

Does harvesting amplify environmentally induced population fluctuations over time in marine and terrestrial species?

Marlène Gamelon, Brett K Sandercock, Bernt-erik Sæther

► To cite this version:

Marlène Gamelon, Brett K Sandercock, Bernt-erik Sæther. Does harvesting amplify environmentally induced population fluctuations over time in marine and terrestrial species?. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2019, 56 (9), pp.2186 - 2194. 10.1111/1365-2664.13466 . hal-03282120

HAL Id: hal-03282120 https://hal.science/hal-03282120v1

Submitted on 8 Jul 2021

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	Does harvesting amplify environmentally induced population fluctuations					
2	over time in marine and terrestrial species?					
3						
4	Marlène Gamelon ^{1,*} , Brett K. Sandercock ² and Bernt-Erik Sæther ¹					
5	¹ Centre for Biodiversity Dynamics, Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science					
6	and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway.					
7	² Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, 7485					
8	Trondheim, Norway.					
9						
10 11	*Correspondence: <u>marlene.gamelon@ntnu.no</u>					
11						
12 13	Abstract1. In marine and terrestrial ecosystems, organisms are affected by environmental					
14	variations that cause fluctuations in population size. The harvest-interaction					
15	hypothesis predicts that environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size are					
16	magnified by harvesting. Empirical evidence is urgently needed in the context of					
17	global change because greater fluctuations will increase extinction risk.					
18	2. Here, we review theoretical and empirical work that has addressed the harvest-					
19	interaction hypothesis in fish, birds and mammals. We identify the mechanisms by					
20	which harvesting might make population size more variable over time and thereby					
21	increase the risk of extinction.					
22	3. Theoretical models show that harvest can modify population structure in time and					
23	space, and that changes in the amplitude and synchrony of population dynamics both					
24	increase extinction risk. Empirical evidence indicates that fishing amplifies the effects					
25	of environmental changes on the population variability, but no empirical study of					

terrestrial species has tested for amplified environmentally-induced fluctuations due tohunting.

4. Synthesis and applications. In terrestrial species, theoretical studies have evaluated how environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size are magnified by different harvest strategies, but there is now an urgent need for an empirical evaluation of this hypothesis. Future research is needed to explore how hunting and climate interact and to test whether hunting enhances environmentally induced fluctuations in population numbers of terrestrial species.

34

35 KEYWORDS

- 36 climate change, environmental factors, fishing, hunting, population dynamics, harvesting,
- 37 population size, environmentally induced fluctuations

39 1 | INTRODUCTION

40 Free-ranging populations live in a global environment that is rapidly changing. All 41 ecosystems, from marine to terrestrial, are impacted by global drivers of environmental 42 change. Climate variation is one of the most important drivers of annual fluctuations in 43 population size (Sæther 1997; Gaillard, Festa-Bianchet & Yoccoz 1998; Sæther et al. 2016). 44 Variability in climate may influence population size through changes in phenotypic traits such 45 as body condition or key demographic rates including fecundity or survival (Jenouvrier 2013; 46 Jenouvrier et al. 2018). For instance, climate variation impacts age of maturity, recruitment 47 rates and hence the overall population dynamics of large herbivores (Sæther 1997; Post et al. 48 1999). Climate effects can have strong consequences on population persistence, because 49 greater environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size will lead to higher extinction 50 risk (Lande, Engen & Saether 2003). Exploited natural populations are also affected by 51 commercial, recreational or subsistence harvest, with removal of individuals through fishing 52 or hunting. The magnitude of the fluctuations in population size can be large if declining 53 populations are overharvested or populations that start to rebound have low harvest rates 54 (Fryxell et al. 2010). To maintain sustainable harvest and to avoid extinction due to 55 overexploitation in the current context of global change, it is crucial to include the effects of 56 environmental trends and stochastic variation in the environment in the development of 57 sustainable harvest strategies (May et al. 1978; Lande, Engen & Saether 1995; Brander 2007). 58 The question of whether harvesting amplifies the effects of environmental changes on the 59 variability in population size over time and increases extinction risk (hereafter called 60 "harvest-interaction hypothesis") or alternatively, stabilizes population dynamics has been an 61 unsolved problem for some years. During the last fifteen years, the question of potential 62 interactions between climate and harvest has received growing interest in marine ecology, 63 mainly due to the collapse of commercially important fisheries (Hutchings & Myers 1994;

Myers, Hutchings & Barrowman 1997). Here, we assess whether harvesting can amplify 64 65 environmentally-induced population fluctuations and affect dynamics of exploited 66 populations in the changing environments in both marine and terrestrial ecosystems. 67 Our objective was to assess the ecological consequences of harvesting in a variable 68 environment by identifying the mechanisms causing fishing/hunting to increase 69 environmentally-induced population fluctuations in terms of changes in population size over 70 time. Here, we review theoretical and empirical studies based on observational or 71 experimental approaches that have evaluated the harvest-interaction hypothesis of higher 72 variability in exploited population sizes over time. Based on our findings, we propose new 73 avenues of research for understanding the effects of harvest on exploited populations of 74 marine and terrestrial organisms.

75

76

2 | HARVEST EFFECTS ON AGE/SIZE STRUCTURE

77 Harvesting can be proportional (or balanced) on all age/size classes in a population. 78 However, removal of individuals through harvesting is rarely random with respect to size or 79 demographic classes (Kuparinen & Festa-Bianchet 2017). If the oldest and largest individuals 80 are preferentially removed, or if harvesting pressure is high, the proportion of old individuals 81 in the populations decreases. In exploited populations of northern cod *Gadus morhua*, the age 82 structure contained 18 age classes in the 1960s, but the older fish disappeared and the age 83 structure was truncated to 9 age classes more recently (Drinkwater 2002). The northern cod is 84 not an exception: age truncation is pervasive in exploited populations where the proportion of 85 individuals in the oldest age classes drastically decreases at a severe rate (reviewed by Barnett 86 et al. 2017 for 63 exploited populations of fish). A growing body of empirical evidence shows 87 that fishing plays a key role in changes in size structure, and that climate changes such as 88 increasing water temperature contribute to a less extent to the observed changes in size

