



Mediterranean Marine Science

Vol 22, No 3 (2021)

VOL 22, No 3 (2021)



The use of fishers' Local Ecological Knowledge to reconstruct fish behavioural traits and fishers' perception of conservation relevance of elasmobranchs in the Mediterranean Sea

MATTEO BARBATO, CLAUDIO BARRÍA, ANDREA BELLODI, SARA BONANOMI, DIEGO BORME, ILIJA ĆETKOVIĆ, FRANCESCO COLLOCA, ANA I. COLMENERO. FABIO CROCETTA. FRANCESCO De CARLO, EGEMEN DEMÍR, MANFREDI DI LORENZO, MARIA CRISTINA FOLLESA, FULVIO GARIBALDI. GIANNI GIGLIO, IOANNIS GIOVOS, GIULIA GUERRIERO, OLFA HENTATI, MOHAMED KSIBI, CLAUDIA KRUSCHEL, LUCA LANTERI, FRANCESCO LUIGI LEONETTI, ALESSANDRO LIGAS, ADRIANO MADONNA. SANJA MATIĆ SKOKO. RENATA MIMICA. DIMITRIOS K. MOUTOPOULOS, ANTONELLO MULAS. VEDRANA NERLOVIĆ, ANA PEŠIĆ, CRISTINA PORCU, EMILIO RIGINELLA, EMILIO SPERONE, KONSTANTINOS TSOUKNIDAS, SEZGINER TUNCER. DARIO VRDOLJAK, CARLOTTA MAZZOLDI

doi: 10.12681/mms.25306

To cite this article:

BARBATO, M., BARRÍA, C., BELLODI, A., BONANOMI, S., BORME, D., ĆETKOVIĆ, I., COLLOCA, F., COLMENERO, A. I., CROCETTA, F., De CARLO, F., DEMÍR, E., DI LORENZO, M., FOLLESA, M. C., GARIBALDI, F., GIGLIO, G., GIOVOS, I., GUERRIERO, G., HENTATI, O., KSIBI, M., KRUSCHEL, C., LANTERI, L., LEONETTI, F. L., LIGAS, A.,





MADONNA, A., MATIĆ SKOKO, S., MIMICA, R., MOUTOPOULOS, D. K., MULAS, A., NERLOVIĆ, V., PEŠIĆ, A., PORCU, C., RIGINELLA, E., SPERONE, E., TSOUKNIDAS, K., TUNÇER, S., VRDOLJAK, D., & MAZZOLDI, C. (2021). The use of fishers' Local Ecological Knowledge to reconstruct fish behavioural traits and fishers' perception of conservation relevance of elasmobranchs in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mediterranean Marine Science*, *22*(3), 603–622. https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.25306

Mediterranean Marine Science
Indexed in WoS (Web of Science, ISI Thomson) and SCOPUS
The journal is available on line at http://www.medit-mar-sc.net
DOI: http://doi.org/10.12681/mms.25306

The use of fishers' Local Ecological Knowledge to reconstruct fish behavioural traits and fishers' perception of the conservation relevance of elasmobranchs in the Mediterranean Sea

Matteo BARBATO, Claudio BARRÍA, Andrea BELLODI, Sara BONANOMI, , Diego BORME, Ilija ĆETKOVIĆ, Francesco COLLOCA, Ana I. COLMENERO, Fabio CROCETTA, Francesco DE CARLO, Egemen DEMİR, Manfredi DI LORENZO, Maria Cristina FOLLESA, Fulvio GARIBALDI, Gianni GIGLIO, Ioannis GIOVOS, Giulia GUERRIERO, Olfa HENTATI, Mohamed KSIBI, Claudia KRUSCHEL, Luca LANTERI, Francesco Luigi LEONETTI, Alessandro LIGAS, Adriano MADONNA, Sanja MATIĆ SKOKO, Renata MIMICA, Dimitrios K. MOUTOPOULOS, Antonello MULAS, Vedrana NERLOVIĆ, Ana PEŠIĆ Cristina PORCU, Emilio RIGINELLA, Emilio SPERONE, Konstantinos TSOUKNIDAS, Sezginer TUNÇER, Dario VRDOLJAK and Carlotta MAZZOLDI

Mediterranean Marine Science, 2021, 22 (3)

