Seems like empirical weight-at-age is a much better idea than trying to estimate age-length-weight relationships within a stock assessment.

If stock structure is 'Major Issue #1' why does it receive less attention in stock assessments than other decisions?

Domed selectivity due to spatial effects are often temporary, which can cause problems if you are using them to estimate reference points

Estimates of M can be confounded by F, steepness, etc etc

when would fishery selectivity never be used for info on F?

so shifting baselines are good?

by shifting recruitment periods

if one can't hear so well (I can't) state-space models can sound like "faith-based" models...point being that ;evaluation of processes tends to get lost...e.g., mortality rate variation from means get lost...in interpretation

Close kin requires extreme stock structure information/assumptions

not if there's spawning elsewhere, and goes unsampnled (for population estimation

agree if catching their Juveniles, all great...it's when there's spawning outside the sampled area but mixes w/ juveniles that estimates will be biased

Sadly expert systems require experts which we don't have.. We could develop an expert systems to replicate Rick M

CPUE: we should be thinking CPUE and comps at the same time..

What about precision when standardizing comps

How do you get an index that is not time-varying etc.

No interacting pops? Lets talk

What about Ianelli-like smoothing?

Age-length models!!

Multi-species models?

Surely ideal IF you have the data?

Predation age >= age-at-recruitment

What about regime shifts in mean recruitment (bigeye..)

Dynamic B0??

Correlations in residuals OVER time??

What about non-representative samples for comp (think Australia...)

Process error - HARD to get right

Cody's paper on the wrong process error being modelled..

Marine Mammals do a much better job with stock structure than fish!

Also, two stocks rather than one -> neat allocation issues..

How do you deal with conflicting CPUEs (i.e. increasing and decreasing) from disparate fleets? Say, for a highly migratory species fished by many nations in an RFMO setting.

Shouldn't we expect residuals in the selectivity if a strong/weak year class moves through? Such that not all residuals are bad?

You mentioned tagging and genetics information, but... Given the wealth of otolith samples typically already available due to ageing needs, do you see any utility in otolith chemistry for stock ID within this framework (especially for Pacific HMS like tunas?

Genetics, otochem answering questions on different timescales

I've not read your paper, but would you include environmental covariates in the spatiotemporal model (e.g. el nino / sst in your example)

Any thoughts about closed areas with no index or CPUE data? Or lower density areas with no fishing so no CPUE?

Thoughts on use of meta-analysis of steepness for west coast rockfish (which obviously depends on assuming a stock-recruit relationship)?

How do you reconcile how you collect the data to inform growth (tagging, age/length) with fleet structure, growth data is often collected independently of a fishery (survey)

If ALL if your fleets have dome-shaped selectivity then the RHS is going to be poorly estimated. At least one has to be logistic, right?

Close kin provides stock structure information, Jim

If spawning elsewhere doesn't contribute to the juveniles you're catching then they're non-relevant separate stock. If you ARE catching the juveniles, then you are including their parents in your estimate

population genetics is distinct from CKMR. CKMR is very immediate time scale