

# Maximum Sustainable Yields from a Spatially-Explicit Harvest Model

by  
Nao Takashina<sup>1\*</sup> and Akihiko Mougi<sup>2</sup>

1. *Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences,  
Kyushu University, 6-10-1, Hakozaki, Fukuoka, 812-8581, Japan  
nao.takashina@gmail.com*
2. *Department of Biological Science, Faculty of Life and Environmental Science,  
Shimane University, Nishikawatsu-cho 1060, Matsue 690-8504, Japan  
amougi@gmail.com*

## Abstract

Spatial heterogeneity plays an important role in complex ecosystem dynamics and, thus, is an important consideration in harvesting theory. However, little is known about how spatial effects can influence predictions derived from a non-spatial harvest model. Here, we extended the Schaefer model, a classical non-spatial harvest model that is used in resource management to a spatially-explicit harvest model by integrating environmental heterogeneities as well as species migrations between patches. By comparing the outputs of both models, we aimed to examine the effects of spatial heterogeneity on maximum sustainable yields (MSY). When spatial heterogeneity existed, we found that the Schaefer model tended to overestimate MSY. By assuming a well-mixed population, we showed that the Schaefer model always overestimated the MSY, regardless of the number of patches, and that the degree of overestimation becomes significant when spatial heterogeneity is marked. Collectively, these results highlight the importance of explicitly considering differences in spatial structure to prevent overharvesting resources.

## 1. Introduction

A diverse range of environments are characterized by spatial heterogeneity and ecologists recognize that often, this heterogeneity plays a critical role in the complex dynamics of ecosystem [1,2]. In the field of conservation ecology, the use of spatially explicit approaches to describe and manage environments are increasing rapidly, particularly in relation to the use of terrestrial and marine reserves [3–6]. However, many other management approaches, for example fisheries management [7] and hunting in tropical forests [8], still rely on the classical concept of maximum sustainable yield (MSY). This concept has traditionally played a major role in sustainable environmental management [9,10]; however, it does not take into consideration differences in spatial structure. This is likely because most harvesting theories (which rely on MSY) originated in commercial fisheries science [9,10] where spatial heterogeneity was not considered until recently [11].

---

\* Corresponding author

Thus, this leaves us to question how neglecting spatial heterogeneity may be affecting the efficacy of current resource management.

Two studies have already explicitly addressed this question: Ling and Milner-Gulland [11] used a static spatial harvesting model but also considered the effects of traveling costs, showing that MSY can be overestimated when these costs are not taken into consideration; and Ying et al. [12] discussed the risks of ignoring spatial structure in a 10-year simulation of fisheries management, showing that such an omission resulted in a high probability of fishing stocks off the coast of China being over exploited and/or suffering localized depletions. Both papers highlight the importance of explicitly considering spatial structure in mitigating the risks of overestimation or overexploitation. However, both studies were somewhat context specific.

In this study, we developed a more general model that enabled us to directly compare our results with those from the more conventionally used harvest models. Thus, our work will be applicable to many different harvesting systems. One of the most conventional models used in resource management is the Schaefer model [7,10]. This model is still widely used as a basis for more complex ecosystem models [4]. In light of this, it seemed rational to extend the Schaefer model to include a spatial dimension as the first step towards the spatial extension of harvest models.

In this paper, we examine the spatial effect on the MSY of a harvested population by extending the Schaefer model to become a spatially generalized model. We show that when spatial structure is not considered, this omission leads to an overestimation in MSY for both the simulations and mathematical analysis. We also discuss the conditions in which overestimation becomes a significant issue, the different approaches available for managing harvested populations living in heterogeneous environments, and finally the different ways we can predict how spatial structure will affect MSY.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 MSY in the Schaefer model

One of the most basic harvest models is the Schaefer model, which can be described as:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = rx \left( 1 - \frac{x}{K} \right) - ex, \quad (1)$$

where  $x$  is population abundance,  $r$  the per capita growth rate (/time),  $K$  is the carrying capacity of the environment and  $e$  is the harvest rate (/time). Using this equation, MSY is calculated to be equal to  $rK/4$  and thus, when MSY is reached, population abundance is equal to  $K/2$  [9,10].

