

Examining violence

51




Structure of a ribozyme

56



Graphite whiskers
in meteorites

61



LETTERS | BOOKS | POLICY FORUM | EDUCATION FORUM | PERSPECTIVES

LETTERS

edited by Jennifer Sills

The Role of Fisheries-Induced Evolution

IN THEIR POLICY FORUM (“MANAGING EVOLVING fish stocks,” 23 November 2007, p. 1247), C. Jørgensen *et al.* propose evolutionary impact assessments (EvoIAs) as a general tool for managing evolving resources. The basis for their proposal is that fisheries-induced evolution (FIE) is the most important driver of changes in life-history characteristics of heavily exploited marine fishes. Although Jørgensen *et al.* give the impression that this is well established, the evidence supporting FIE unfortunately remains circumstantial and is

often open to alternative interpretations (1).

To make the case for EvoIAs, Jørgensen *et al.* present a selective set of studies—those concluding that FIE was a likely cause of the observed changes, after considering some environmental effects (see their table S2). In doing this, they excluded results that do not support their case [e.g., (2, 3)]. Furthermore, because FIE is often a matter of interpretation [e.g., (3, 4)] and the authors of the Policy Forum are strong advocates of FIE, the majority of the studies on life-history traits included in table S2 were their own. Their analysis does not represent a consensus opinion developed from critical scrutiny of the studies currently available.

Some component of phenotypic change is undoubtedly genetic and caused by fishing. The challenge remains to determine how important this is relative to other environmental and trophic drivers. A truly precautionary approach to fisheries management must allow for FIE in the longer term. However, EvoIA should be one of several tools used to address the many pressing problems facing fisheries managers.

HOWARD I. BROWMAN,¹ RICHARD LAW,²
C. TARA MARSHALL³

¹Austevoll Research Station, Institute of Marine Research, Storebø 5392, Norway. ²Department of Biology, University of York, York YO10 5YW, UK. ³School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 2TZ, UK.

References

1. C. T. Marshall, H. I. Browman, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 249 (2007).
2. K. Morita, M. Fukuwaka, *Evolution* **60**, 1516 (2006).
3. A. D. Rijnsdorp, R. E. Grift, S. B. M. Kraak, *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **62**, 833 (2005).
4. G. H. Engelhard, M. Heino, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **272**, 245 (2004).

IN A RECENT POLICY FORUM, “MANAGING evolving fish stocks” (23 November 2007, p. 1247), C. Jørgensen *et al.* propose that evolutionary impact assessment should be adopted as a tool to manage evolving fish stocks. This is a well-motivated idea in principle, but their reasoning relies entirely on the assumptions that fisheries-induced evolution (FIE) occurs commonly and that it is an undisputable fact. Neither of these assumptions is true. None of the studies of exploited fish populations in their article have provided genetic evidence for the observed phenotypic changes. Because evolution is by definition a change in the genetic constitution of a population, an evolutionary change cannot be postulated without demonstrating a genetic basis for the observed phenotypic shift. In fact, phenotypic changes in mean trait values due to simple environmental inductions are common (1), as are cases where populations are not evolving despite strong directional selection acting on heritable traits (2). Furthermore, several studies have shown that observed phenotypic shifts in exploited fish popula-

tions are fully consistent with simple environmentally induced changes (3, 4).

We are inclined to believe that some of the case studies listed in the Jørgensen *et al.* Policy Forum might indeed turn out to be cases of FIE if genetic data were to become available. However, until that proof is provided, the claims about FIE are nothing but “adaptive storytelling” (5). As pointed out by S. J. Gould and R. C. Lewontin three decades ago (5), unwillingness to consider alternatives to adaptive stories, reliance on plausibility as a criterion for accepting speculative tales, and failure to consider adequately competing themes are

characteristics of an “adaptationist program” that seems to have become revitalized in the context of fisheries-induced “evolution.”

ANNA KUPARINEN AND JUHA MERILÄ

Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki FI-00014, Finland.

References

1. A. P. Hendry *et al.*, *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 20 (2008).
2. J. Merilä *et al.*, *Genetica* **112**, 199 (2001).
3. S. B. M. Kraak, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 295 (2007).
4. K. Morita, M. Fukuwa, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 289 (2007).
5. S. J. Gould, R. C. Lewontin, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* **205**, 581 (1979).

Response

WE THANK BROWMAN *ET AL.* AND KUPARINEN and Merilä for their responses to our Policy Forum on fisheries-induced evolution (FIE) (“Managing evolving fish stocks,” 23 November 2007, p. 1247).

We disagree with Browman *et al.*’s interpretation of our article and with their view of the state of research in this field. FIE warrants attention because it is one of the drivers of change in exploited fish populations. We do not claim that “FIE is the most important driver” of changes in fish life histories, and

our argument in no way depends on this being the case. Ecology, evolution, and economics are linked through feedbacks and jointly determine the future of fisheries on time scales relevant for management. FIE is one of several threats to the long-term viability of fish stocks, but the potentially slow reversibility of FIE necessitates extra precaution. The evolutionary impact assessment (EvoIA) framework we proposed recognizes the need to address complementary perspectives simultaneously and is one of several tools required to achieve sustainable fisheries.

