deviation of 2.5 for intercepts and random effects. We ran the model with eight chains that had 4000 warmup iterations and 1000 sampling iterations each. Posterior samples from individual chains were combined and assessed using an  $\hat{R}$  below 1.1 (Gelman and Rubin, 1992) and with effective sample sizes over 2000. Parameter significance was assessed at an  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Marginal effects were calculated using the conditional effects function in *brms*.

## RESULTS

### *At-Sea Observer Trends*

The majority of discarded hogfish (~80%) were discarded with no barotrauma mitigation, as observed through the at-sea observer program (Table 2). Vented hogfish accounted for approximately 13% of discards and the remaining 7% were recompressed. One hogfish in 2024 was vented prior to recompression and was included in the recompression category. While surface releases accounted for the majority of discards, annual rates of venting and recompression increased slightly after 2020 (Table 2).

Nearly 90% of hogfish were captured in 10-20 m, and <1% were captured in depths > 30 m (Table 3). Despite being captured primarily in 10-20 m depth, catastrophic symptoms of barotrauma were being observed in more than half of the hogfish caught on for-hire trips (~53%). Severe barotrauma symptoms were observed nearly 24% of the time, intermediate symptoms ~15% of the time, and approximately 8% of observed hogfish did not exhibit any barotrauma or only minor barotrauma symptoms. In the primary depth range of capture (10-20 m) almost 56% of hogfish exhibited catastrophic barotrauma symptoms, 23% exhibited severe barotrauma, 15% exhibited intermediate symptoms, and the remaining ~6% exhibited minor or no symptoms of barotrauma (Table 3).

The percentage of discarded hogfish observed by depth bins did not significantly change from all observations (Table 4). However, 59% of discarded hogfish exhibited catastrophic barotrauma, 20% exhibited severe barotrauma symptoms, 12% exhibited intermediate barotrauma, and the remaining 9% had minor or no visible barotrauma. In

the primary depth range of capture (10-20 m), 63% of discarded hogfish exhibited catastrophic barotrauma, 19% exhibited severe barotrauma, 11% exhibited intermediate barotrauma, and the remaining 7% exhibited minor or no visible barotrauma (Table 4).

Despite severe and catastrophic barotrauma symptoms present in approximately 77% of observed hogfish, 69% of sampled hogfish in the primary depth range (10-20 m) were released with no barotrauma mitigation (Table 5). Sample sizes for discarded hogfish outside of this depth range were low but may indicate increased barotrauma mitigation in greater depths. Despite only ~5% of hogfish sampled having been caught in 20-30 m, 25% of discarded hogfish were vented, as opposed to ~15% in the primary depth range (Table 5). Sample sizes in depths >30 m were too low to confidently describe any trends regarding barotrauma mitigation for discarded hogfish.

#### *Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model*

The Bayesian mixed effects ordinal logistic regression converged with all parameters having  $\hat{R}$  values of less than 1.002 and effective sample sizes over 4000 samples. Fork length, SST Anomaly, Summer, Winter, BT Anomaly, the interaction between SST Anomaly and Spring, and the interaction between BT Anomaly and Spring all had probability of directions greater than 0.98 indicating strong positive or negative effects (Table 7). Interactions between SST Anomaly and Season, and BT Anomaly and Season had mixed results. Summer and Winter interactions were not significant, but Spring was (Table 7).

Capture depth had a median posterior parameter estimate close to zero as well as confidence intervals that overlapped 0 indicating it was not a significant predictor of barotrauma score (Table 7, Figure 1). This stands in contrast to other species as depth

is frequently a factor contributing to barotrauma in reef fishes (Drumhiller et al. 2014, Rudershausen et al. 2014, Ayala 2020). In Tampa Bay-caught Hogfish, the most likely barotrauma scoring is catastrophic regardless of depth and makes up ~50% of the expected barotrauma scores (Figure 1). Fork length was estimated to have an inverse relationship with the probability of catastrophic barotrauma for hogfish (Figure 2). At the minimum size limit in the Gulf, 14 inches or 356 mm fork length (NOAA Fisheries 2017), the model predicts roughly a 45% probability of catastrophic barotrauma symptoms, 35% probability of severe barotrauma, 15% probability of intermediate barotrauma, and a probability of less than 5% of absent or minor barotrauma symptoms.