### 2.2 The spatially explicit harvest model


In this study, we considered a simple spatial generalization of the Schaefer model, hereafter referred to as the spatially explicit harvest model (SEH). One of the simplest ways to spatially extend an otherwise non-spatial model is to divide the area being considered into

two patches with the fractions  $\alpha$  and  $1-\alpha$  (Fig. 1). Thus, each patch can then represent two different environments with two different carrying capacities, i.e.,  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ . The actual carrying capacities are then the product of the fraction of the patch and the carrying capacity of the patch. The two patches are interconnected through the exchange of individuals from the two populations, an event that is represented by the exchange rate  $m$ , defined for each time period and each patch. Therefore, the actual exchange rate between populations is proportional to the area of other patch and the population abundance  $x_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) in the focal patch. We add the exchange terms to the Schaefer model (Eq. 1) to obtain the two-patch SEH model:

$$\frac{dx_1}{dt} = rx_1 \left( 1 - \frac{x_1}{\alpha K_1} \right) - e_1 x_1 + m(\alpha x_2 - (1-\alpha)x_1), \quad (2a)$$

$$\frac{dx_2}{dt} = rx_2 \left( 1 - \frac{x_2}{(1-\alpha)K_2} \right) - e_2 x_2 + m((1-\alpha)x_1 - \alpha x_2). \quad (2b)$$

The subdivision of the area does not change  $r$  and managers can take different harvest rates  $e_i$  for each patch.



**Figure 1** Schematic description of the spatial-integrated Schaefer model. Environmental heterogeneities create two different patches in the concerned area. Two patches have different carrying capacities  $K_i$  ( $i=1, 2$ ) and fractions of the space  $\alpha$ ,  $1-\alpha$  and migration of species connect with patches at rate  $m$ .

### 2.3 The Schaefer model versus the SEH model

To examine the effects of spatial differences on MSY we compared the MSYs calculated by both the Schaefer and SEH models. In the SEH model, the conventional MSY becomes  $r(\alpha K_1 + (1-\alpha)K_2)/4$ , noting that the  $K$  in Equation 1 has been replaced by the total carrying capacity of the whole area. For simplicity,  $r$  was set at unity, but it does not change the ratio between the conventional MSY and the MSY in the SHE model because it does not appear in the ratio.

For the SEH model, it was possible to calculate two different MSY values depending on which management regime was applied. In the first regime (uMSY) harvest

rates were assumed to be uniform for both patches (i.e.,  $e_1 = e_2$ ) whilst for the second regime (gMSY) harvest rates were altered in both patches with a view to reaching a global MSY that was defined as the MSY in the whole area.

In the following section, we examine the effect of space on MSY in cases where the two patches are isolated, connected through an intermediate exchange rate or well-mixed by a high exchange rate. For more general situations, we also considered an  $n$ -patch generalization of the SHE model for broader applications. We did not examine the population abundance at the MSY values, because the MSY in the Schaefer model is proportional to the population abundance at the MSY value and one may infer the spatial effect to the population abundance at the MSY.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 The two-patch SHE model

##### 3.1.1 Isolated patches

When the two sections are isolated from each other (i.e., thus  $m = 0$  in Eq. 2a and 2b), uMSY and gMSY are simply the sum of the MSY values calculated independently for each section. In this case, it is then clear that uMSY is equal to gMSY, and also that they are both equal to the conventional MSY. Thus, when the two sections are isolated, there are no spatial effects on the MSY in either management regime.


