SC/69B/SM/10

Sub-committees/working group name: SM

The ongoing issue of fishery interactions among endangered Hawaiian false killer whales: repeated mouthline and dorsal fin injuries, stock and sex-specific trends, and early-life interactions

A.E. Harnish, R.W. Baird, S.D. Mahaffy , A.B. Douglas, M.A. Kratofil, J.F. Shaff, T. Cullins, S.H. Stack, J. J. Currie, A.L. Bradford

The ongoing issue of fishery interactions among endangered Hawaiian false killer whales: repeated mouthline and dorsal fin injuries, stock and sex-specific trends, and early-life interactions

ANNETTE E. HARNISH[1], ROBIN W. BAIRD[1], SABRE D. MAHAFFY[1], ANNIE B. DOUGLAS[1], MICHAELA A. KRATOFIL[1], JACQUELYN F. SHAFF[1], TORI CULLINS[2], STEPHANIE H. STACK[3,4], JENS J. CURRIE[3], AMANDA L. BRADFORD[5]

Contact email: rwbaird@cascadiaresearch.org

ABSTRACT

Monitoring bycatch in fisheries is essential for effective conservation and fisheries sustainability. False killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in Hawaiian waters are known to interact with both commercial and recreational fisheries, but limited observer coverage obscures the ability to document interactions and assess bycatch rates. Here, we assess fisheries interactions using photographic evidence of dorsal fin and mouthline injuries for three false killer whale stocks that vary in their spatial overlap with fisheries. Photographs from 504 individuals documented from 1999–2021 were scored for injuries to determine their consistency with fishery interactions. For individuals with both dorsal fin and mouthline photos available, the endangered main Hawaiian Islands (MHI) stock had the highest rates of fisheries-related injuries (28.7% of individuals), followed by the pelagic stock (11.7%), while no individuals from the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands stock with both photo types had fisheries-related injuries. Mouthline injury rates were known to be negatively biased, as the median percentage of mouthline visible ranged from 50-60% among stocks. Females were significantly more likely to have fisheries-related injuries to the dorsal fin (17.4%) than males (5.3%), although rates of mouthline injuries were similar (females-17.8%; males-12.2%). Frequency of fisheries-related injuries among social clusters within the MHI stock ranged from 19.4% to 38.2% of individuals. Some individuals from the MHI stock were documented with multiple fisheries-related injuries acquired on different occasions, indicating repeated interactions with fisheries throughout their lives. Individuals with injuries consistent with fishery interactions spanned all age classes; the youngest individuals with injuries were estimated to be two years old. Fisheries-related injuries were acquired throughout the study period, indicating that this is an ongoing issue, and not a legacy of past interactions. Our results suggest that monitoring of fisheries that overlap the range of the MHI stock is needed, particularly given that the stock is endangered and declining.

INTRODUCTION

Marine predator bycatch and depredation in commercial and recreational fisheries is a global issue, with consequences for both conservation and fisheries economics (Lewison et al. 2014, Mitchell et al. 2018, Jog et al. 2022, Read 2008, Hamer et al. 2012). Species with slow life

[1]Cascadia Research Collective, Olympia, Washington 98501, USA
[2]Wild Dolphin Foundation, Wai‘anae, Hawai‘i 96792, USA
[3] Pacific Whale Foundation, Wailuku, Hawai‘i 96793, USA
[4]Current address: Southern Ocean Persistent Organic Pollutants Program, Centre for Planetary Health and Food Security, Griffith University, QLD 4111, Australia
[5] Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96818, USA

histories are particularly vulnerable, including a number of marine mammals (Davidson et al. 2012). Bycatch in fisheries has led to the decline of several marine mammal populations, and even the extinction of a small river dolphin (baiji, *Lipotes vexillifer*, Turvey et al. 2007). Thus, monitoring and assessing impacts of bycatch is critical to developing effective management efforts for these species (Wade et al. 2021).

Globally, false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) are listed as Near Threatened by the IUCN, due to a combination of bycatch in fisheries, directed takes in some areas, and susceptibility to population effects from bycatch and takes, given their slow life history (Baird 2019). In Hawaiian waters, false killer whales feed on a wide variety of both pelagic and reef-associated game fish, including ahi (*Thunnus albacares*), aku (*Katsuwonus pelamis*), mahimahi (*Coryphaena hippurus*), monchong (*Eumegistus illustrus*), uku (*Aprion virescens*), kāhala (*Seriola quinqueradiata*), and ulua aukea (*Caranx ignobilis*), among others (Baird et al. 2008, 2023). All of these species are targeted by either commercial or recreational fisheries in Hawai‘i, and false killer whales have been known to depredate catch from hook and line fisheries there since at least the early 1960s (Pryor 1975). Reports of depredation of tunas and billfish have been frequent but largely anecdotal in nature (Shallenberger 1981, Nitta & Henderson 1993), and actual documentation of depredation and bycatch in Hawaiian waters is limited, as only longline fisheries are required to use observers, and even then have limited coverage of the fishery as a whole (Forney et al. 2011). Observers in the Hawai‘i-based longline fisheries document incidents of both protected species bycatch and depredation, and record details such as gear type and crew response (Forney et al. 2011). In the deep-set longline fishery, which targets bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*), false killer whales are the most frequently recorded bycaught cetacean (Forney et al. 2011), and are thought to be responsible for the majority of depredation (Fader et al. 2021).