Estimates of the SST anomaly effect indicated that small temperature changes may influence barotrauma severity (Figure 3). Strong negative SST anomalies were estimated to curtail the probability of catastrophic barotrauma (Figure 3). But even with moderate negative SST anomalies of  $-1^{\circ}\text{C}$ , Hogfish were expected to have higher rates of catastrophic barotrauma than other barotrauma outcomes. Bottom temperature anomalies have inverse effects on barotrauma predictions (Figure 4). Higher BT anomalies predict lower barotrauma scores have higher probabilities but by  $1^{\circ}\text{C}$ , severe and catastrophic scores have higher probabilities than other outcomes. By  $-5^{\circ}\text{C}$  BT anomaly, the probability of catastrophic barotrauma is 95%. Across seasons, summer was estimated to have the lowest probability of severe or catastrophic barotrauma, with intermediate having the highest estimated probability at 39%. Winter was estimated to be dominated by catastrophic barotrauma with a probability of 71%. Spring and fall exhibit similar trends with each barotrauma score. Given the strong correlation between

season and hook-and-line fishing effort (almost all in the winter), it is very likely these seasonal fixed effects are confounded in part by this phenomenon.

Negative SST anomalies in spring influence higher probabilities of absent/minor barotrauma, while positive SST anomalies influence catastrophic (Figure 6). In fall, strong negative SST anomalies influence lower barotrauma scores, otherwise catastrophic barotrauma has the highest probability. SST anomalies with summer and winter had high uncertainty (93% and 431% respectively, Table 6). Spring and fall BT anomalies had the opposite relationship of SST anomalies. In spring, negative anomalies generated higher probabilities of catastrophic barotrauma and positive anomalies generated high probability of absent/minor barotrauma (Figure 7). Fall BT anomalies also had the opposite relationship from SST anomalies with an increasing chance of catastrophic barotrauma with decreasing anomaly (Figure 7). Again, summer and winter BT anomalies had high uncertainty similar to the SST anomalies (76% and 229% respectively, Table 6).

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank Sean Wilms and the samplers of the at-sea observer survey for coordinating and collecting the data utilized in this analysis. We'd also like to thank Alexander Hyman, Chloe Ramsay, and Luiz Barbieri for assistance with data filtering and analysis. Additionally, we'd like to thank all of the captains, crew, and anglers that allowed observers on trips and cooperated/assisted in data collection. Lastly, thanks to Oscar (Butch) Ayala for his fishery expertise, and inspiration in conducting this analysis. This research is funded with the help of the Fish & Wildlife Foundation of Florida via proceeds from the Koons-Ayala Marine Fisheries Research and Conservation Endowment by providing a scholarship for graduate studies at the University of Florida.

## REFERENCES

- Ayala, O. E. 2020. Testing the efficacy of recompression tools to reduce the discard mortality of reef fishes in the Gulf of Mexico. Master's thesis, University of South Florida, Tampa.
- Bürkner, P. C. 2017. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software* 80(1):1–28. doi:10.18637/jss.v080.i01
- Bürkner, P. C. 2018. Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *The R Journal* 10(1):395–411. doi:10.32614/RJ-2018-017
- Bürkner, P. C. 2021. Bayesian item response modeling in R with brms and Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software* 100(5):1–54. doi:10.18637/jss.v100.i05
- Chassignet, E. P., H. E. Hurlburt, O. M. Smedstad, G. R. Halliwell, P. J. Hogan, A. J. Wallcraft, and R. Bleck. 2007. The HYCOM (HYbrid Coordinate Ocean Model) data assimilative system. *Journal of Marine Systems* 65(1–4):60–83.
- Collins, A. B., and R. S. McBride. 2015. Variations in reproductive potential between nearshore and offshore spawning contingents of Hogfish in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 22(2):113–124.
- Davis, J. C. 1976. Biology of the Hogfish, *Lachnolaimus maximus* (Walbaum), in the Florida Keys. Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables.
- Diamond, S. L., and M. D. Campbell. 2009. Linking “sink or swim” indicators to delayed mortality in red snapper by using a condition index. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 1:107–120.
- Drumhiller, K. L., M. W. Johnson, S. L. Diamond, M. M. Reese Robillard, and G. W. Stunz. 2014. Venting or rapid recompression increase survival and improve recovery of Red Snapper with barotrauma. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 6(1):190–199.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2024a. At-Sea Observer Survey. Available from: <https://myfwc.com/research/saltwater/fishstats/at-sea-observer-survey/> (October 30, 2024)..
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2024b. State Reef Fish Program Overview. Available from: <https://myfwc.com/research/saltwater/fishstats/srfs/program/> (October 30, 2024).