89 distribution (Tu, Chen & Hsieh 2018). Size-selective harvest is problematic because the oldest 90 individuals may have different fecundity and survival rates that buffer the population against 91 environmental changes. In fish, large/old females are generally more fertile than small/young 92 ones and spawn during different temporal and spatial windows (Berkeley, Chapman & Sogard 93 2004), hence spreading the risk of losing all the offspring when conditions are unfavorable. In 94 ungulates, selective harvest can also lead to age truncation with a larger proportion of 95 individuals in younger age-classes than populations not subject to hunting. Many studies have 96 documented that in long-lived species, young individuals exhibit more variable survival rates 97 over years than adults, adult survival being canalized and thus buffered against environmental 98 variation (Gaillard & Yoccoz 2003), a process called "demographic buffering" (Morris & 99 Doak 2004). Consequently, harvest-induced changes in age structure might increase 100 sensitivity of the population dynamics to climate variation if the remaining age classes are 101 more sensitive to climate variation. Conversely, one can expect dampened environmentally-102 induced population fluctuations if harvest targets young individuals that are the most sensitive 103 to climate variation. Harvest strategies are often designed to target specific demographic 104 classes. In many European ungulates, harvest quotas are designed to take more calves and 105 yearlings with low reproductive value (Apollonio, Andersen & Putman 2010). In fisheries 106 management, evidence is also accumulating that regulations stipulating a maximum size of 107 fish that can be harvested and thus favoring the removal of the youngest/smallest individuals 108 can reduce the negative effects of harvest (Birkeland & Dayton 2005). Selective harvest 109 directed towards some specific age classes implies that hunters can identify the age of the individuals. Group composition, phenotypic traits or coat color can be used to identify age 110 111 classes. For example, in wild boar (Sus scrofa), a social group is led by an old female, 112 followed by juveniles striped until 4 months of age and wearing a reddish coat until 6 months

of age (Gamelon *et al.* 2012), making age determination straightforward. In fish, gill nets are
commonly used tools to select and remove individuals of specific size-classes.

115 A growing body of empirical evidence shows that age truncation might enhance climate 116 sensitivity and generate fluctuations in population size over years (Anderson et al. 2008). In 117 2012, from long-term data of 6 fish species, Rouver et al. (2012) showed that high mortality 118 due to fishing is associated with a change in age structure that enhances the population 119 susceptibility to extrinsic environmental forcing (table 1). Five years later, Shelton and 120 Mangel (2011) confirmed through modeling and demographic data collected from the 121 literature including 45 fish species (table 1) that age-selective fishing increases the relative 122 contribution of recruits and thus amplifies the destabilizing effect of climate variation. This 123 finding has been further discussed by Sugihara et al. (2011). Recently, Cameron et al. (2016) 124 experimentally tested the hypothesis of enhanced fluctuations in population size when 125 adult/old individuals were removed using a terrestrial species, the soil mite (Sancassania 126 berlese). The experiment consisted of different harvesting treatments under different regimes 127 of environmental fluctuations. The authors showed that harvesting adults increased population 128 variability but only in variable environments. In a constant environment, harvest had no effect on the coefficient of variation (CV) of population sizes over time. The laboratory study 129 130 provided experimental evidence that harvesting directed towards adults can increase climatic 131 sensitivity of exploited populations (table 1). Harvest may also select for accelerated life 132 histories with higher fecundity, early maturity and short lifespan (Anderson et al. 2008; 133 Allendorf & Hard 2009; Kuparinen & Festa-Bianchet 2017). When the rate of turnover of 134 individuals is accelerated, a population is moved towards the fast end of the continuum of life 135 history variation (see Gaillard et al. 2016) and becomes more prone to greater fluctuations in 136 population sizes in response to variation in environmental conditions (Gamelon et al. 2014). 137 In particular, environmental fluctuations generate temporal autocorrelations among fecundity,

138 survival and other demographic rates that in turn influence both the mean and the variance of 139 population size (Engen et al. 2013). The effects of temporal autocorrelation on the 140 demography depend on life history variation: species with fast life histories are more sensitive 141 to autocorrelation than slow species with opposite characteristics (Paniw, Ozgul & Salguero-142 Gómez 2018). A shift towards younger age classes due to harvest that accelerates the pace of 143 life may thus also favour autocorrelation in population dynamics. Thus, it may be difficult to 144 disentangle whether changes in population size are caused by harvest or changes in climate 145 conditions, which in turn may increase the risk for overexploitation and population collapse.

146

147 **3 | HARVEST EFFECTS ON SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION**

148 The distributional range of some exploited species may shift in response to climate 149 change (Mysterud & Sæther 2010). For example, cod and pollock (*Gadus chalcogrammus*) 150 distributions have changed over the last years in the northern oceans (Hollowed & Sundby 151 2014). Northbound shifts in spatial distribution allow individuals to better cope with changing 152 environmental conditions. Harvesting per se may affect the spatial distribution of exploited 153 species (Takashina & Mougi 2015). For instance, in a network of patches with and without 154 harvest, individuals can move from patches without harvest to harvested patches, a process 155 called compensatory immigration (see Gervasi et al. 2015 for an example on wolverines Gulo 156 *Gulo*). Alternatively, when exposed to harvest, individuals might move to new habitats and 157 exploit any available niche to avoid mortality risk (see Lefebvre et al. 2017 for an example on 158 greater snow goose *Anser caerulescens*). Displacement can result in high spatial aggregation, 159 or enhanced spatial heterogeneity of animal distribution (see Ciannelli et al. 2013 for a review 160 on fish). Similarly, different age classes can inhabit contrasting habitats according to their 161 age-specific needs, mobile abilities and competitive advantages (Rijnsdorp & Pastoors 1995; 162 Nøttestad et al. 1999; Fauchald, Mauritzen & Gjøsaeter 2006; Breau, Cunjak & Bremset

163 2007), resulting in homogeneous populations in terms of spatial structure capable of 164 occupying various habitats. Harvest-induced changes in (st)age structure can also alter spatial 165 structure and favour heterogeneity (Kuo et al. 2016). Empirical work has shown that such a 166 constriction of geographic distributions associated with harvest pressure can weaken the 167 populations' ability to buffer the effects of unfavorable environmental conditions (Planque et 168 al. 2010). Populations become more vulnerable to climate variability, and fluctuations in 169 population numbers and risk of local extinction increase (Hsieh et al. 2008; Kuo et al. 2016). 170 If the goal of managers is to decrease population sizes, for instance to control overabundant 171 populations of geese, increasing vulnerability to climate variability and local extinction risks 172 might be a desirable outcome. Similarly, migration is a simple way to buffer climate-driven 173 variations in terrestrial and marine ecosystems. Seasonal migration is a widespread 174 phenomenon in vertebrates, being observed in fish, birds and mammals (Milner-Gulland, 175 Fryxell & Sinclair 2011). Migration patterns can be culturally transmitted through social 176 learning in both marine (Corten 2002) and terrestrial environments (Jesmer et al. 2018). 177 Harvest of mature individuals may lead to a loss of transmission of migration knowledge to 178 younger individuals, alter migration patterns and lead to greater sensitivity to climate change 179 (Fryxell et al. 2010). Hence, harvesting can affect the spatial distribution of exploited species 180 and shifts in distribution can be unfavourable when facing a changing climate (see Hsieh et al. 181 2010 for a review in fisheries).