Around the main Hawaiian Islands, three overlapping populations of false killer whales have been recognized, based on a combination of association patterns of photo-identified individuals, genetics, and satellite tagging (Baird et al. 2008, 2012, 2013, Martien et al. 2014, Bradford et al. 2015). An offshore population, referred to as the Hawai‘i pelagic stock, ranges broadly inside and outside of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) surrounding the archipelago, and individuals occasionally come nearshore and pass through the islands (Anderson et al. 2020, Fader et al. 2021). This population overlaps with both U.S. and international longline fisheries, as well as with nearshore fisheries. Two insular populations also exist, referred to as the northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI) stock and the main Hawaiian Islands (MHI) insular stock (Carretta et al. 2023). Groups from the NWHI population appear to spend most of their time in what is now the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (Baird et al. 2013, Kratofil et al. 2023), and fishing effort has largely been excluded within the range of this population. Thus, individuals from this population have likely had limited interactions with fisheries, at least in recent years.

Individuals from the MHI insular population, by contrast, overlap with a variety of commercial and recreational nearshore fisheries that target many of the same fish species that false killer whales feed on (Boggs & Ito 1993, Glazier 2007, McCoy et al. 2018, Baird et al. 2021). Prior to 1992, much of the U.S.-based longline fishing effort was around the main Hawaiian Islands (Boggs & Ito 1993, He et al. 1997), but in March 1992, longline fishing was excluded from an area around the main Hawaiian Islands to reduce conflicts with nearshore fisheries. Today, by far the largest commercial gear type used around the main Hawaiian Islands is trolling with lures, responsible for 74% of the days fished based on State of Hawaiʻi commercial marine license data from 2007 through 2018 (Baird et al. 2021). However, other types of commercial fishing, i.e., trolling with bait, deep-sea handline, rod and reel, and palu-ahi (Glazier 2007), were responsible for the highest levels of fishing effort in areas with the greatest potential for interactions between false killer whales and individual fishermen (Baird et al. 2021). Understanding of actual interactions or bycatch is limited however, as there are no observer programs or other monitoring (e.g., electronic monitoring) in any of the nearshore fisheries around the Hawaiian Islands.

Several lines of evidence suggest the MHI insular population experienced a large decline in abundance between the late 1980s and the early 2000s (Baird 2009, Reeves et al. 2009, Oleson et al. 2010, Silva et al. 2013), and in 2012, this population was listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Based on recent analyses, the population again appears to be in decline, and in 2021, was estimated to number approximately 138 individuals (95% credible interval = 120-160, Badger et al. 2024). The factors that led the population to decline are unknown, but may include bycatch in fisheries, deleterious health effects due to high exposure to persistent organic pollutants, reduced prey availability, and deliberate killing (Baird 2009, Ylitalo et al. 2009, Oleson et al. 2010, Kratofil et al. 2020).

With no observer programs for fisheries around the main Hawaiian Islands, evidence for fisheries interactions comes from indirect sources, including stranded animals and live individuals showing evidence of prior fishery interactions (e.g., Baird & Gorgone 2005, Kiszka et al. 2008, Moore & Barco 2013, Machernis et al. 2021). False killer whales are individually identified based on photographs of the dorsal fin and surrounding area (Baird et al. 2008). Baird & Gorgone (2005) documented dorsal fin disfigurements of three live animals, now known to be part of the MHI insular population, that were consistent with interactions with fishing gear. A more recent study used photos from 2000-2013 of all three recognized stocks and found that individuals from the MHI insular population had significantly higher rates of dorsal fin injuries that were consistent with fishery interactions than either the pelagic or NWHI populations (Baird et al. 2015). Additionally, the same study found that females have a higher rate of dorsal fin injuries consistent with fisheries interactions than males, and fisheries-related injury rates might vary by social cluster for the MHI population (Baird et al. 2015). Stack et al. (2019) reported bent dorsal fins in two out of 82 false killer whales documented off Maui, also thought to be from fisheries interactions.

Such injuries, typically to the leading edge of the dorsal fin, presumably originate when an animal is hooked in the mouth and struggles against the taut line, as is seen in observer video footage from the longline fishery (PIRO unpubl. data, see Baird & Gorgone 2005), although injuries to other areas of the body can also occur if an animal becomes entangled during the process. Presumably not all animals struggle in the same way after being hooked, and thus dorsal fin injuries are likely to represent only a subset of those individuals that survive hooking. Given that the majority of animals are likely hooked in the mouth, mouthline injuries caused by hooking may be a better representation of trends in hooking within and between populations, although head and mouth photos are often not available and frequently not matched to individual identifications.