- Gelman, A., and D. B. Rubin. 1992. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Statistical Science* 7:457–472.
- Halliwell, G. R. 2004. Evaluation of vertical coordinate and vertical mixing algorithms in the HYbrid-Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM). *Ocean Modelling* 7(3–4):285–322.
- HYCOM (HYbrid Coordinate Ocean Model). 2024. Gulf of Mexico reanalysis (GOMI0.04/expt\_91.1). Available: <https://www.hycom.org/data/gomb0pt01/gom-reanalysis> (June 26, 2025).
- McBride, R. S. 2001. Age, growth, and reproduction of Hogfish, *Lachnolaimus maximus*. In *Final Report for Marine Fisheries Initiative (MARFIN) Program* (NOAA Award Number NA87FF0422). Florida Marine Research Institute Report F0723-98-00-F, St. Petersburg, Florida. pp. 35.
- NOAA Fisheries. 2017. Final rule for hogfish management in Gulf of Mexico federal waters. NOAA Fisheries. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/bulletin/final-rule-hogfish-management-gulf-mexico-federal-waters>.
- NOAA Fisheries. 2025. Recreational fishing surveys. Available: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/recreational-fishing-data/recreational-fishing-surveys> (June 3, 2025).
- Peterson, R. A., and J. E. Cavanaugh. 2020. Ordered quantile normalization: a semiparametric transformation built for the cross-validation era. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 47(13–15):2312–2327. doi:10.1080/02664763.2019.1630372
- Peterson, R. A. 2021. Finding optimal normalizing transformations via bestNormalize. *The R Journal* 13(1):310–329. doi:10.32614/RJ-2021-041
- R Core Team. 2023. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rudershausen, P. J., J. A. Buckel, and J. E. Hightower. 2014. Estimating reef fish discard mortality using surface and bottom tagging: effects of hook injury and barotrauma. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 71(4):514–520.
- SAS Institute Inc. 2004. SAS software version 8.3. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina.

- Sauls, B. 2014. Relative survival of Gags *Mycteroperca microlepis* released within a recreational hook-and-line fishery: application of the Cox regression model to control for heterogeneity in a large-scale mark–recapture study. *Fisheries Research* 150:18–27.
- SEDAR. 2004. SEDAR 6: Complete stock assessment report of hogfish snapper. SEDAR6-SAR2. SEDAR, Charleston, South Carolina.
- SEDAR. 2013. SEDAR 37: The 2013 stock assessment report for Hogfish in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- SEDAR. 2017. SEDAR 37 update: Stock assessment of Hogfish in the West Florida Shelf stock 1986–2016. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Thorr, J. C., D. Chambers, J. A. Quinlan, J. P. Kilborn, and S. A. Murawski. 2025. Beyond surface level: evaluating spatial incongruencies in high-resolution bottom temperature trends for the Gulf of Mexico, 1996–2012. *Fisheries Oceanography* e12726.
- Vecchio, J. L., D. Lazarre, B. Sauls, M. Head, and T. Moncrief. 2022. A description of Florida’s Gulf Coast recreational fishery and release mortality estimates for the central and eastern subregions (Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida) with varying levels of descender use. SEDAR74-DW-6. SEDAR, North Charleston, South Carolina. 27 pp.

Table 1. Barotrauma score code and corresponding symptoms as determined by FWRI's At-Sea observer survey. Barotrauma codes are assigned to every fish measured at sea. Photos taken by L. Eguia.






