#### Check for updates

#### OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY Kate Brooks, Deakin University, Australia

\*CORRESPONDENCE Matthew Damiano Mmddamian@ncsu.edu

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 13 April 2023 ACCEPTED 24 April 2023 PUBLISHED 16 May 2023

#### CITATION

Damiano M, Wager B, Rocco A, Shertzer KW, Murray GD and Cao J (2023) Corrigendum: Integrating information from semi-structured interviews into management strategy evaluation: a case study for Southeast United States marine fisheries. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 10:1205418. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2023.1205418

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Damiano, Wager, Rocco, Shertzer, Murray and Cao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Corrigendum: Integrating information from semistructured interviews into management strategy evaluation: a case study for Southeast United States marine fisheries

Matthew Damiano<sup>1\*</sup>, Bethany Wager<sup>1†</sup>, Alex Rocco<sup>1†</sup>, Kyle W. Shertzer<sup>2†</sup>, Grant D. Murray<sup>3†</sup> and Jie Cao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Ecology, Center for Marine Sciences and Technology, North Carolina State University, Morehead City, NC, United States, <sup>2</sup>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Beaufort Laboratory, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Beaufort, NC, United States, <sup>3</sup>Duke University Marine Lab, Nicholas School of the Environment, Beaufort, NC, United States

#### KEYWORDS

marine resource management, fishers' knowledge, management strategy evaluation, experiential knowledge, ecosystem approach management

#### A Corrigendum on

Integrating information from semi-structured interviews into management strategy evaluation: a case study for Southeast United States marine fisheries

by Damiano M, Wager B, Rocco A, Shertzer KW, Murray GD and Cao J (2022) Front. Mar. Sci. 9:1063260. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2022.1063260

## Error in Figure

### Table Legend

In the published article, there was an error in the legend for Figure 1 as published. Conceptual objectives group "F" was labeled "E". The corrected legend appears below.

In the published article, there was an error in the legend for Figure 2 as published. Preferred management measure group "F" was labeled "E". The corrected legend appears below.

In the published article, there was an error in Table 3 as published. The performance metric referring to a proxy for season length reads "catch rates," when it should be "exploitation rates". The corrected Table 3 and its caption appear below.

The authors apologize for these errors and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.



#### FIGURE 1

Tallied responses to Interview Question 2 which asks fishers to identify their top three conceptual objectives from a list provided by the interviewer. Conceptual objectives were ranked 1st, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3rd by commercial fishers (left) and recreational fishers (right) for black sea bass (red) and cobia (blue). Options for ranking were (A) "Catching the greatest number of pounds," (B) "Catching the greatest number of fish," (C) "Catching the largest size fish," (D) "Maximizing the length of the season," (E) "Conservation of the resource," and (F) "Increased access or opportunity within the fishery.".



#### FIGURE 2

Tallied responses to Interview Question 3 which asks fishers to identify their top three management measures from a list provided by the interviewer. Management measures were ranked 1st, 2nd, or 3rd by commercial fishers (left) and recreational fishers (right) for black sea bass (red) and cobia (blue). Options for ranking were (A) "Changing the vessel/trip or bag limits," (B) "Changing the size limits," (C) "Changing the size limits to a slot limit," (D) "Seasonal closures," (E) "In-season adjustments to vessel/trip or bag limits," and (F) "Changing catch limit allocation among sectors.".

TABLE 3 Conceptual objectives and performance metrics derived from participants' responses to interview questions.

Type of Objective	Species	Conceptual Objective	Performance Metric
Commercial Fishing	Black sea bass	Catch the greatest number of pounds	Changes in median of average catch
Recreational	Black sea bass	Catch the greatest number of pounds	Changes in the median of average catch
Recreational	Black sea bass	Catch the largest fish	Proportion of legal-sized fish in the population
Recreational	Black sea bass	Maximize the length of the season	Changes in exploitation rates as a proxy for season length
Recreational and Commercial Fishing	Black sea bass	Reduce discards	Magnitude of discards
Commercial Fishing	Cobia	Maximize the length of the season	Changes in exploitation rates as a proxy for season length
Recreational Fishing	Cobia	Maximize the length of the season	Changes in exploitation rates as a proxy for season length
Recreational Fishing	Cobia	Catch the largest fish	Proportion of legal-sized fish in the population
Conservation	Black sea bass/Cobia	Maintain SSB above MSST	% of simulations in which SSB remains above MSST

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.