Field efforts to photographically document false killer whales in Hawaiian waters have continued since the Baird et al. (2015) study, including research efforts by multiple independent groups and contributions from an increasing number of citizen scientists (Mahaffy et al. 2023). Additionally, new photos from 2000 through 2013 that were not originally included in the Baird et al. (2015) study have become available, so the current sample size of individual encounters available for assessment of fisheries-related injuries is roughly double what was utilized in the earlier study. In recent years, particularly with the increased availability of fast high-resolution digital cameras, efforts have been made to obtain head (and thus mouthline) photos that can be matched to individual identifications. Since the Baird et al. (2015) study, additional genetic samples are available to confirm sex of more individuals in all three populations, and research examining the social structure of MHI false killer whales has revealed that there are four social clusters within that population (Mahaffy et al. 2023), as compared to the previously recognized three (Baird et al. 2012).

This study characterizes evidence of fisheries interactions among false killer whales in Hawaiian waters, using this expanded dataset of dorsal fin and mouthline photographs and updated knowledge of false killer whale social structure. We assess interaction rates by population, sex, and, for the MHI insular population, by social cluster. In addition to assessing variation in injury rates among clusters, we also examine association patterns of individuals with and without fisheries-related injuries, to see if injured individuals preferentially associate. We also use information on the estimated age of individuals (Kratofil et al. in prep) to determine at what age individuals first begin interacting with fishing gear. Finally, we also determine whether the injuries observed are contemporary (i.e., from recent years), or a legacy of past interactions (e.g., from before the early 1990s, when longline fishing occurred closer to shore). Combined, these lines of investigation provide the best available data for interactions between MHI insular false killer whales and fisheries over the past two decades. We also provide suggestions for measures to reduce uncertainty and better understand the consequences of fishery interactions for these populations.

METHODS

Photographs of false killer whales available from 1999 to 2021 were used in this analysis (see Mahaffy et al. 2023). Following the protocol from Baird et al. (2008), encounters were sorted by individual and each individual assigned a dorsal fin distinctiveness rating: 1 = not distinctive, 2 = slightly distinctive, 3 = distinctive, 4 = very distinctive. Each sighting was also assigned a photo quality score between 1 and 4 (1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent), following Baird et al. (2008). Individuals were assigned to one of three stocks based on a combination of genetic results (Martien et al. 2014), location of sightings, satellite tag data (see Bradford et al. 2015), and associations. Groups of individuals for which insufficient information was available to determine stock were classified as unknown. Individuals from the MHI insular stock were further assigned to one of four social clusters based on Mahaffy et al. (2023). When possible, the sex of individuals was identified using genetic analysis of biopsy samples (Morin et al. 2005, Chivers et al., 2010), by the presence of neonates or small calves in close proximity, or by morphology (e.g., head shape, leading-edge dorsal fin hump, see Kratofil et al. in prep). Age classes (calf [neonate to <3 years], juvenile [≥ 3 to <6 years], sub-adult [≥ 6 to <10 years], or adult [10+ years]) were assigned to each sighting of each MHI individual based on a number of factors, including relative body size, year first documented, and morphology (Kratofil et al. in prep).

Each individual was assigned an age class confidence rating following Kratofil et al. (in prep) ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Only individuals with confidence ratings of 3 to 5 were used to assess the proportion of injuries among different age classes, but all available photos were used to identify when individuals that span multiple age classes first acquired injuries.

Dorsal fin and mouthline photos were examined for evidence of scarring or injuries following the protocol of Baird et al. (2015, 2017). Due to the large number of dorsal fin photos available, all dorsal fin photos were initially evaluated to identify sightings of individuals with damaged fins, for which representative photos of the injury, as well as photos pre-injury (when available), were compiled. For mouthline assessments, all available photos for each individual from each sighting were compiled for assessment, as there were relatively few to assess, details of mouthline injuries could easily be obscured by water or influenced by focus, and the majority of individuals had some form of scarring on the mouthline (whether from natural causes or fishery interactions) that merited assessment. For each sighting with mouthline photos available, the percentage of the mouthline visible for that sighting was estimated (e.g., 100% = entire view of both sides of mouthline, 50% = entire view of one side or portions of both sides of mouthline equating to 50% total). The compiled mouthlines for each sighting and dorsal fin photos of each potential injury were then scored by four reviewers as either "consistent", "possibly consistent", or "not consistent" with a fisheries interaction. All reviewers had previous experience in photo identification of false killer whales, as well as training in identifying injuries typical of fisheries interactions. A score was assigned to each potential dorsal fin injury, and to each sighting of the mouthline. If any reviewer felt they could not accurately assess a photo due to photo quality or other factors that obscured a clear view of the focal area, the reviewer scored the photo as "undeterminable", and these photos of a particular individual were removed from consideration in the analysis regardless of the number of reviewers that scored the photo as "undeterminable".