Barotrauma Code	Definition	Example
Absent (0)	No external symptoms such as popeye, stomach extrusion or intestinal eversion. Ventral area does not feel inflated and firm to the touch, it is soft and pliable.	
Minor (1)	Ventral region tight or swollen (bladder/stomach), No Externally visible stomach extrusion (there may be slight stomach extrusion inside the mouth).	
Intermediate (2)	Ventral region tight or swollen (bladder/stomach), Stomach extruded and visible outside mouth and/or minor intestinal extrusion, defined as less than one-inch intestines visible.	
Severe (3)	Ventral region tight or swollen (bladder/stomach), Stomach extruding from mouth and/or out gill raker/plate, Exophthalmia visible-orbit still in contact with eye socket and/or major intestinal extrusion, defined as greater than one-inch of intestines visible.	
Catastrophic (4)	Severe Exophthalmia-hanging by optic nerve, Scales raised, air and/or blood leaching from body, Intestinal extrusion-not required, Tight belly, and/or stomach fully extruded - may not be present, swim bladder ruptured.	

Table 2. Release methods for Hogfish *Lachnolaimus maximus* reported by FWRI At-Sea observers in the Tampa Bay region during 2009-2024. Surface release meant that no barotrauma mitigation tools were used when releasing the fish, venting involved puncturing the gas bladder prior to release, and recompressed was for fish that were descended using various devices. \*One discarded Hogfish in 2024 was vented prior to recompression. Percentages for release methods represent annual percent, while total percent represents total percent of entire time series.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Surface Released</b>		<b>Vented</b>		<b>Recompressed</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
2009	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	0.09
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	0.09
2012	2	66.67	1	33.33	0	0	3	0.28
2013	7	100	0	0	0	0	7	0.66
2014	42	93.33	3	6.67	0	0	45	4.23
2015	38	95	2	5	0	0	40	3.76
2016	42	95.45	2	4.55	0	0	44	4.14
2017	39	86.67	6	13.33	0	0	45	4.23
2018	78	96.3	3	3.7	0	0	81	7.62
2019	94	92.16	8	7.84	0	0	102	9.60
2020	8	88.89	1	11.11	0	0	9	0.85
2021	110	78.01	30	21.28	1	0.71	141	13.3
2022	185	73.71	26	10.36	40	15.94	251	23.6
2023	87	73.73	19	16.1	12	10.17	118	11.1
2024	119	68	36	20.57	20*	11.43	175	16.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>80.24</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>12.89</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>6.87</b>	<b>1063</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3. Barotrauma score as a function of depth of capture of Hogfish reported by FWRI's at-sea observers from July 2022 through December 2024. Barotrauma score was based on ranked scores described in Table 1.

Barotrauma	Depth of Capture (m)								Total	
	0-10		10-20		20-30		>30		n	%
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Absent	6	26.09	2	0.37	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>8</b>	<b>1.31</b>
Minor	6	26.09	33	6.03	2	5.26	0	0.00	<b>41</b>	<b>6.70</b>
Intermediate	6	26.09	81	14.81	6	15.79	1	25.00	<b>94</b>	<b>15.36</b>
Severe	3	13.04	127	23.22	14	36.84	2	50.00	<b>146</b>	<b>23.86</b>
Catastrophic	2	8.70	304	55.58	16	42.11	1	25.00	<b>323</b>	<b>52.78</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>89.38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6.21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4. Barotrauma score as a function of depth of capture of only discarded Hogfish reported by FWRI's at-sea observers from July 2022 through December 2024. Barotrauma score was based on ranked scores described in Table 1.

<b>Barotrauma</b>	<b>Depth of Capture (m)</b>									
	<b>0-10</b>		<b>10-20</b>		<b>20-30</b>		<b>&gt;30</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Absent	6	28.57	2	0.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>8</b>	<b>1.78</b>
Minor	6	28.57	24	5.97	2	8.33	0	0.00	<b>32</b>	<b>7.11</b>
Intermediate	6	28.57	46	11.44	2	8.33	1	33.33	<b>55</b>	<b>12.22</b>
Severe	3	9.52	77	19.15	8	33.33	2	66.67	<b>89</b>	<b>19.78</b>
Catastrophic	2	4.76	253	62.94	12	50.00	0	0.00	<b>266</b>	<b>59.11</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>89.33</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5: Release method as a function of depth of capture of Hogfish reported by FWRI's at-sea observers with barotrauma assessments in 2022-2024. Release methods are grouped the same as Table 2. \*One discarded Hogfish in 2024 was vented prior to recompression. Percentages for release methods represent depth bin percent, while total percent represents total percentage of release methods.

