

## ***Interactive comment on “Standardization of a geo-referenced fishing dataset for the Indian Ocean Bigeye Tuna, *Thunnus obesus* (1952–2014)” by Teja A. Wibawa et al.***

**Teja A. Wibawa et al.**

twibawa@cls.fr

Received and published: 24 November 2016

1. The nominal catch is not well explained and I believe that this needs greater clarification.

Response: See the response for the 1st reviewer concerning the same point. In addition, the detailed explanation of nominal versus geo-referenced catch is followed by a clarification of the main objective of the study: “A key objective of the present study, by crossing all available information, is to build a geo-referenced dataset, i.e., with monthly catch spatially distributed, that matches the total (nominal) catch for fleets of fishing Countries providing both type of catch, taking into account as far as possible the size selectivity of the fishing gears. “

C1

2. The authors refer to a 'robust outlier filtering method was used without citing any particular method.

Response: The outlier filtering method is described in the method section “2.5 Detection and correction of outliers” . It is the Hampel Identifier method and a reference is provided (Pearson, 1952). The name of the method and its reference is reminded in the discussion.

3. Many of the data sets have been subject to many filtering and analytical algorithms, but the text is difficult to follow because many aspects are not clear. [...] There needs to be themes within the introduction and discussion to allow the reader to visualize where the authors are going with this. The Discussion also does not do justice. It only identifies a few weaknesses in the data. I was hoping to see some comparative analysis highlighting where the discrepancies arise between the reported catch and standardized catch is not well explained.

Response: The introduction and discussion have been fully revised to clarify the objectives and methods. Themes have been added in the discussion that is now structured after an introductory paragraph into 3 sections: 4.1 Catch / 4.2 Data screening / 4.3. Fishing effort and catchability / 4.3 Perspectives

Finally, we provide a revised dataset of geo-referenced catch, effort and length frequencies for the PANGEA database that includes both the original catch data in number of individuals and their conversion in weight raised to the nominal catch level for the Japanese and Korean longline fisheries as described in Table 3.

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., doi:10.5194/essd-2016-40, 2016.

C2