Scarring and injuries to the dorsal fin considered consistent with fisheries interactions included deep notches to the leading edge of the dorsal fin, often seen with linear scarring extending from the notch along the side of the fin, and linear cuts into the dorsal fin, likely to have been caused by a monofilament line. Dorsal fin disfigurements also considered consistent with fisheries interactions include missing, collapsed, or bent dorsal fins (Baird & Gorgone 2005). Evidence of injuries on the mouthline considered consistent with fisheries interactions included lacerations along the mouthline, white scar tissue indicating major damage, or tissue loss (i.e., notches along the mouthline or in the gape). Additionally, though not factored into the dorsal fin or mouthline scores, reviewers noted any additional scarring from other areas of the body that may be indicative of a previous fisheries interaction, such as scarring on the peduncle or pectoral fins indicative of potential line wrap injuries.

Each of the ratings for both dorsal fin and mouthline injuries were converted to a numerical score of 3 ("consistent"), 2 ("possibly consistent"), or 1 ("not consistent"). Following protocol from Baird et al. (2015), we calculated the mean of the four reviewer scores for each individual's dorsal fin and mouthline scores. For individuals with mouthline photos that were seen multiple times, we used the highest mean score available from all sightings. Higher scores for mouthlines typically occurred with better quality photos or when photos were available from both sides of the individual, and thus allowed for a more robust assessment of the cause of injuries. For all dorsal fins where no evidence of damage was noted during initial review (and for any dorsal fins not selected for review), an automatic mean highest score of 1 was assigned. This resulted in each individual having a single dorsal fin score, and each individual with mouthline photos of sufficient quality available also having a single mouthline score. We considered individuals with mean highest scores ≥ 2.5 for either dorsal fins or mouthlines to have injuries consistent with a fisheries interaction, and those with mean highest scores ≥ 2 but < 2.5 to have injuries that were possibly consistent with a fisheries interaction.

Various restrictions were applied during analysis to reduce bias (Table 1). For most analyses, we considered only individuals at least slightly distinctive at some point in their sighting history, in order to reduce the chance of mismatched identifications being included in the dataset. For the analyses of age class, non-distinctive individuals were included to minimize bias, as younger animals tend to be less distinctive. Additionally, age class analyses were restricted to individuals from the MHI stock, due to the limited sighting histories of most pelagic and NWHI animals. The dorsal fin analysis was also restricted to individuals with good or excellent photo quality (Table 1). For mouthline photos, all were considered except for those sightings with one or more "undeterminable" scores, which resulted in the removal of that sighting for assessment. To reduce negative bias from partial views, the mouthline analysis was restricted to cases where 50% or more of the entire mouthline was visible (i.e., at least one entire side of the mouthline, or proportions of both sides equivalent to at least 50% of the entire mouthline).

All statistical tests were performed in R v.4.2.1 (R Core Team 2022). To explore any potential confounding variables for dorsal fins, we assessed how the proportion of animals with consistent injuries varied between those individuals with photos of both or just one side of the dorsal fin, or with good versus excellent photo qualities, with a Fisher's exact test (using the fisher.test() function). For mouthlines, we evaluated how the proportion of the mouthline visible varied between stocks, social clusters, and sexes. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs were used to test for differences in proportion of the mouthline visible by stock and cluster, using the kruskal.test() function. A Mann-Whitney U test was used to test for differences between sexes in the proportion of mouthline visible by ID, using the wilcox.test() function. We also evaluated whether there was a difference in the proportion of mouthline visible between individuals with and without injuries with a Mann-Whitney U test. To test for differences in the frequency of fisheries interactions by stock, cluster membership, and sex, the proportion of individuals with injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions were compared using a Fisher's exact test. All statistical tests were two-tailed.

For individuals seen on more than one occasion, we examined the time-series of dorsal fin and mouthline photos available for each individual to identify the narrowest possible time frame for when the injury occurred (e.g., between year X and year Y). The most recent encounter an individual was seen without an injury prior to the first encounter the injury was documented was used as the lower bracket of the time frame the injury may have been acquired. Temporal evaluation of photos to identify when injuries most likely occurred used all available photos, including those from before 1999, regardless of photo quality or proportion of mouthline visible. Given the increased certainty surrounding the age of individuals documented as calves, juveniles, and sub-adults, we were able to use the ages of these individuals to narrow down the time frame for when individuals documented with injuries as calves, juveniles, and sub-adults acquired injuries. For these individuals, if they had no other information (e.g., no mouthline photos) available to assess the earliest year the individual could have acquired an injury, and had a high confidence age estimate (confidence rating of 3 or higher), we chose the year the individual was estimated to be one-year old to bracket the time frame the injury or injuries may have been acquired (see Kratofil et al. in prep), as we assume that animals less than one year of age are unlikely to interact with fishing gear. To assess whether there was an interaction between sex and age class (i.e., adult or non-adult), for known-sex individuals we determined the age class that fisheries-related injuries were first documented, or, when known, first acquired. Given the small sample size by class when broken down by sex we pooled calves, juveniles, and subadults as non-adults. For individuals that were first documented with fisheries-related injuries as adults, we examined the time series (when available) to determine whether injuries were acquired as an adult, versus those that could have been acquired as a non-adult but were first detected as an adult.