Release Method	Depth of Capture (m)									
	0-10		10-20		20-30		>30		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Surface Released	14	66.67	276	68.66	14	58.33	0	0	<b>304</b>	<b>67.56</b>
Vented	7	33.33	60	14.93	6	25.00	1	33.33	<b>74</b>	<b>16.44</b>
Recompressed*	0	0	66	16.42	4	16.67	2	66.67	<b>72</b>	<b>16.00</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>89.33</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6. Parameter variables used as predictors in the barotrauma estimation model. Data came from the At-Sea Observer Program (2022-2024) and HYCOM for temperature.

Parameters	Parameter Type	Definition	Parameter Source
<i>Response Variables</i>			
Barotrauma (BTC)	Categorical	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Absent/Minor</li> <li>2. Intermediate</li> <li>3. Severe</li> <li>4. Catastrophic</li> </ol> See Table 1 for detailed definitions	At-Sea
<i>Predictor Variables</i>			
Season	Categorical	<b>Spring:</b> March, April, May <b>Summer:</b> June, July, August <b>Fall:</b> September, October, November <b>Winter:</b> December, January, February	At-Sea
Depth	Continuous	Depth in meters (m) collected by At-Sea Observers at every location	At-Sea
Fork Length (FL)	Continuous	Measurement recorded by observers to the nearest millimeter (mm) of the base of the mouth to the fork of the caudal fin	At-Sea
Sea Surface Temperature (SST)	Continuous	Temperature recorded at 0m depth to the nearest date, hour, latitude, and longitude)	HYCOM
Bottom Temperature (BT)	Continuous	Temperature recorded at bottom depth to the nearest date, hour, latitude, and longitude)	HYCOM
SST Anomaly	Continuous	Calculated by subtracting the mean SST from each season from the observed SST	HYCOM
BT Anomaly	Continuous	Calculated by subtracting the mean BT from each season from the observed BT	HYCOM
<i>Random Effect Variables</i>			
FDMSamplerID	Categorical	Sampler ID assigned to every At-Sea Observer to distinguish source of data collection	At-Sea
FDMVesselID	Categorical	Unique 7-digit code to identify individual vessels on which observers collect data	At-Sea
VesselType	Categorical	<b>H:</b> Headboat – includes multi day trips (typically denoted as <b>M</b> ) <b>C:</b> Private charter	At-Sea

Table 7. Posterior parameter estimates of fixed and random effects from Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model. For each parameter, we report the median, lower and upper 95% credible interval (CI), the probability of direction (PD), the percent of the 95% credible interval in the region of practical equivalence (-0.18,0.18; ROPE), the  $\hat{R}$  statistic, and effective sample size (ESS). Probabilities of direction close to one indicate the posterior is strongly negative or positive. High percent in ROPE indicates posteriors are poorly distinguishable from an effect size of zero.

Parameter	Median	Lower CI	Upper CI	PD	ROPE	$\hat{R}$	ESS
Intercept[1]	-2.869	-6.211	0.451	0.951	1.93%	1.001	8717
Intercept[2]	-1.080	-4.430	2.215	0.741	7.14%	1.001	8827
Intercept[3]	0.538	-2.823	3.823	0.629	8.83%	1.001	8851
Log(Depth)	0.249	-0.933	1.406	0.664	23.55%	1.001	9058
Fork Length	-0.575	-0.771	-0.388	1.000	0.00%	1.000	8701
SST Anomaly	1.353	0.316	2.624	0.996	0.00%	1.000	4560
Spring	-0.138	-1.308	1.061	0.592	23.93%	1.000	6894
Summer	-2.353	-3.431	-1.357	1.000	0.00%	1.000	4483
Winter	0.754	0.244	1.267	0.998	0.00%	1.001	7407
BT Anomaly	-1.087	-2.309	-0.100	0.985	1.53%	1.000	4483
SST Anomaly: Spring	11.863	4.519	19.882	1.000	0.00%	1.001	4567
SST Anomaly: Summer	-3.674	-10.645	2.957	0.860	2.57%	1.000	4157
SST Anomaly: Winter	0.652	-4.717	5.867	0.602	5.22%	1.001	4848
BT Anomaly: Spring	-12.839	-21.504	-4.986	1.000	0.00%	1.001	4470
BT Anomaly: Summer	4.820	-2.239	12.353	0.908	1.82%	1.000	4118
BT Anomaly: Winter	-1.248	-6.697	4.318	0.677	5.00%	1.001	4902