We and others (1) think that after environmental factors are accounted for, FIE is the most probable and parsimonious explanation of the remaining phenotypic changes documented for many stocks, species, fisheries, and regions. Our table S2 illustrates the wide taxonomic and geographic occurrence of FIE. Of the studies included, 19 (out of 34) had no involvement from our large group of co-authors. We explicitly listed positive findings, as they are sufficiently numerous that ignoring FIE can no longer be justified.

While we agree with Kuparinen and Merilä that direct genetic evidence for FIE in the wild

Letters to the Editor

Letters (~300 words) discuss material published in *Science* in the previous 3 months or issues of general interest. They can be submitted through the Web (www.submit2science.org) or by regular mail (1200 New York Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not acknowledged upon receipt, nor are authors generally consulted before publication. Whether published in full or in part, letters are subject to editing for clarity and space.

is highly desirable and practically nonexistent, we must take issue with their claim that “an evolutionary change cannot be postulated without demonstrating a genetic basis for the observed phenotypic shift.” This claim questions the fundamental assumption that scientists can make inferences about genotypes by studying phenotypes. It is worth remembering that Darwin formulated his theory of evolution with a similar assumption—that traits are heritable—nearly a century before DNA was found to carry hereditary information. Without such assumptions, evolutionary ecology could not operate. Moreover, Kuparinen and Merilä now seem to contradict their recent conclusion that “[t]heory, phenotypic observations and modelling studies all suggest that fisheries are capable of inducing evolutionary changes in life histories in harvested populations” (2).

Like Kuparinen and Merilä, we look forward to the day when direct genetic evidence can decisively determine the extent of FIE. At a practical level, however, traits affected by FIE are likely polygenic and involve unexplored genotype-to-phenotype relations. Even where changing allele frequencies are found, it might take a long time before such changes

are robustly linked to phenotypic effects.

FIE is not a universal explanation for phenotypic changes in harvested fish populations. The importance of FIE relative to other processes that induce phenotypic change will need to be evaluated case by case. One must expect, as Kuparinen and Merilä suggest, that sometimes “observed phenotypic shifts in exploited fish populations are fully consistent with simple environmentally induced changes.” For this reason, researchers of FIE have made considerable efforts to account for environmental effects and phenotypic plasticity before ascribing residual trends to FIE [e.g., (3)]. Of the two studies Kuparinen and Merilä highlighted, one kept open the possibility of FIE (4), while the other even concluded that FIE played a role (5).

Kuparinen and Merilä also refer to a famous argument from the 1970s (6) that did not stand up to scrutiny (7) and had few implications for mainstream evolutionary biology. Furthermore, Kuparinen and Merilä overlook the many, mutually complementary sources of evidence for FIE: expectations from life-history theory and quantitative evolutionary models of exploited fish; statistical analyses

of scientific-survey and fisheries time series that consider phenotypic plasticity; comparative studies of populations experiencing different fishing pressures; demonstrations of FIE in laboratory experiments; and successful engineering of life-history traits in breeding programs. Together, this is much more than “adaptive storytelling.”

CHRISTIAN JØRGENSEN,^{1*} KATJA ENBERG,^{1,2}

ERIN S. DUNLOP,^{2,1} ROBERT ARLINGHAUS,^{3,4}

DAVID S. BOUKAL,^{2,1} KEITH BRANDER,⁵

BRUNO ERNANDE,^{6,7} ANNA GÅRDMARK,⁸

FIONA JOHNSTON,^{7,3} SHUICHI MATSUMURA,^{7,3}

HEIDI PARDOE,^{9,10} KRISTINA RAAB,¹¹ ALEXANDRA

SILVA,¹² ANSSI VAINIKKA,⁸ ULF DIECKMANN,⁷

MIKKO HEINO,^{2,1,7} ADRIAAN D. RIJNSDORP¹¹

¹Department of Biology, University of Bergen, N-5020 Bergen, Norway. ²Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway. ³Department of Biology and Ecology of Fishes, Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Berlin, Germany. ⁴Humboldt-University of Berlin, Institute of Animal Sciences, Berlin, Germany. ⁵DTU-Aqua, Charlottenlund, Denmark. ⁶Laboratoire Ressources Halieutiques, Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer (IFREMER), Port-en-Bessin, France. ⁷Evolution and Ecology Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria. ⁸Institute of Coastal Research, Swedish Board of Fisheries, Öregrund, Sweden. ⁹Marine Research Institute, Reykjavik, Iceland. ¹⁰University of Iceland, Institute of

Biology, Sturlugata 7, Reykjavik, Iceland. ¹¹Wageningen Institute for Marine Resources and Ecosystem Studies (IMARES), Ijmuiden, Netherlands. ¹²INRB-IPIMAR National Institute for Agriculture and Fisheries, Lisboa, Portugal.

*Author for correspondence. E-mail: christian.jorgensen@bio.uib.no

References

1. J. A. Hutchings, D. J. Fraser, *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 294 (2008).
2. A. Kuparinen, J. Merilä, *TREE* **22**, 652 (2007).
3. U. Dieckmann, M. Heino, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 253 (2007).
4. K. Morita, M. Fukuwaka, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 289 (2007).
5. S. B. M. Kraak, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **335**, 295 (2007).
6. S. J. Gould, R. C. Lewontin, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* **205**, 581 (1979).
7. D. C. Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea* (Penguin, London, 1995), chap. 10.