Fig. S1: Questionnal	ire tem	iplate.							
PERSONAL DAT	Ά								
Name and surnam	e (vo	luntary)	•••••						
Residence:				City	y		Provin	ce	
Age and years of	fishi	ng experience							
Fisheries		☐ Gill nets		□ Bot	tom traw	/1	□ Ot	hers	
		□ Longline		□ Otte	er beam t	trav	wl		
Targeted species:	:								
Fishing frequenc	y: Nu	imber of times/year	·						
Questions									
1. Have you ever f	ished,	in the past or the p	resen	t, sharks, skates	s or rays	s?			
		PA	ST				PRES	SENT	
Sharks		YES		NO			YES		NO
Skates and Rays		YES		NO			YES		NO

- 2. In which areas have you fished in the past? (point in the map)
- 3. In which areas do you fish nowadays? If it has changed regarding the past, why?

4. Have the shark_fisheries varied over time? In which way?

CATCHES

		1940-1960		1960-1980		1980-2000		2000-present
Total catches in the past regarding the present Personal assessment		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)
		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)
		They remain the same		They remain the same		They remain the same		They remain the same
		Less abundant		Less abundant		Less abundant		Less abundant
		No assessment		No assessment		No assessment		No assessment
Which ones used to be the most	1) 2)		1) 2)		1) 2)		1) 2)	
abundant species?	3)		3)		3)		3)	
	4)5)		4) 5)		4)5)		4) 5)	

- 5. Which shark species are not caught anymore, or have dramatically declined?
- 6. Are there any new shark species that have been caught nowadays, but not in the past? Which ones?
- 7. Have you noticed any change (increase or decrease) in the size of any shark species over time?

Specie	Increase	Decrease

8. Have the rays and skates' fisheries varied over time? In which way?

CATCHES

		1940-1960		1960-1980		1980-2000		2000-present
Total catches in the past regarding the present Personal assessment		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)		Very abundant (more than 3 times in comparison to the present)
		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)		Abundant (twice more than in the present)
		They remain the same						
		Less abundant		Less abundant		Less abundant		Less abundant
		No assessment		No assessment		No assessment		No assessment
Which ones used	1)		1)		1)		1)	
to be the most abundant species?	2)		2)		2)		2)	
aoundant species:	3)		3)		3)		3)	
	4)		4)		4)		4)	
	5)		5)		5)		5)	

9.	Which ray/skate s	pecies are n	not caught	anymore, o	or have	dramatically	declined?

10. Are there any new ray/skate species that have been caught nowadays, but not in the past? Which ones?

11. Have you noticed any change (increase or decrease) in the size of any ray/skate species over time?

Specie	Increase	Decrease

12. In your opinion, has the way of fishing sharks, skates and rays changed over time? (Type of fishery, seasons...)

13. Are there seasons in which you caught more or fewer sharks and/or skates and rays? (Please indicate the season(s))

Species	Spring	Summer	Autumn	Winter

- 14. In your opinion, is this seasonality related to migratory movements? For which species do you think this is true?
- 15. According to your knowledge, how do the sharks, skates and rays move in your fishing area?
- 16. Have you ever seen or fished any time aggregation of sharks and/or skates/rays? Of which species?

17. Has the occurrence of such aggregations changed over time? For which species?

AGGREGATIONS

	1940-1960)	1960-1980	1980-2000	2000-present		
Species	□ Never obser	ved 🗆	Never observed	Never observed		Never observed	
	□ Rarely		Rarely	Rarely		Rarely	
	☐ Frequently		Frequently	Frequently		Frequently	

18. Description of the aggregations: dimension, sex and abundance, in the past and present.

AGGREGATIONS

		1940-1960	1960-1980	1980-2000	2000-present
Species		Few	Few	Few	Few
		Many (more than 10 specimens)	Many (more than 10 specimens)	Many (more than 10 specimens)	Many (more than 10 specimens)
	☐ A lot of (more the specime)☐ Big		A lot of them (more than 50 specimens)	A lot of them (more than 50 specimens)	A lot of them (more than 50 specimens)
			Big	Big	Big
		Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
		Small	Small	Small	Small
		Males	Males	Males	Males
		No pregnant females	No pregnant females	No pregnant females	No pregnant females
		Pregnant females	Pregnant females	Pregnant females	Pregnant females
		Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed

- 19. Could you indicate in which areas these aggregations occurred (map)? Inshore or offshore? Any location in particular?
- 20. In which period of the year?
- 21. Do you believe that sharks, rays and skates are important for the marine environment?
- 22. Do you believe that sharks, skates and rays are important for fisheries?
- 23. Do you think that is important to conserve sharks, skates and rays? If so, how would you do it?