To examine association patterns and visualize the distribution of individuals with injuries consistent with fisheries interactions within the social network, we undertook analyses in SOCPROG 2.9 (Whitehead 2009) using MATLAB (MATLAB 2016) following the methodology of Mahaffy et al. (2023). In brief, we used a half-weight index (HWI) of association data to generate a social network. Association data were imported into Netdraw 2.1568 (Borgatti 2002) to generate social network diagrams. All individuals from the MHI population are linked together in the same component of the social network, but for both the NWHI and pelagic populations, multiple components (i.e., groups of individuals linked by association but not linked to other groups) are present. We examined the prevalence of injuries consistent with fishery interactions among components for the NWHI and pelagic populations. To compare social relationships of individuals with and without fisheries-related injuries, we used network measures from the weighted network for *strength* (the weighted-network equivalent of “degree” in a binary network that measures an individual’s gregariousness), *eigenvector centrality* (how well connected an individual is within a network), and *clustering coefficient* (a useful measure of individual sociality, see Croft et al. 2004, Whitehead 2008). We used the maximum HWI to assess the strength and connectivity of dyadic associations across the network using all three measures.

We used a Mantel test (Mantel 1967, Schnell 1985) to determine whether those with and without fisheries-related injuries differed in association strength, using 20,000 permutations. The Mantel test was restricted to individuals considered slightly distinctive or above with fair or better photo quality that were seen on five or more days. Because of the latter restriction, only individuals from the MHI population were included in this analysis. We also performed a sensitivity analysis on the Mantel test results (using the same set of restrictions above) for Cluster 1, the cluster with the largest sample size of identifications (see Mahaffy et al. 2023) to determine whether results were also representative within clusters.

RESULTS

Photos were available from 512 false killer whale sightings between 1999 and 2021. After restrictions (Table 1), there were 504 individuals with suitable dorsal fin photos (274 MHI, 87 NWHI, 134 pelagic, 9 unknown), and 201 individuals with suitable mouthline photos (154 MHI, 17 NWHI, 24 pelagic, 6 unknown). Of the 504 individuals with dorsal fin photos, 217 were assessed to determine source of injury (Table 2). Though not factored into the dorsal fin or mouthline scores, 29 individuals also had other evidence of possible fisheries interactions such as injuries to the peduncle or pectoral fins, of which only three had dorsal fin injuries, and only one (out of 16 with mouthline photos) had mouthline injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions.

Dorsal fin injuries

Forty-five of the 504 individuals assessed (8.7%) had their mean highest dorsal score by ID ≥ 2.5, i.e., they had injuries considered to be consistent with fisheries interactions (Table 3, Figure 1A-C). An additional individual with a mean highest dorsal score = 2.5 was included in age and date of injury assessments, though it did not meet the restrictions for inclusion in the stock, cluster, or sex analyses (Table 1). We were able to narrow down the range of years when initial injuries occurred for 21 individuals: 15 individuals using sighting history (i.e., for those individuals first documented prior to injury acquisition), and six individuals first documented with injuries as calves, juveniles, or sub-adults (with an age confidence rating of 3 or more) by using the year the individual was estimated to be 1-year old as the start of the range (Table 3). Seven of these 21 individuals had initial injuries occur in the first half of our study period (1999-2010), 12 acquired injuries in the second half (2011-2021), and two may have occurred in either half (Table 3).

In addition to the five individuals that were seen with amputated, collapsed, or bent dorsal fins prior to the start of the study (four from the MHI insular population and one from the pelagic population), we were able to document full or partial dorsal fin collapse for three more individuals, all from the MHI insular population. One individual (HIPc310) was documented with a relatively recent (i.e., unhealed) fishing line injury at the anterior insertion of the dorsal fin in October 2016. The injury had partially resolved by 2017, but was avulsed in 2021 (Figure 2). By February 2023, the dorsal fin of this individual had begun to collapse, apparently as a result of the injury (Figure 2). The dorsal fin of another individual (HIPc316), was partially severed at the base of the leading edge sometime between the fall of 1999 and July of 2008. When resighted in 2008 the dorsal fin had lost some structural integrity from the injury to the leading edge and had started to collapse over to the left side. When this individual was last sighted in 2015, the fin had fully collapsed. A third individual (HIPc398) was documented with a healed leading edge injury at the base of the fin when first seen in 2006. The individual was resighted in 2010 with two additional healed injuries higher up on the leading edge, one of which extended across the left side of the fin, causing the fin to bend to the left.