Figure 1: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of depth.




Figure 2: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of fork length.




Figure 3: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of sea surface temperature anomaly.




Figure 4: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of bottom temperature anomaly.




Figure 5: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of season.




Figure 6: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of sea surface temperature in each season.




Figure 7: Bayesian Mixed Effects Ordinal Regression Model prediction of probability of barotrauma score as a function of bottom temperature in each season.

Supplemental Paper for SEDAR94-DW-16 Recreational For-Hire Trends in Release  
Methods and Barotrauma Assessment of Hogfish (*Lachnolaimus maximus*) using a  
Fisheries-Dependent At-Sea Observer Program

Leonardo Eguia<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Zachary Siders<sup>1</sup>, and Debra Murie<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, School of Forest, Fisheries, & Geomatic Sciences,  
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.*

<sup>2</sup> *Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Fish and Wildlife Research  
Institute, 100 Eighth Avenue SE, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701*

*\*Corresponding Author: Leonardo.egua@myfwc.com*

27 August 2025

This document provides supplemental tables to SEDAR94-DW-16 describing observed barotrauma scores and release conditions for hogfish from the FWRI-FDM At-Sea Observer program (Tables S1-S3) to further aid in justification of a baseline and upper bound discard mortality rate for hogfish.

From the 450 total discarded hogfish with observed barotrauma scores (Table 4 of SEDAR94-DW-16), 5 hogfish had unknown release conditions, 2 of which had severe barotrauma symptoms, and the remaining 3 exhibited catastrophic barotrauma symptoms. Due to release condition not being assessed, these 5 fish are omitted from Tables S1-S3. No discarded hogfish with barotrauma observations were recorded with post-release predation or released dead.

Release conditions include the following: 'Good' releases indicate fish that rapidly swim back down with minor injury from hooking; 'Fair' releases indicate fish that swim down slowly but eventually descend out of sight or have moderate bleeding; and 'Bad' releases indicate fish that float off (even if they eventually go back down), are bleeding profusely and swim poorly, or remain just under the surface within sight. Recompressed releases indicate usage of descending devices (such as SeaQualizer), weighted inverted hooks, or weighted cages to release the fish at depth, therefore swim condition cannot be assessed by observers.

While release conditions do not fully reflect the true discard mortality rate for released fish, they can make inferences to immediate mortality. Additionally, barotrauma scores can make inferences to delayed mortality post release. We are aware of the subjectivity surrounding the release conditions from not having rigid definitions for swim speeds or extent of bleeding, ultimately relying on sampler interpretation of the codes,

as well as the potential for positive outcome bias or misjudgment of accurate release condition due to the fast-paced nature of fishing aboard for-hire vessels. However, given there is no current discard mortality rate for surface released or vented hogfish, with the vast majority of hogfish surface released in for-hire fisheries (SEDAR94-DW-16), we believe this is the best available data for estimating an upper bound and baseline discard mortality rate for this species.

Three tables are provided that summarize different condition/pooling options for hogfish barotrauma scores and release conditions from the observer program (Tables S1-S3). First, we provided all release conditions, excluding unknown release conditions, and barotrauma scores for discarded hogfish in the observer program (Table S1). Second, we provided release conditions and barotrauma scored for discarded hogfish excluding recompressed and unknown release conditions (Table S2). Third, we pooled known release conditions in an attempt to reduce subjectivity of the release conditions by combining bad and fair releases, and good and recompressed releases (Table S3).