##### 3.1.2 (a) Interconnection via an intermediate exchange rate

When the two sections are interconnected by an intermediate exchange rate (i.e.,  $m = 1$  or  $10$ ), uMSY is always smaller than the conventional MSY. The decrease in uMSY, relative to the conventional MSY, becomes significant when there is an intermediate size ratio between the two patches (Fig. 2a). Additionally, it also becomes larger when the difference in the carrying capacities of the two patches is large or the exchange rate is relatively high. These results suggest that an overestimation in the MSY is likely to occur when the target population moves easily between habitats with high environmental heterogeneity. In this regime, using the conventional MSY could result in an overestimation of up to 2.85 times (Fig. 2a; triangles). The gMSY shows a similar pattern when the exchange rate and carrying capacity ratio are both relatively high (i.e.,  $m = 10$  and  $K_2 / K_1 = 10$ ; Fig. 2a). Here, using the conventional MSY could result in an overestimation that was approximately 2.63-times the true MSY (Fig. 2b; triangles). However, unlike the uMSY, gMSY does not show significant declines relative to the conventional MSY when the exchange rate and carrying capacity ratio are relatively small (i.e.,  $m = 1$  and  $K_2 / K_1 = 2$ ; Fig. 2b).


##### 3.1.2 (b) Harvest rates

The harvest rates of each patch change according to the size ratio of the two patches (i.e.,  $\alpha / (1 - \alpha)$ ) in the gMSY regime (Fig. 3). As the fraction of space taken by Patch 1 increased, the harvest rates in both Patch 1 and 2 approach the 0.5 and 0 MSY values obtained from the Schaefer model, respectively. This occurs regardless of what the carrying

capacity and exchange rate values are (Fig. 3). Conversely, when the ratio of Patch 1 decreased, its harvest rate becomes very large. It also tended to diverge, especially when there was a high exchange rate and a relatively large difference in the carrying capacities of the two patches (Fig. 3a; triangles; maximum harvest rate was set at 20 to prevent the harvest rate diverging). Meanwhile, in Patch 2, the harvest rate approached the MSY value obtained from the Schaefer model.



**Figure 2** uMSY (a) and gMSY (b) values relative to the conventional MSY.



**Figure 3** Harvest rates in (a) patch 1 and (b) patch 2 in the regime of gMSY management.

### 3.1.3 A well-mixed population (through a high exchange rate)

When the population exchange rate between the two sections is sufficiently high (i.e.,  $m \gg 1$ ), we can approximate the dynamics of the two populations (Eqs. 2a and 2b) into one population dynamic model using the aggregation method: this method assumes that  $m$  has a negligible effect on the overall dynamics of the entire population's abundance (i.e., the macro variable,  $X = x_1 + x_2$ ) at the time scale  $\tau$  [13,14]. Thus, we can formulate the

simple equation:

$$\frac{dX}{d\tau} = rX \left( 1 - \frac{X}{K'} \right) - e'X, \quad (3)$$

where  $K' = K_1 K_2 / (\alpha K_2 + (1 - \alpha) K_1)$  and  $e' = e_1 \alpha + e_2 (1 - \alpha)$ . In this equation we do not impose any requirements on  $e_i$ , (as assumed in the uMSY regime). Using the MSY value obtained from the aggregation model (MSY'), we can then calculate the ratio of MSY' to the conventional MSY using the following equation (see supporting information [SI] for further details):

$$\frac{MSY'}{MSY} = \frac{1}{\alpha(1 - \alpha) \frac{(K_1 - K_2)^2}{K_1 K_2} + 1} \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

This calculation clearly shows that MSY' does not exceed the conventional MSY. When the carrying capacity in both patches are equal (i.e.,  $K_1 = K_2$ ) there is no spatial effect, regardless of patch sizes. By calculating the right-hand side of Equation 4, we found that the decline in MSY' relative to the conventional MSY becomes significant as the ratio of  $K_1 / K_2$  becomes larger or smaller. This effect is magnified if the patch with the larger carrying capacity then also expands in size. We confirmed that when  $m$  is high (i.e.,  $m = 10^3$ ; Fig. S1 in SI) the equality of Equation 4 was a good fit for the values obtained from the simulations.