Evidence of repeated interactions with fisheries (from injuries to the dorsal fin acquired in separate years) was positively documented for four individuals from the MHI population, although this number is likely higher as several individuals had additional injuries considered possibly consistent with fishery interactions (see below). Five additional individuals, four from the MHI population and one from the pelagic population, were documented with multiple fishery-related injuries when first seen, making it unclear whether these injuries occurred during the same event or over several interactions: four individuals had multiple injuries to the leading edge of the fin, one had injuries to the leading and trailing edge of the fin and one had injuries to the leading edge of the fin and was also missing the tip of the fin, all of which were considered consistent with fishery interactions.

Another 43 individuals (8.5%) had mean highest dorsal fin scores by ID ≥ 2.0 but < 2.5, meaning that they had injuries considered to be possibly consistent with fisheries interactions (Table SA). In all cases, at least one reviewer scored the individual as consistent with fishery interactions. Injuries were similar to those considered consistent with fishery interactions but were more ambiguous in nature and included notches and dents to the leading edge or top of the fin, fresh or healed smooth cuts to the leading or trailing edge (sometimes impacting the sidewall of the fin), and severed or partially severed dorsal fin tips. Dorsal fin consistency score was relatively robust to availability of photos of just one versus both sides of the dorsal fin (Table SB, Fisher's exact test, $p = 1.0$), but injuries were more likely to have a lower fishery consistency score if photo quality was good rather than excellent (Table SC, Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.005$).

The proportion of individuals with dorsal fin injuries consistent with fisheries interactions varied by stock (Fisher's exact test, $p < 0.001$): 12.8% of all MHI individuals, 5.2% of pelagic stock individuals, and 1.1% of NWHI stock individuals (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 3A). Within clusters from the MHI stock, Cluster 3 had the highest rate (17.4%), almost three times the rate of Cluster 4 (6.0%), while Cluster 1 (13.0%) and Cluster 2 (11.6%) were intermediate, although these differences were not statistically significant (Table 2, Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.281$, Figure 4A).

Of the 504 individuals whose dorsal fins were assessed, sex was known for 243 (149 females, 94 males). Of the 45 individuals with injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions after restrictions, 26 were female (17.4% of all females), five were male (5.3% of all males), and 14 were of unknown sex (5.3% of all individuals of unknown sex, Table 3). The proportion of individuals with dorsal fin injuries differed by sex for individuals of known sex, with a significantly higher proportion of females with dorsal fin injuries (Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.005$, Figure 5A).

In total, 228 individuals from the MHI stock with dorsal fin photos were included in the age analyses. Individuals considered not distinctive were included and all photo quality restrictions were dropped in order to ensure the inclusion of as many age classes as were available. Just over half of the individuals ($n = 122$, 53.5%) were documented in only one age class, though 106 individuals (46.5%) were documented across multiple age classes. However, because the age class analyses were restricted to those individuals with age class confidence ratings of 3 or higher, only 20 individuals in this dataset had mean highest dorsal fin scores ≥ 2.5. Generally, dorsal fin scores increased with age class, with the first injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions appearing among calves (the earliest at a best estimated age of 2 years), and becoming more frequent with increasing age class (Table 4). Individuals documented only as adults made up almost half of individuals with injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions ($n = 9$, 45.0%). Among the individuals with injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions that were documented across multiple age classes ($n = 8$), four were first documented with injuries as adults, one as a sub-adult, one as a juvenile, and two as calves. There appeared to be an interaction between sex and the age class for when fisheries-related dorsal fin injuries were first detected. For males, similar proportions of adults and non-adults had fisheries-consistent dorsal fin injuries first detected during these age classes (5.7% of pooled calves, juveniles and subadults, versus 4.2% of adults; Table SD). For females, 4.8% of pooled calves, juveniles, and subadults were known to have acquired fisheries-consistent dorsal fin injuries, while 16.9% of adults had injuries first detected as adults (Table SD). The majority of adult females with injuries first detected as adults (seven of 10) were documented as adults prior to injury acquisition, but three may have acquired injuries either as an adult or a non-adult, given their sighting histories. For adult males, one of the two with injuries first documented as an adult was known to have acquired the injury as an adult, but the other could have been acquired either as an adult or non-adult.

Mouthline injuries

Overall, 30 of 201 individuals (15.4%) had mean highest mouthline scores by ID ≥ 2.5, and thus were considered to have injuries consistent with fisheries interactions (Table 5, Figure 1D-F). An additional individual with a mean highest dorsal score = 2.5 was included in age and date of injury assessments, but did not meet the restrictions for inclusion in the stock, cluster, or sex analyses (Table 1). Additionally, another 22 individuals (10.9%) had mean highest mouthline scores by ID ≥ 2 but < 2.5, meaning that they had injuries considered to be possibly consistent with fisheries interactions (Table SE). The proportion of mouthline visible by stock, MHI cluster, and sex were similar (Table SF). Individuals with injuries consistent with fishery interactions had a greater proportion of mouthline visible (median = 80%) than those with no injuries (median = 50%), although this was not statistically significant (Mann-Whitney U test, W = 3042.5, p = 0.079).