Table S1. Barotrauma score as a function of release condition for discarded hogfish reported from FWRI's at-sea observers from July 2022 through December of 2024. Unknown release condition discards were excluded. Barotrauma score was based on ranked scores described in Table 1 of SEDAR94-DW-16. Total % refers to percentage of release condition and barotrauma for all observations (445), and column % refers to percentage of barotrauma score for all observations in each release condition.

Barotrauma	Release Condition												Total	
	Bad			Fair			Good			Recompressed				
	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total %	Column %	n	%
Absent (0)	1	0.22	1.16	2	0.45	1.56	5	1.12	3.14	0	0.00	0.00	<b>8</b>	<b>1.80</b>
Minor (1)	9	2.02	10.47	10	2.25	7.81	13	2.92	8.18	0	0.00	0.00	<b>32</b>	<b>7.19</b>
Intermediate (2)	16	3.60	18.60	15	3.37	11.72	20	4.49	12.58	4	0.90	5.56	<b>55</b>	<b>12.36</b>
Severe (3)	24	5.39	27.91	24	5.39	18.75	16	3.60	10.06	23	5.17	31.94	<b>87</b>	<b>19.55</b>
Catastrophic (4)	36	8.09	41.86	77	17.30	60.16	105	23.60	66.04	45	10.11	62.50	<b>263</b>	<b>59.10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>19.33</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>28.76</b>		<b>159</b>	<b>35.73</b>		<b>72</b>	<b>16.18</b>		<b>445</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table S2. Barotrauma score as a function of release condition for discarded hogfish reported from FWRI's at-sea observers from July 2022 through December of 2024. Recompressed and unknown release condition discards were excluded. Barotrauma score was based on ranked scores described in Table 1 of SEDAR94-DW-16. Total % refers to percentage of release condition and barotrauma for all observations (373), and column % refers to percentage of barotrauma score for all observations in each release condition.

Barotrauma	Release Condition									Total	
	Bad			Fair			Good				
	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total %	Column %	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Absent (0)	1	0.27	1.16	2	0.54	1.56	5	1.34	3.14	<b>8</b>	<b>2.14</b>
Minor (1)	9	2.41	10.47	10	2.68	7.81	13	3.49	8.18	<b>32</b>	<b>8.58</b>
Intermediate (2)	16	4.29	18.60	15	4.02	11.72	20	5.36	12.58	<b>51</b>	<b>13.67</b>
Severe (3)	24	6.43	27.91	24	6.43	18.75	16	4.29	10.06	<b>64</b>	<b>17.16</b>
Catastrophic (4)	36	9.65	41.86	77	20.64	60.16	105	28.15	66.04	<b>218</b>	<b>58.45</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>23.06</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>34.32</b>		<b>159</b>	<b>42.63</b>		<b>373</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table S3. Pooled barotrauma scores as a function of release condition for discarded hogfish reported from FWRI's at-sea observers from July 2022 through December of 2024. Unknown release condition discards were excluded. Barotrauma score was based on ranked scores described in Table 1 of SEDAR94-DW-16. Total % refers to percentage of release condition and barotrauma for all observations (445), and column % refers to percentage of barotrauma score for all observations in each release condition.

Barotrauma	Release Condition						Total	
	Bad/Fair			Good/Recompressed				
	n	Total %	Column %	n	Total%	Column %	<i>n</i>	%
Absent (0)	3	0.67	1.40	5	1.12	2.16	<b>8</b>	<b>1.80</b>
Minor (1)	19	4.27	8.88	13	2.92	5.63	<b>32</b>	<b>7.19</b>
Intermediate (2)	31	6.97	14.49	24	5.39	10.39	<b>55</b>	<b>12.36</b>
Severe (3)	48	10.79	22.43	39	8.76	16.88	<b>87</b>	<b>19.55</b>
Catastrophic (4)	113	25.39	52.80	150	33.71	64.94	<b>263</b>	<b>59.10</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>48.09</b>		<b>231</b>	<b>51.91</b>		<b>445</b>	<b>100.00</b>