### 3.2. The $n$ -patch SEH model

The two-patch SEH model can be extended to a more general  $n$ -patch model in which population exchanges between patches occurs at a rate proportional to the area of another patch and the population abundance in the focal patch. Thus, given the fraction of the specified area  $\alpha_i$ , a carrying capacity of  $K_i$ , and a harvest rate  $e_i$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  patch, the population abundance dynamics in that patch  $x_i$  can be described as:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = rx_i \left( 1 - \frac{x_i}{\alpha_i K_i} \right) - e_i x_i + m \left( \alpha_i \sum_{j \neq i}^N x_j - (1 - \alpha_i) x_i \right), \quad (1 \leq i \leq n), \quad (5)$$

where the dimensions of the model parameters are the same as in the two-patch SEH model (Eqs. 2a and 2b) and  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = 1$ . A similar aggregation method can also be applied when  $m$  is sufficiently high (i.e.,  $m \gg 1$ ), giving us:

$$\frac{d\hat{X}}{d\tau} = r\hat{X}\left(1 - \frac{\hat{X}}{\hat{K}}\right) - \hat{e}\hat{X}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\hat{K} = \sum_i^n \alpha_i K_1 \cdots K_{i-1} K_{i+1} \cdots K_n / \prod_{i=1}^n K_i$  and  $\hat{e} = \sum_i^n e_i \alpha_i$ . For all values of  $i$ , we did not impose any restrictions on  $e_i$  and assumed that  $K_i > 0$ . The MSYs obtained from the  $n$ -patch SEH model and Schaefer model were denoted as  $MSY'_n$  and  $MSY_n$ , respectively. As before, we also calculated the  $MSY'_n/MSY_n$  ratio using the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{MSY'_n}{MSY_n} &= \frac{1}{\sum_i^{n-1} \sum_{j>i}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \left( \frac{K_i}{K_j} + \frac{K_j}{K_i} \right) + \sum_i^n \alpha_i^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2 \sum_i^{n-1} \sum_{j>i}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j + \sum_i^n \alpha_i^2} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This showed that  $MSY'_n$  never exceeds  $MSY_n$ , regardless of the number of patches (see SI for the full mathematical derivation of Eq. 7). This finding supports the general applicability of the two-patch SHE model.

#### 4. Discussion

In this paper, we extended the Schaefer model [7, 13] to a more general, spatial model that allowed us to examine the effects of space on MSY. Our results showed that when the harvest model lacked spatial structure, it tended to overestimate MSY, regardless of whether plausible management regimes were in place. In the most extreme case, the Schaefer model overestimated MSY by about 2.85. Overestimation is more likely to occur when spatial heterogeneity is greater, population exchange rates are larger, and the management regime is uMSY. Furthermore, when the populations in the area of concern are well-mixed through rapid migrations, we show that overestimating MSY is inevitable, regardless of the number of patches present.

Looking explicitly at spatial structure, the management regimes that may plausibly be available are uMSY and gMSY: the specific choice depends on the resolution of the spatial information available. If the data are of a sufficiently fine scale to detect environmental heterogeneity, managers can choose an appropriate management regime that avoids the overestimation of MSY. However, it is worth noting that gathering such fine-scale spatial information and then applying fine-tuned management responses are much more expensive than relying on coarse resolution data and uniformed-effort management [15,16]. Therefore, managers should always take such costs into consideration

when making decisions.

Our model may include a property similar to that of the optimal harvesting model in terms of the two-patch, source-sink dynamics [3]. Our two-patch model displays source-sink properties when the size of one patch becomes much bigger because, in such a case, emigration to the other patch becomes almost zero as immigration into the larger patch immediately experiences a negative growth rate. This is because of changes to the realized carrying capacity (fraction of the area  $\times$  carrying capacity). They concluded that the optimal harvest strategy occurs when either (a) the sink is harvested at the MSY level or (b) the sink is harvested at a maximum rate and the source is harvested at its MSY level. Our model shows a similar trend to the first proposal because as  $\alpha/1-\alpha$  becomes very small, the richer patch becomes the source (Fig. 3). Conversely, regardless of parameter values, all the curves show a trend in line with the second strategy proposed when  $\alpha/1-\alpha$  becomes very large, with the poorer patch becoming the source. We observed this tendency towards (b) starts when  $\alpha/1-\alpha$  reaches (and exceeds) 1 and the exchange rate is high (i.e.,  $m=10$ ). This suggests that a larger exchange rate promotes source-sink dynamics in cases where the poorer patch has become the source.