Moving from the effects of harvesting on the spatial structure of a single population to populations structured in space, populations separated in space that exhibit correlated fluctuations in population size over years are theoretically more prone to extinction because local patches can go extinct without being rescued by immigration from other populations (Heino *et al.* 1997; Earn, Levin & Rohani 2000; Engen 2007). One of the key insights that has been derived from spatial population models is that increased synchrony in population

188 fluctuations over larger areas tends to reduce population size and increase the risk of 189 extinction (Foley 1994; Engen, Lande & Saether 2002). Recent theoretical analyses have 190 shown that proportional harvest itself, where the annual yield is proportional to the population 191 size, tends to induce spatial synchrony (Engen 2017; Engen, Cao & Sæther 2018). Greater 192 synchrony implies that spatially variation in harvest strategies including protected areas could 193 be a way of avoiding this effect. In fact, theoretical results have shown that adjusting the 194 harvesting rate according to local population fluctuations can result in reduced spatial scaling 195 of the population synchrony. Spatio-temporal changes in the covariation of key environmental 196 variables are expected due to changes in climate, which may provide a mechanism to 197 counteract climate-induced changes in the dynamics of exploited species. For example, if the 198 spatial scaling of the environmental noise is altered because of alteration of the climate 199 regime, the proportion of juveniles included in the harvest will influence the spatial scaling of 200 the distribution of abundance (Engen, Lee & Sæther 2018). Growing empirical evidence in 201 fisheries indicates that synchronized harvest at a large spatial scale plays a key role in 202 affecting the degree of spatial synchrony in population fluctuations, providing support for 203 theoretical expectations. For instance, Frank et al. (2016) showed that the size of 22 204 populations of cod fluctuate synchronously in North Atlantic not solely due to climate but 205 also due to harvesting.

206

207 4 | HARVEST EFFECTS ON DENSITY REGULATION

Fluctuations in size of natural populations are driven by climate effects (Sæther *et al.* 209 2000; Coulson *et al.* 2001; Stenseth *et al.* 2003; Berryman & Lima 2006) and also by density 210 dependence, involving a negative feedback of the population density on the population 211 growth rate (Royama 1992; Turchin 1995). Mechanisms can vary but include intraspecific 212 competition, social behavior and other factors. Importantly, climate effects can interact with

213 density-dependent regulation of population dynamics (Turchin 1995; Stenseth et al. 2003; 214 Barbraud & Weimerskirch 2003; Gamelon et al. 2017; Hansen et al. 2019). For example, 215 effects of climate on demographic rates and population size can be stronger at high density 216 than at low density because when climate conditions are bad, food resources are more limiting 217 if the population is at or above carrying capacity (see Gamelon *et al.* 2017 for a case study on 218 dippers Cinclus cinclus; see Hansen et al. 2019 for a case study on Svalbard reindeer Rangifer 219 *tarandus*). If the population is above carrying capacity, the remaining individuals in the 220 population after harvest might exhibit improved fecundity and survival via *compensatory* 221 density dependence (Bonenfant et al. 2009), being for instance more likely to colonize 222 habitats of better quality instead of occupying less optimal places (MacCall 1990; Marshall & 223 Frank 1995). In contrast, reduced population sizes can be associated with lower demographic 224 performance for the remaining individuals via Allee effects such as higher risk of starvation due to stress (reviewed by Courchamp, Berec & Gascoigne 2008; Péron 2013). The interplay 225 226 between climate and density dependence (Gamelon et al. 2017; Hansen et al. 2019), and 227 between harvest and density dependence (Boyce, Sinclair & White 1999; Sandercock et al. 228 2011) have been well studied, but an integrative approach to the combined effects of 229 harvesting and climate on density-regulated populations remains lacking. An integrated 230 approach is strongly needed because complex interactions between harvest, density 231 dependence and climate variation might arise. For instance, harvest might influence the way 232 in which a population responds to density dependence, make it more or less vulnerable to 233 climate variation, and thus might ultimately amplify or dampen fluctuations in population 234 sizes over time.

235

236 5 | EVIDENCE FOR HARVEST EFFECTS ON POPULATION DYNAMICS

237 Empirical evidence is accumulating in marine species of fish that harvesting might 238 magnify environmentally-induced fluctuations in population sizes. In a pioneering study, 239 Hsieh et al. (2006) compared the temporal variability of 13 exploited vs. 16 unexploited fish 240 populations living in a common environment and subject to the same environmental 241 fluctuations. From long-term data, they found that the CV of annual larval abundance was 242 lower in unexploited than in exploited populations and concluded that the addition of 243 mortality from fishing resulted in increased temporal variability of all species subject to 244 variable environments (table 1). In terrestrial species, some studies have shown that specific 245 harvesting strategies may increase fluctuations in population size and favor cyclicity, 246 accentuating the risk of population collapse when environmental conditions are harsh (Fryxell 247 et al. 2010). In a case study of black grouse (Tetrao tetrix), Jonzen et al. (2003) demonstrated 248 that harvesting can cause quasi-cyclic fluctuations when the harvest fraction was time-249 dependent, thus reducing the ability of the population to recover when environmental 250 conditions are unsuitable. Similarly, Bunnefeld et al. (2011) used simulations to explore the 251 effects of selective harvest by sex and age on population cycles in red grouse (Lagopus 252 *lagopus*). In general, a *threshold harvest strategy* that involves immediate removal of all 253 individuals above a critical population size generates a large variance in annual yield (Sæther, 254 Engen & Solberg 2001; Sæther et al. 2005) and large fluctuations in age distributions. Engen 255 et al. (1997) therefore proposed a *proportional threshold strategy*, in which only a fraction of 256 the excess individuals above a lower critical threshold is removed. Proportional threshold 257 involves a reduction of the threshold when harvest is allowed compared to a pure threshold 258 strategy. The modified strategy allows for an increase in the number of years harvesting is 259 permitted, which in turn generates less variability in the annual yield (Sæther, Engen & 260 Solberg 2001; Aanes et al. 2002; Sæther et al. 2005). Thus, the strategy should make it easier

to separate out climate-induced influences on the population dynamics and hence adjust theharvest tactics accordingly.