For all but three of the 30 individuals with mouthline injuries consistent with fisheries interactions, the injury was documented in the first mouthline photos of the injured region that were available, although we were able to narrow down the time frame of the injury for an additional five individuals that were calves, juveniles, or sub-adults when first seen (Table 5). Two of these injuries occurred in the first half of the study (1999-2010), three occurred in the second half (2011-2021), and the timing of the remaining three spanned the two periods. Injuries for two of the three from the second half were acquired sometime between 2018 and 2021 (Table 5).

The proportion of individuals with mouthline injuries consistent with fisheries interactions varied by stock – albeit not statistically significantly (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.161) - with 16.9% of individuals from the MHI stock (26 of 154 individuals), 10.7% of individuals from the pelagic stock (3 of 24), and zero percent from the NWHI stock (0 of 17 individuals, Table 2, Table 5, Figure 3B). Within clusters from the MHI stock, there was less variability in the proportion of individuals with mouthline injuries consistent with fishery interactions: Cluster 1 – 12.5%, Cluster 2 –12.9%, Cluster 3 – 21.8%, Cluster 4 – 17.9%, Table 2, Fisher's exact test, p = 0.628, Figure 4B). Of the 201 individuals that were assessed, sex was known for 114 (73 females, 41 males). Females had a slightly higher proportion of individuals with injuries consistent with fishery interactions (13 of 72, 17.8%) than males, although this finding was not statistically significant (5 of 41, 12.2% of all males, Fisher's exact test, p=0.594, Figure 5B).

A total of 188 individuals from the MHI stock with mouthline photos were included in the age analyses, as individuals considered not distinctive were included, and all photo quality restrictions were dropped in order to ensure that as many age classes as were available were assessed. Most individuals (n = 141, 75.0%) were only documented within one age class, with 47 individuals (25.0%) documented across multiple age classes (e.g., from juvenile to sub-adult, sub-adult to adult). However, because the age class analyses were restricted to those individuals with age class confidence ratings of 3 or higher, only 14 individuals had highest mouthlines scores ≥ 2.5. Injuries scored as consistent with fisheries interactions began to appear at the juvenile age class (the earliest at a best estimated age of 4 years), and became more frequent with increasing age class (Table 6). Of the 47 individuals documented across multiple age classes, seven were documented with injuries consistent with fishery interactions. Five of those seven were first documented with the injuries as sub-adults, with the remaining two individuals first documented injured as a juvenile or as an adult. The remaining seven individuals with mouthline injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions were documented only as adults. The interaction between sex and age class that was apparent for dorsal fin injuries did not appear to occur for mouthline injuries: for both males and females, the proportion of individuals that had injuries first detected as adults (8.1% males, 7.8% females) was similar to the proportion of injuries known to have been acquired as calves, juveniles or subadults (males 11.8%, females 8.0%, Table SD). For adult females, only one of four with injuries first documented as adults had been seen as an adult without the injury, while for adult males two of three were seen as adults without the injuries, indicating the individuals were adults when the injuries were acquired.

Individuals with both dorsal fin and mouthline scoring

Dorsal fin and mouthline scores were both available for 187 individuals (Table 7). Overall, approximately two-thirds (63.7%) had the same scores for both dorsal fin and mouthline, largely driven by consensus on which dorsal fins and mouthlines did not have injuries considered to be consistent with fishery interactions. Six individuals had both dorsal fin and mouthline injuries considered to be consistent with fisheries interactions, out of the 25 individuals with consistent dorsal fin injuries and 27 individuals with consistent mouthline injuries that had both score types available (Table 7). However, the median percentage of mouthline visible for those individuals with dorsal fin injuries ranged from 50 to 55% (Table SG); thus, many of these individuals may also have had mouthline injuries that were not detectable with available photographs.

Of the 187 individuals with both types of scores, 46 (24.6%) had either or both a dorsal fin or mouthline injury that was considered to be consistent with fishery interactions. The proportions of individuals with injuries varied significantly by stock, with 28.7% of MHI individuals, 11.7% of pelagic stock individuals, and no NWHI individuals with both score types available having an injury considered consistent with a fisheries interaction (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.010). Among MHI individuals, Cluster 3 had the greatest proportion of individuals with either or both injury types (38.2%), followed by Cluster 4 (25.9%), Cluster 1 (25.0%), and Cluster 2 (19.4%), though the proportion of individuals with injuries did not show statistically significant variation between clusters (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.274). Among the individuals with both score types of known sex (73 females, 43 males), the proportion of females with injuries (35.6%) was almost double the proportion of males with injuries (19.5%), although this was not statistically significant (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.060).