We used an aggregation method in this study to derive useful analytical predictions. When  $m$  was  $10^3$ , the simulated values of  $uMSY/MSY$  indicate quite a good fit to the analytical values, but the simulated values with  $m=10^2$  also show a relatively good fit (Fig. S1 in the SI). For species with a large home range or species that use distinct foraging and refuge areas, an exchange rate of  $m \geq 10^2$  may not be unusual. Species that have long periods between breeding events also tend to have larger exchange rates because the growth rate of these species tends to be lower.

For practical applications, an easy way to make use of the relationship described in Equation 7 is to subdivide a given management area into  $n$  equal-sized patches, namely  $\alpha_i = 1/n$  for all  $i$ . By substituting this into the right hand-side of the equation presented in the first line of Equation 7 and performing some basic algebra, the following equation can

be obtained:  $MSY'_n/MSY = 1 / \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j>i}^n \left( \frac{K_i^2 + K_j^2}{K_i K_j} \right) + n \right) \right)$ . Having completed this step, the

only unknown parameters are the carrying capacities and one can estimate the decline from the MSY value by measuring the carrying capacities in each patch. Managers can choose an arbitrary number of subdivisions  $n$ : their selection may depend on the existing data available or the technological limitations of measuring carrying capacity. Note, however, that the approximated value  $MSY'_n/MSY$  becomes more reliable as  $n$  increases because the exchange rate  $m$  should increase with the number of subdivisions.

The SHE model explored in this paper is one of the simplest extensions of a traditional harvest model. However, despite its simplicity, it can provide many important predictions. Our outputs strongly support the importance of incorporating spatial structure into harvest model and provide more reliable population dynamics of the harvested



population. In natural systems, the habitat heterogeneity is widely observed, and it may tend to increase with a size of the focal area (spatial scale of the management region). Spatial resolution of data also affects available management regime, suggesting importance of decision-making of the spatial unit scale in the environmental assessment for each management region. Applying spatial explicit harvest model helps avoiding overestimation of the maximum sustainable yields and it will lead to the sustainable resource uses.

## Acknowledgements

We thank LAK. Barnett, ML. Baskett, and Y. Tachiki for their thoughtful comments.

## References

1. Hanski I (1998) Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature* 396: 41–49. Available: [http://www.helsinki.fi/~ihanski/Articles/Nature 1998 Hanski.pdf](http://www.helsinki.fi/~ihanski/Articles/Nature%201998%20Hanski.pdf).
2. Levin SA (1992) The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *73*: 1943–1967.
3. Lundberg P, Jonzén N (1999) Optimal population harvesting in a source-sink environment. *Evol Ecol Res* 1: 719–729.
4. Neubert M (2003) Marine reserves and optimal harvesting. *Ecol Lett* 6: 843–849. Available: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00493.x/pdf>.
5. Sanchirico JN, James E. Wilen (1999) Bioeconomics of spatial exploitation in a patchy environment. *J Environ Econ Manage* 37: 129–150. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0095069698910609>.
6. White C, Costello C (2011) Matching spatial property rights fisheries with scales of fish dispersal. *Ecol Appl* 21: 350–362. doi:10.1890/09-1188.1.
7. Clark WC (1990) *Mathematical bioeconomics: the optimal management of renewable resources*. 2nd: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Available: <http://books.google.com/books?id=o3fwAAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover>.
8. Robinson JG, Redford KH (1991) Sustainable harvest of neotropical forest mammals. *Neotropical Wildlife Use and Conservation*. Vol. 56. pp. 415–429. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3808886?origin=crossref>.
9. Gordon HS (1954) The economic theory of a common-property resource: the fishery. *J Polit Econ* 62: 124–142. Available: [papers2://publication/uuid/077548A3-7555-4EEC-A39B-0645148BD8C9](http://papers2://publication/uuid/077548A3-7555-4EEC-A39B-0645148BD8C9).
10. Schaefer M (1954) Some aspects of the dynamics of populations important to the management of the commercial marine fisheries. *Bull Inter-American Trop Tuna Comm* 1: 27–56. doi:10.1016/S0092-8240(05)80049-7.
11. Ling S, Milner-Gulland EJ (2008) When does spatial structure matter in models of wildlife harvesting? *J Appl Ecol* 45: 63–71. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01391.x.
12. Ying Y, Chen Y, Lin L, Gao T, Quinn Terrance II (2011) Risks of ignoring fish population spatial structure in fisheries management. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 68: 2101–2120. Available: <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/f2011-116>.