263

264 6 | EVIDENCE FOR HARVEST EFFECTS ON COMMUNITY DYNAMICS IN 265 SPACE

266 Species live in communities with other species and can compete for limiting resources. 267 The harvest of one species may induce cascading effects on other species because it may 268 affect interspecific interactions and hence ecosystem processes leading to alternative stable 269 states (Barkai & McQuaid 1988; Kirby, Beaugrand & Lindley 2009; Selkoe et al. 2015; 270 Gårdmark et al. 2015). Surprisingly, a topic that to a large extent has been ignored is how 271 harvesting affects the fluctuations of population size of interacting species. Jarillo et al. 272 (2018) showed that proportional harvesting, in which the catches at each location are 273 proportional to the population size, tends to synchronize fluctuations in population size of 274 competing harvested species in space, and thus ultimately increases the probability of 275 extinction. However, if other harvesting strategies are applied, such as *fixed quota* strategy for 276 catches more concentrated in areas with high population sizes, the outcome can be opposite: 277 harvesting can reduce the synchrony of the species (Engen, Cao & Sæther 2018) and thus the 278 risk of local extinction. However, fixed quota harvest strategies are generally not sustainable 279 on the long-run (Lande, Engen & Saether 1995; Lande, Sæther & Engen 1997). Thus, 280 different harvesting strategies can have contrasting effects on vulnerability of interacting 281 species over large geographical areas to changes in climate and cause spatial decoupling of 282 ecosystem structures. Interactions imply that harvest of a given species may affect the 283 dynamics of entire food webs, also affecting non-harvested species. The removal of species at 284 low-trophic levels affects the dynamics of upper-trophic levels and thus the entire community 285 (Smith et al. 2011). Similarly, when apex predators are removed from the ecosystem or when

286 their dynamics are modified by trophic down-grading, the entire ecosystem can be 287 destabilized through trophic cascades, involving changes in the abundance of multiple 288 interacting species subsequently to the change in abundance of a single species (McCann 289 2012; Terborgh 2015). Cascades can modify the response of the entire community to 290 changing climate conditions (Estes et al. 2011). For instance, the removal of carnivores might 291 lead to high abundance in herbivores as ungulates, higher herbivory and lower frequency and 292 intensity of wildfires (Estes et al. 2011). In marine systems, overfishing of large-bodied fish 293 might reduce herbivory, increase levels of disease and prevent the recovery of corals after 294 cyclones (Hughes et al. 2003). In this later example, interactions among species are essential 295 to the resilience of the community (Loreau 2010), and when some species decline or are 296 removed from the system, interactions are broken and the ability of the entire community to 297 recover from disturbances such as changing climate conditions decreases. Understanding such 298 interactions has received an increasing interest in the recent years and multi-species 299 interactions are now included in models for sustainable harvest of exploited populations 300 (Leslie & McLeod 2007; Persson, Van Leeuwen & De Roos 2014). Ecosystem-based 301 approaches are crucial to gain a comprehensive understanding of harvest-induced effects at 302 the community level.

303

304 7 | CONCLUSIONS

305 Does harvesting increase environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size? 306 Among empiricists, this question has mainly been addressed by marine ecologists and 307 evidence for the "harvest-interaction hypothesis" is accumulating (table 1). The combined 308 effect of fishing and climate on population fluctuations in fish stocks has received increasing 309 interest in the recent years (Lindegren *et al.* 2013; Frank *et al.* 2016) and both theoretical and 310 empirical works have provided evidence that specific types of harvesting strategies might

311 increase environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size and thus extinction risk. In 312 terrestrial environments, studies evaluating the "harvest-interaction hypothesis" have mainly 313 developed theoretical approaches to evaluate how contrasting harvesting strategies might 314 enhance or reduce environmentally-induced fluctuations in population size. Surprisingly, 315 empirical evidence is lacking. Few field experiments have been conducted and little is known 316 on the combined effect of hunting and climate on population fluctuations in terrestrial species. 317 Available studies have measured the relative contributions of climate, density dependence and 318 harvesting on the population growth rate fluctuations (Koons et al. 2015 for a study on 319 American bison Bison bison; López-Montoya, Moro & Azorit 2017 for a study on red Cervus 320 *elaphus hispanicus* and fallow deer *Dama dama*) whereas other studies have evaluated the 321 effect of different harvesting strategies on population dynamics (McGowan 1975; Mentis & 322 Bigalke 1985; Connelly et al. 2003; Gervasi et al. 2015). Other studies have compared the 323 dynamics of harvested vs. natural populations in similar environments (Palmer & Bennett Jr 324 1963; Pedersen et al. 2004). Tests of how harvesting enhances or dampens environmentally-325 induced fluctuations in population sizes by comparing the dynamics of harvested vs. natural 326 populations in similar environments have not yet been conducted. We strongly encourage 327 analyses of this question on a large range of species with contrasting life histories (slow 328 versus fast species), with contrasting abilities to face environmental fluctuations (mobile 329 versus resident species, ectotherms versus endotherms), at different trophic levels (carnivores 330 versus herbivores) by using some of the existing long-term field studies of exploited 331 populations. Long-term individual-based studies with capture-mark-recapture data and 332 population counts are available for many exploited bird and mammalian populations. 333 Analyses of time series of classified counts and harvest data can be complicated by hunting 334 regulations and hunter preferences and also by covariation between abundance and 335 regulations. As stated by Festa-Bianchet et al. (2017) "It remains unclear, therefore, whether

the response of heavily hunted populations to changes in density, weather, and resource availability differs from that documented by long-term studies of unhunted populations." A promising avenue of research is to explore how hunting and climate interact and evaluate whether, like observed in marine species, hunting enhances environmentally-induced fluctuations in population sizes for terrestrial exploited species. Both the theory and the data are now available to address this question of major importance in ecology, management and conservation in exploited avian and mammalian populations.