Table S1. Percentage of interviewed fishers answering about the seasonality of each species for the different sampling points (Ancona (ANC), Chioggia (CHIO), Marano Lagunare (ML), Northern Istria (NI), Southern Istria (SI), Eastern Adriatic coast (EAC) and Montenegro (MON) in the Adriatic Sea, above the 25% threshold.

	ANC	СНЮ	ML	NI	SI	EAC	MON
Total of fishers	15	12	13	23	21	8	10
Mustelus spp.	-	83	92	100	52	100	40
M. aquila	-	-	92	100	-	75	-
<i>Raja</i> spp.	53	33	85	75	62	100	50
S. acanthias	27	42	100	100	57	25	30
S. stellaris	-	-	62	60	-	-	-

Table S2. Percentage of interviewed fishers answering about the seasonality question of each species for the different sampling areas in other GSAs [Italy (ITA), Turkey (TUR), Spain (SPA)], above the 25% threshold.

GSA	9	9	22/28	11.2	16	6	19	10
Country	ITA	ITA	TUR	ITA (SAR)	ITA (SIC)	SPA	ITA(CAL)	ITA(CAL)
Tot. fishers	12	9	10	14	15	15	6	6
Raja spp.	40	33	44	57	-	-	-	-
P. glauca	-	33	-	-	-	28	50	-
S. canicula	-	-	-	42	-	-	-	-
Torpedo spp.	-	-	-	28	-	-	33	-
Mustelus spp.	-	-	-	-	40	-	-	-
P. violacea	-	-	-	-	-	42	-	-
I. oxyrhincus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33

Table S3. Percentage of interviewed fishers answering to each question (QN: question number) for each species indicating aggregation features in the Adriatic Sea during different time periods: B) 1960-1980; C) 1980-2000; D) 2000-Present.

	QN 17				QN 18A			QN 18B			QN 18C		
	1960- 1980	1980- 2000	2000 -Present										
Mustelus spp.	9	45	48	7	49	49	7	38	42	5	43	44	
S. acanthias	5	30	35	4	22	26	4	17	20	5	17	19	
M. aquila	4	22	23	2	19	16	2	15	13	2	10	9	
Raja spp.	7	19	25	4	16	24	4	13	20	3	11	14	

Table S4. Percentage of interviewed fishers answering to each question (QN: question number) for each species indicating aggregation features in other Mediterranean GSAs during different time periods: B) 1960-1980; C) 1980-2000; D) 2000-Present.

	QN 17			QN 18A			QN 18B			QN 18C		
	1960- 1980	1980- 2000	2000 -Present	1960- 1980	1980- 2000	2000 -Present	1960- 1980	1980- 2000	2000-Present	1960- 1980	1980- 2000	2000 -Present
Mustelus spp.	9	9	7	8	9	4	7	8	3	6	6	4
Raja spp.	9	11	9	9	13	10	8	13	9	8	10	9
S. canicula	9	14	11	7	12	12	5	12	11	5	9	8

Table S5. Percentage of interviewed fishers answering to the questions related to aggregations (QN 17 and QN 18) in each GSA.

GSA	GSA 6	GSA 9	GSA 10	GSA 11	GSA 16	GSA 19	GSA 22/28
Mustelus spp.	-	8	-	-	84	8	
Raja spp.	-	25	13	13	36	-	13
S. canicula	23	27	-	23	27	-	-

Table S6. Percentage of fishing gears used by interviewed fishers in the different sampling areas.

	GSA 6	GSA 9	GSA 10	GSA 11	GSA13	GSA 16	GSA 17	GSA 18	GSA 19	GSA 20	GSA 22	GSA 28
Gillnets (GNS)	0	40	30	34	41	17	29	17	31	8	45	0
Long Line (LLS)	11	21	25	35	5	20	8	25	31	33	45	50
Bottom trawl (OTB)	55	29	40	24	33	63	35	25	8	58	10	6
Mid-water Trawl (PTM)	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	0	0	0	6
Other beam trawl (TTB)	0	0	0	0	22	0	9	0	0	0	0	19
Other	27	9	5	7	0	0	10	17	31	0	0	19