13. Iwasa Y, Andreasen V (1987) Aggregation in model ecosystems. I. Perfect aggregation. *Ecol Modell* 37: 287–302. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0304380087900305>.
14. Auger P, de La Parra R, Poggiale J (2008) Aggregation methods in dynamical systems and applications in population and community dynamics. *Phys Life Rev* 5: 79–105. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1571064508000110>.
15. Richardson EA, Kaiser MJ, Edwards-Jones G, Possingham HP (2006) Sensitivity of marine-reserve design to the spatial resolution of socioeconomic data. *Conserv Biol* 20: 1191–1202. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00426.x.
16. Naidoo R, Balmford A, Ferraro PJ, Polasky S, Ricketts TH, et al. (2006) Integrating economic costs into conservation planning. *Trends Ecol Evol* 21: 681–687. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17050033>. Accessed 20 March 2014.

## Supporting Information

### S1 Full derivations of Equations 4 and 7


Here, we give a full description of Equation 4 and Equation 7 presented in the main text. The derivation of Equation 4 is relatively straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{MSY'}{MSY} &= \frac{K_1 K_2}{(\alpha K_1 + (1 - \alpha) K_2)(\alpha K_2 + (1 - \alpha) K_1)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\left(\alpha + (1 - \alpha) \frac{K_2}{K_1}\right) \left(\alpha + (1 - \alpha) \frac{K_1}{K_2}\right)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\alpha^2 + (1 - \alpha)^2 + \alpha(1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{K_1^2 + K_2^2}{K_1 K_2}\right)} \tag{Eq. S1} \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\alpha(\alpha - 1) \left(1 - \frac{K_1^2 + K_2^2}{2K_1 K_2}\right) + 1} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\alpha(1 - \alpha) \frac{(K_1 - K_2)^2}{K_1 K_2} + 1} \\
 &\leq 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

The derivation of Equation 7 is more complicated. Therefore, we only derived the upper limit of these ratios:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{MSY'_n}{MSY_n} &= \frac{\prod_i^n K_i}{\sum_{i,j}^n \alpha_i K_i \alpha_j K_1 \cdots K_{j-1} K_{j+1} \cdots K_n} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_i^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n \alpha_i K_i \alpha_j \frac{1}{K_j} + \sum_i^n \alpha_i^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_i^{n-1} \sum_{j>i}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \left( \frac{K_i}{K_j} + \frac{K_j}{K_i} \right) + \sum_i^n \alpha_i^2} \\
\text{(a)} &\leq \frac{1}{2 \sum_i^{n-1} \sum_{j>i}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j + \sum_i^n \alpha_i^2} \\
\text{(b)} &= \frac{1}{\sum_{i,j}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_i^n \alpha_i} \\
&= 1
\end{aligned} \tag{Eq. S2}$$

To obtain the inequality (a), we use the fact  $(K_i^2 + K_j^2)/K_i K_j \geq 2$  with a requirement  $K_i, K_j \neq 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$  and an equality occurs if  $K_i = K_j$ . We can conclude that if condition (a) is satisfied ( $K_i = K_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ ) the distribution of the areal size,  $\alpha$ , does not matter.



**Figure S1** uMSY values relative to the conventional MSY for various migration rates ( $m = 10, 10^2, 10^3$ ) and analytic value (Eq. 4). (a)  $K_1 = 10, K_2 = 100$ , (b)  $K_1 = 50, K_2 = 100$ .