343

344 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

345 We thank Marco Festa-Bianchet, John Fryxell, one anonymous referee and the Editor for their

helpful comments on previous drafts of this paper. Our study was funded by the Research

Council of Norway as part of the Centre of Excellence-grant to CBD (SFF-III 223257/F50)

and to SUSTAIN (244647/E10).

349

350 AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

M.G. led the writing of the manuscript. B.K.S. and B.-E.S contributed to the drafts and gavefinal approval for publication.

353

354 DATA ACCESSIBILITY

355 Data have not been archived because this article does not contain data.

356 Table 1 – Case studies with evidence that harvesting enhances environmentally-induced fluctuations in population sizes.

Species	Environment	Approach	Evidence for effects of harvest on greater environmentally- induced fluctuations in population sizes	Source
29 species	Marine	Observational	"This well-documented mechanism [age truncation] suggests how fishing can make populations more susceptible to extrinsic environmental forcing."	Hsieh et al. 2006
6 species	Marine	Observational	"Our results demonstrate that populations exhibiting a truncation of their age structure were associated with shorter-term fluctuations in time series, which suggests an increased sensitivity to the short-term changes in the environment."	Rouyer et al. 2012
45 species	Marine	Observational	"In a variable environment, the addition of mortality from fishing leads to increased temporal variability for all species examined."	Shelton and Mangel 2011
1 species of acarid mite	Terrestrial	Experimental	"Only when environmental variation and harvesting were combined did we see strong evidence of magnified fluctuations in abundance."	Cameron et al. 2016

357 **REFERENCES**

- 358
- Aanes, S., Engen, S., Sæther, B.-E., Willebrand, T. & Marcström, V. (2002) Sustainable
 harvesting strategies of illow Ptarmigan in a fluctuating environment. *Ecological Applications*, 12, 281–290.
- Allendorf, F.W. & Hard, J.J. (2009) Human-induced evolution caused by unnatural selection
 through harvest of wild animals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
 106, 9987–9994.
- Anderson, C.N.K., Hsieh, C., Sandin, S.A., Hewitt, R., Hollowed, A., Beddington, J., May,
 R.M. & Sugihara, G. (2008) Why fishing magnifies fluctuations in fish abundance.
 Nature, 452, 835–839.
- Apollonio, M., Andersen, R. & Putman, R. (2010) European ungulates and their management
 21st century
- Barbraud, C. & Weimerskirch, H. (2003) Climate and density shape population dynamics of a
 marine top predator. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 270,
 2111–2116.
- Barkai, A. & McQuaid, C. (1988) Predator-Prey Role Reversal in a Marine Benthic
 Ecosystem. *Science*, 242, 62–64.
- Barnett, L.A.K., Branch, T.A., Ranasinghe, R.A. & Essington, T.E. (2017) Old-growth fishes
 become scarce under fishing. *Current Biology*, 27, 2843-2848.e2.
- Berkeley, S.A., Chapman, C. & Sogard, S.M. (2004) Maternal age as a determinant of larval
 growth and survival in a marine fish, *Sebastes melanops. Ecology*, **85**, 1258–1264.
- Berryman, A. & Lima, M. (2006) Deciphering the effects of climate on animal populations:
 diagnostic analysis provides new interpretation of Soay sheep dynamics. *The American Naturalist*, 168, 784–795.
- Birkeland, C. & Dayton, P.K. (2005) The importance in fishery management of leaving the
 big ones. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20, 356–358.
- Bonenfant, C., Gaillard, J., Coulson, T., Festa-Bianchet, M., Loison, A., Garel, M., Loe, L.E.,
 Blanchard, P., Pettorelli, N., Owen-Smith, N., Du Toit, J. & Duncan, P. (2009)
 Empirical evidence of density-dependence in populations of large herbivores. *Advances in Ecological Research* (ed H. Caswell), pp. 313–357. Academic Press.
- Boyce, M.S., Sinclair, A.R.E. & White, G.C. (1999) Seasonal compensation of predation and harvesting. *Oikos*, **87**, 419–426.
- Brander, K.M. (2007) Global fish production and climate change. *Proceedings of the National* Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, **104**, 19709–19714.
- Breau, C., Cunjak, R.A. & Bremset, G. (2007) Age-specific aggregation of wild juvenile
 Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* at cool water sources during high temperature events.
 Journal of Fish Biology, **71**, 1179–1191.
- Bunnefeld, N., Reuman, D.C., Baines, D. & Milner-Gulland, E.J. (2011) Impact of
 unintentional selective harvesting on the population dynamics of red grouse. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80, 1258–1268.
- Cameron, T.C., O'Sullivan, D., Reynolds, A., Hicks, J.P., Piertney, S.B. & Benton, T.G.
 (2016) Harvested populations are more variable only in more variable environments.
 Ecology and Evolution, 6, 4179–4191.
- 401 Ciannelli, L., Fisher, J.A.D., Skern-Mauritzen, M., Hunsicker, M.E., Hidalgo, M., Frank, K.T.
 402 & Bailey, K.M. (2013) Theory, consequences and evidence of eroding population
 403 spatial structure in harvested marine fishes: a review. *Marine Ecology Progress*404 Series, 480, 227–243.

- Connelly, J.W., Reese, K.P., Garton, E.O. & Commons-Kemner, M.L. (2003) Response of
 greater sage-grouse Centrocercus urophasianus populations to different levels of
 exploitation in Idaho, USA. *Wildlife Biology*, 9, 335–340.
- 408 Corten, A. (2002) The role of conservatism in herring migrations. *Reviews in Fish Biology* 409 *and Fisheries*, 11, 339–361.
- Coulson, T., Catchpole, E.A., Albon, S.D., Morgan, B.J.T., Pemberton, J.M., Clutton-Brock,
 T.H., Crawley, M.J. & Grenfell, B.T. (2001) Age, sex, density, winter weather, and
 population crashes in Soay sheep. *Science*, **292**, 1528–1531.
- 413 Courchamp, F., Berec, L. & Gascoigne, J. (2008) *Allee Effects in Ecology and Conservation*.
 414 OUP Oxford, Oxford ; New York.
- Drinkwater, K. (2002) A review of the role of climate variability in the decline of
 northern cod. *Fisheries in a changing climate*, American Fisheries Society, pp. 113–
 129. N.A. McGinn, Bethesda, Maryland.
- 418 Earn, D.J.D., Levin, S.A. & Rohani, P. (2000) Coherence and Conservation. *Science*, 290, 1360–1364.
- 420 Engen, S. (2007) Stochastic growth and extinction in a spatial geometric Brownian population
 421 model with migration and correlated noise. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 209, 240–255.
- 422 Engen, S. (2017) Spatial synchrony and harvesting in fluctuating populations: relaxing the
 423 small noise assumption. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **116**, 18–26.
- 424 Engen, S., Cao, F.J. & Sæther, B.-E. (2018) The effect of harvesting on the spatial synchrony
 425 of population fluctuations. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **123**, 28–34.
- Engen, S., Lande, R. & Sæther, B.-E. (1997) Harvesting strategies for fluctuating populations
 based on uncertain population estimates. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 186, 201–
 212.
- 429 Engen, S., Lande, R. & Saether, B.-E. (2002) The spatial scale of population fluctuations and
 430 quasi-extinction risk. *The American Naturalist*, 160, 439–451.
- 431 Engen, S., Lee, A.M. & Sæther, B.-E. (2018) Spatial distribution and optimal harvesting of an
 432 age-structured population in a fluctuating environment. *Mathematical Biosciences*,
 433 296, 36–44.
- Engen, S., Sæther, B.-E., Armitage, K.B., Blumstein, D.T., Clutton-Brock, T.H., Dobson,
 F.S., Festa-Bianchet, M., Oli, M.K. & Ozgul, A. (2013) Estimating the effect of
 temporally autocorrelated environments on the demography of density-independent
 age-structured populations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 573–584.
- Estes, J.A., Terborgh, J., Brashares, J.S., Power, M.E., Berger, J., Bond, W.J., Carpenter,
 S.R., Essington, T.E., Holt, R.D., Jackson, J.B.C., Marquis, R.J., Oksanen, L.,
 Oksanen, T., Paine, R.T., Pikitch, E.K., Ripple, W.J., Sandin, S.A., Scheffer, M.,
 Schoener, T.W., Shurin, J.B., Sinclair, A.R.E., Soulé, M.E., Virtanen, R. & Wardle,
- 442 D.A. (2011) Trophic downgrading of planet Earth. *Science*, **333**, 301–306.
- Fauchald, P., Mauritzen, M. & Gjøsaeter, H. (2006) Density-dependent migratory waves in
 the marine pelagic ecosystem. *Ecology*, 87, 2915–2924.
- Festa-Bianchet, M., Douhard, M., Gaillard, J.-M. & Pelletier, F. (2017) Successes and
 challenges of long-term field studies of marked ungulates. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 98,
 612–620.
- Foley, P. (1994) Predicting Extinction Times from Environmental Stochasticity and Carrying
 Capacity. *Conservation Biology*, 8, 124–137.
- Frank, K.T., Petrie, B., Leggett, W.C. & Boyce, D.G. (2016) Large scale, synchronous
 variability of marine fish populations driven by commercial exploitation. *Proceedings*of the National Academy of Sciences, 113, 8248–8253.

- Fryxell, J.M., Packer, C., McCann, K., Solberg, E.J. & Sæther, B.-E. (2010) Resource
 management cycles and the sustainability of harvested wildlife populations. *Science*, **328**, 903–906.
- Gaillard, J.-M., Festa-Bianchet, M. & Yoccoz, N.G. (1998) Population dynamics of large
 herbivores: variable recruitment with constant adult survival. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 13, 58–63.
- Gaillard, J.-M., Lemaître, J.-F., Berger, V., Bonenfant, C., Devillard, S., Douhard, M.,
 Gamelon, M., Plard, F. & Lebreton, J.-D. (2016) Axes of variation in life histories. *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Biology*, Elsevier, pp. 312–323. R. M. Kliman, Oxford,
 UK.
- Gaillard, J.-M. & Yoccoz, N.G. (2003) Temporal variation in survival of mammals: a case of
 environmental canalization? *Ecology*, 84, 3294–3306.
- Gamelon, M., Gaillard, J.-M., Servanty, S., Gimenez, O., Toïgo, C., Baubet, E., Klein, F. &
 Lebreton, J.-D. (2012) Making use of harvest information to examine alternative
 management scenarios: a body weight-structured model for wild boar. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 49, 833–841.
- Gamelon, M., Gimenez, O., Baubet, E., Coulson, T., Tuljapurkar, S. & Gaillard, J.-M. (2014)
 Influence of life-history tactics on transient dynamics: a comparative analysis across
 mammalian populations. *The American Naturalist*, **184**, 673–683.
- Gamelon, M., Grøtan, V., Nilsson, A.L.K., Engen, S., Hurrell, J.W., Jerstad, K., Phillips,
 A.S., Røstad, O.W., Slagsvold, T., Walseng, B., Stenseth, N.C. & Sæther, B.-E.
 (2017) Interactions between demography and environmental effects are important
 determinants of population dynamics. *Science Advances*, 3, e1602298.
- 476 Gårdmark, A., Casini, M., Huss, M., Leeuwen, A. van, Hjelm, J., Persson, L. & de Roos,
 477 A.M. (2015) Regime shifts in exploited marine food webs: detecting mechanisms
 478 underlying alternative stable states using size-structured community dynamics theory.
 479 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, **370**, 20130262.
- 480 Gervasi, V., Brøseth, H., Nilsen, E.B., Ellegren, H., Flagstad, Ø. & Linnell, J.D.C. (2015)
 481 Compensatory immigration counteracts contrasting conservation strategies of
 482 wolverines (*Gulo gulo*) within Scandinavia. *Biological Conservation*, **191**, 632–639.
- Hansen, B.B., Gamelon, M., Albon, S.D., Lee, A.M., Stien, A., Irvine, R.J., Sæther, B.-E.,
 Loe, L.E., Ropstad, E., Veiberg, V. & Grøtan, V. (2019) More frequent extreme
 climate events stabilize reindeer population dynamics. *Nature Communications*,
 10:1616.
- Heino, M., Kaitala, V., Ranta, E. & Lindström, J. (1997) Synchronous dynamics and rates of
 extinction in spatially structured populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 264, 481–486.
- Hollowed, A.B. & Sundby, S. (2014) Change is coming to the northern oceans. *Science*, 344, 1084–1085.
- Hsieh, C., Reiss, C.S., Hewitt, R.P. & Sugihara, G. (2008) Spatial analysis shows that fishing
 enhances the climatic sensitivity of marine fishes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 65, 947–961.
- Hsieh, C., Reiss, C.S., Hunter, J.R., Beddington, J.R., May, R.M. & Sugihara, G. (2006)
 Fishing elevates variability in the abundance of exploited species. *Nature*, 443, 859–
 862.
- Hsieh, C., Yamauchi, A., Nakazawa, T. & Wang, W.-F. (2010) Fishing effects on age and
 spatial structures undermine population stability of fishes. *Aquatic Sciences*, **72**, 165–
 178.
- Hughes, T.P., Baird, A.H., Bellwood, D.R., Card, M., Connolly, S.R., Folke, C., Grosberg,
 R., Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Jackson, J.B.C., Kleypas, J., Lough, J.M., Marshall, P.,

- 503Nyström, M., Palumbi, S.R., Pandolfi, J.M., Rosen, B. & Roughgarden, J. (2003)504Climate Change, Human Impacts, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs. Science, 301,505929–933.
- Hutchings, J.A. & Myers, R.A. (1994) What can be learned from the collapse of a renewable
 resource? Atlantic cod, *Gadus morhua*, of Newfoundland and Labrador. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 51, 2126–2146.
- Jarillo, J., Sæther, B.-E., Engen, S. & Cao, F.J. (2018) Spatial scales of population synchrony
 of two competing species: effects of harvesting and strength of competition. *Oikos*,
 127, 1459–1470.
- Jenouvrier, S. (2013) Impacts of climate change on avian populations. *Global Change Biology*, 19, 2036–2057.
- Jenouvrier, S., Desprez, M., Fay, R., Barbraud, C., Weimerskirch, H., Delord, K. & Caswell,
 H. (2018) Climate change and functional traits affect population dynamics of a longlived seabird. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 87, 906–920.
- Jesmer, B.R., Merkle, J.A., Goheen, J.R., Aikens, E.O., Beck, J.L., Courtemanch, A.B.,
 Hurley, M.A., McWhirter, D.E., Miyasaki, H.M., Monteith, K.L. & Kauffman, M.J.
 (2018) Is ungulate migration culturally transmitted? Evidence of social learning from
 translocated animals. *Science*, **361**, 1023–1025.
- Jonzen, N., Ranta, E., Lundberg, P., Kaitala, V. & Lindén, H. (2003) Harvesting-induced
 population fluctuations? *Wildlife Biology*, 9, 59–65.
- Kirby, R.R., Beaugrand, G. & Lindley, J.A. (2009) Synergistic Effects of Climate and Fishing
 in a Marine Ecosystem. *Ecosystems*, 12, 548–561.
- Koons, D.N., Colchero, F., Hersey, K. & Gimenez, O. (2015) Disentangling the effects of
 climate, density dependence, and harvest on an iconic large herbivore's population
 dynamics. *Ecological Applications*, 25, 956–967.
- Kuo, T.-C., Mandal, S., Yamauchi, A. & Hsieh, C. (2016) Life history traits and exploitation
 affect the spatial mean-variance relationship in fish abundance. *Ecology*, 97, 1251–
 1259.
- Kuparinen, A. & Festa-Bianchet, M. (2017) Harvest-induced evolution: insights from aquatic
 and terrestrial systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **372**, 20160036.
- Lande, R., Engen, S. & Saether, B.-E. (1995) Optimal harvesting of fluctuating populations
 with a risk of extinction. *The American Naturalist*, 145, 728–745.
- Lande, R., Engen, S. & Saether, B.-E. (2003) Stochastic Population Dynamics in Ecology and
 Conservation. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- Lande, R., Sæther, B.-E. & Engen, S. (1997) Threshold Harvesting for Sustainability of
 Fluctuating Resources. *Ecology*, 78, 1341–1350.
- Lefebvre, J., Gauthier, G., Giroux, J.-F., Reed, A., Reed, E.T. & Bélanger, L. (2017) The
 greater snow goose Anser caerulescens atlanticus: Managing an overabundant
 population. *Ambio*, 46, 262–274.
- Leslie, H.M. & McLeod, K.L. (2007) Confronting the challenges of implementing marine
 ecosystem-based management. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 5, 540–
 548.
- Lindegren, M., Checkley, D.M., Rouyer, T., MacCall, A.D. & Stenseth, N.C. (2013) Climate,
 fishing, and fluctuations of sardine and anchovy in the California Current. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110**, 13672–13677.
- 549 López-Montoya, A.J., Moro, J.G.M. & Azorit, C. (2017) Drivers of population growth
 550 variations for two Mediterranean sympatric Deer. *Ecological Research*, 32, 703–712.
- Loreau, M. (2010) From Populations to Ecosystems: Theoretical Foundations for a New
 Ecological Synthesis (MPB-46). Princeton University Press.

- MacCall, A.D. (1990) *Dynamic Geography of Marine Fish Populations*. University of
 Washington Press, Seattle, Washington.
- Marshall, C.T. & Frank, K.T. (1995) Density-dependent habitat selection by juvenile haddock
 (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) on the southwestern Scotian Shelf. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 52, 1007–1017.
- May, R.M., Beddington, J.R., Horwood, J.W. & Shepherd, J.G. (1978) Exploiting natural
 populations in an uncertain world. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 42, 219–252.
- 560 McCann, K. (2012) Food Webs. Princeton University Press.
- McGowan, J.D. (1975) Effect of autumn and spring hunting on ptarmigan population trends.
 The Journal of Wildlife Management, **39**, 491–495.
- Mentis, R.C. & Bigalke, M.T.&. (1985) Experimental hunting of grassland francolins in the
 Natal Drakensberg. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research*, 15, 12–16.
- Milner-Gulland, E.J., Fryxell, J.M. & Sinclair, A.R.E. (2011) *Animal Migration: A Synthesis*.
 Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York.
- Morris, W.F. & Doak, D.F. (2004) Buffering of life histories against environmental
 stochasticity: accounting for a spurious correlation between the variabilities of vital
 rates and their contributions to fitness. *The American Naturalist*, **163**, 579–590.
- Myers, R.A., Hutchings, J.A. & Barrowman, N.J. (1997) Why do fish stocks collapse? The example of cod in Atlantic Canada. *Ecological Applications*, 7, 91–106.
- 572 Mysterud, A. & Sæther, B.E. (2010) Climate change and implications for the future
 573 distribution and management of ungulates in Europe. Ungulate management in
 574 Europe: problems and practices, 349–375.
- Nøttestad, L., Holst, J.C., Giske, J. & Huse, G. (1999) A length-based hypothesis for feeding
 migrations in pelagic fish. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 56,
 26–34.
- Palmer, W.L. & Bennett Jr, C.L. (1963) Relation of season length to hunting harvest of ruffed
 grouse. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 634–639.
- Paniw, M., Ozgul, A. & Salguero-Gómez, R. (2018) Interactive life-history traits predict
 sensitivity of plants and animals to temporal autocorrelation. *Ecology Letters*, 21,
 275–286.
- Pedersen, H.C., Steen, H., Kastdalen, L., Brøseth, H., Ims, R.A., Svendsen, W. & Yoccoz,
 N.G. (2004) Weak compensation of harvest despite strong density-dependent growth
 in willow ptarmigan. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, 271, 381–385.
- 586 Péron, G. (2013) Compensation and additivity of anthropogenic mortality: life-history effects
 587 and review of methods. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 82, 408–417.
- Persson, L., Van Leeuwen, A. & De Roos, A.M. (2014) The ecological foundation for
 ecosystem-based management of fisheries: mechanistic linkages between the
 individual-, population-, and community-level dynamics. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 2268–2280.
- Planque, B., Fromentin, J.-M., Cury, P., Drinkwater, K.F., Jennings, S., Perry, R.I. & Kifani,
 S. (2010) How does fishing alter marine populations and ecosystems sensitivity to
 climate? *Journal of Marine Systems*, **79**, 403–417.
- Post, E., Langvatn, R., Forchhammer, M.C. & Stenseth, N.Chr. (1999) Environmental
 variation shapes sexual dimorphism in red deer. *Proceedings of the National Academy*of Sciences of the United States of America, 96, 4467–4471.
- Rijnsdorp, A.D. & Pastoors, M.A. (1995) Modelling the spatial dynamics and fisheries of
 North Sea plaice (*Pleuronectes platessa L.*) based on tagging data. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 52, 963–980.

- Rouyer, T., Sadykov, A., Ohlberger, J. & Stenseth, N.C. (2012) Does increasing mortality
 change the response of fish populations to environmental fluctuations? *Ecology Letters*, 15, 658–665.
- 604 Royama, T. (1992) Analytical Population Dynamics. Springer Science & Business Media.
- 605 Sæther, B.-E. (1997) Environmental stochasticity and population dynamics of large
 606 herbivores: a search for mechanisms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **12**, 143–149.
- 607 Sæther, B.-E., Engen, S., Persson, J., Brøseth, H., Landa, A. & Willebrand, T. (2005)
- Management strategies for the wolverine in Scandinavia. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, **69**, 1001–1014.
- 610 Sæther, B.-E., Engen, S. & Solberg, E.J. (2001) Optimal harvest of age-structured populations
 611 of moose Alces alces in a fluctuating environment. *Wildlife Biology*, 7, 171–179.
- Sæther, B.-E., Grøtan, V., Engen, S., Coulson, T., Grant, P.R., Visser, M.E., Brommer, J.E.,
 Grant, B.R., Gustafsson, L., Hatchwell, B.J., Jerstad, K., Karell, P., Pietiäinen, H.,
 Roulin, A., Røstad, O.W. & Weimerskirch, H. (2016) Demographic routes to
 variability and regulation in bird populations. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12001.
- 616 Sæther, B.-E., Tufto, J., Engen, S., Jerstad, K., Røstad, O.W. & Skåtan, J.E. (2000)
 617 Population dynamical consequences of climate change for a small temperate songbird.
 618 Science, 287, 854–856.
- 619 Sandercock, B.K., Nilsen, E.B., Brøseth, H. & Pedersen, H.C. (2011) Is hunting mortality
 620 additive or compensatory to natural mortality? Effects of experimental harvest on the
 621 survival and cause-specific mortality of willow ptarmigan. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
 622 80, 244–258.
- Selkoe, K.A., Blenckner, T., Caldwell, M.R., Crowder, L.B., Erickson, A.L., Essington, T.E.,
 Estes, J.A., Fujita, R.M., Halpern, B.S., Hunsicker, M.E., Kappel, C.V., Kelly, R.P.,
 Kittinger, J.N., Levin, P.S., Lynham, J.M., Mach, M.E., Martone, R.G., Mease, L.A.,
 Salomon, A.K., Samhouri, J.F., Scarborough, C., Stier, A.C., White, C. & Zedler, J.
 (2015) Principles for managing marine ecosystems prone to tipping points. *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability*, 1, 1–18.
- Shelton, A.O. & Mangel, M. (2011) Fluctuations of fish populations and the magnifying
 effects of fishing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **108**, 7075–7080.
- Smith, A.D.M., Brown, C.J., Bulman, C.M., Fulton, E.A., Johnson, P., Kaplan, I.C., LozanoMontes, H., Mackinson, S., Marzloff, M., Shannon, L.J., Shin, Y.-J. & Tam, J. (2011)
 Impacts of Fishing Low–Trophic Level Species on Marine Ecosystems. *Science*, 333, 1147–1150.
- Stenseth, N.C., Viljugrein, H., Saitoh, T., Hansen, T.F., Kittilsen, M.O., Bølviken, E. &
 Glöckner, F. (2003) Seasonality, density dependence, and population cycles in
 Hokkaido voles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 11478–
 11483.
- Sugihara, G., Beddington, J., Hsieh, C., Deyle, E., Fogarty, M., Glaser, S.M., Hewitt, R.,
 Hollowed, A., May, R.M., Munch, S.B., Perretti, C., Rosenberg, A.A., Sandin, S. &
 Ye, H. (2011) Are exploited fish populations stable? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108, E1224–E1225.
- Takashina, N. & Mougi, A. (2015) Maximum sustainable yields from a spatially-explicit
 harvest model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 383, 87–92.
- Terborgh, J.W. (2015) Toward a trophic theory of species diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112**, 11415–11422.
- Tu, C.-Y., Chen, K.-T. & Hsieh, C. (2018) Fishing and temperature effects on the size
 structure of exploited fish stocks. *Scientific Reports*, 8, 7132.

Turchin, P. (1995) Population regulation: old arguments and a new synthesis. *Population Dynamics*, Academic Press, pp. 19–40. N. Cappucino & P.W. Price, New York. 652