Association analyses

Individuals with injuries consistent with fishery interactions were found in the largest component of the NWHI population, in seven of the 17 isolated components of pelagic stock false killer whales, and in two of 11 components of individuals from an unknown population (Figure 6). Note, these unknown components range in size from one to three individuals, thus represent a small number of individuals overall (Figure 6). Within the MHI population, association rates between individuals with evidence of fishery interactions were similar to those without evidence of fisheries interactions (matrix correlation = 0.0200, t = 1.527, p = 0.1459 (2-sided test)), although it should be noted that only ~56% of individuals with dorsal fin photos also have mouthline photos, and thus many individuals may have fisheries-related injuries that we did not detect. Mean maximum association strength and overall interaction rates (i.e., *strength* or gregariousness), connectivity (i.e., *eigenvector centrality*), and individual sociality (i.e., *clustering coefficient*) between those with and without fishery interactions were also similar (Table SH), suggesting that the behavior that resulted in fishery-related injuries did not affect the number of associates or strength of associations. A sensitivity analysis on individuals from Cluster 1 supported results for the MHI population (matrix correlation = -0.022, t = -0.379, p = 0.7472 (2-sided test).

DISCUSSION

Our results showed that individuals from the endangered MHI population of false killer whales have higher rates of injuries consistent with fishery interactions than individuals from either the pelagic or NWHI stocks of false killer whales, and that interactions with fisheries are ongoing. This finding was consistent both for dorsal fin and mouthline injuries. In our earlier analysis of dorsal fin injuries of distinctive individuals and using an average score of >2.5 as the cutoff, 7.1% of individuals from the MHI stock, 1.3% of individuals from the pelagic stock, and 0% of individuals from the NWHI stock had injuries consistent with fisheries interactions (Baird et al. 2015). Rates of dorsal fin injuries consistent with fishery interactions in our current study, with much larger sample sizes for all three populations, are substantially higher (MHI – 12.8%, pelagic – 5.2%, NWHI – 1.1%). In our current study, we expanded our analyses to include slightly distinctive individuals, which theoretically should have reduced the overall proportion of individuals in the population with evidence of injuries from fishery interactions, particularly since such injuries typically make an individual much more distinctive. Our larger sample sizes provide a more robust assessment of trends in fisheries-related injuries among these three populations, and information that can be incorporated into future analyses of survival rates. However, the higher rates of fishery interactions that we have documented reflect that fishery interactions are ongoing. This is also demonstrated through our temporal evaluation of when injuries occurred; when considering either dorsal fin or mouthline injuries, slightly more occurred in the second half of our study period (2011-2021) than during the first. Two individuals with mouthline injuries known to have been acquired in the second half of our study period acquired those injuries between 2018 and 2021, demonstrating that fishery interactions are still ongoing.

Although the results are consistent with the Baird et al. (2015) study, the higher rates of fisheries-related injuries for the MHI stock than for the pelagic stock are unexpected, given that individuals from the pelagic population are known to regularly depredate bait and catch in the U.S. pelagic longline fishery (Thode et al. 2016, Bayless et al. 2017, Fader et al. 2021) and are occasionally hooked as a result (Forney et al. 2011). There are several possible reasons for this finding. First, it could be that individuals from the MHI population more regularly depredate fishing gear and are injured as a result. Evidence of repeated interactions with fisheries (from fisheries-related injuries to the dorsal fin acquired in separate years) for individuals from the MHI population suggests that interactions may be more frequent than previously thought. The fact that injury rates were relatively high in all four MHI clusters (Table 2, Figure 4), while many groups from the pelagic stock had no fisheries-related injuries (Figure 6) could also reflect that not all social groups from the pelagic stock regularly interact with and depredate catch. This is somewhat supported by analyses of satellite tag data from three different pelagic social groups in relation to logbook data from the U.S. deep-set longline fishery, where only one of the three groups appeared to approach fishing vessels and sets of longline gear in the water (Anderson et al. 2020). Our photo-identification catalog includes the vast majority of individuals from the MHI population, but a relatively small proportion of those estimated to be in the pelagic population (Bradford et al. 2020); thus, our sample of photos from the latter population is less representative of the population as a whole, and there may be un-photographed social groups from the pelagic population that have much higher rates of fisheries-related injuries. Second, it is possible that mortality or serious injury (i.e., an interaction that has a greater than 50% chance of leading to mortality, National Marine Fisheries Service 2022) may be higher in pelagic longline gear than in the typically lighter gear used in most nearshore fisheries, as suggested by Baird et al. (2015). Third, it is possible that pelagic false killer whales are more skilled at depredating bait or catch from gear, and thus less likely to be injured as a result. Finally, the more extensive sighting histories of individuals from the MHI population also likely contributes to the difference. Line injuries heal differently depending on the depth of the injury (Figure 2). In the example shown in Figure 2, a shallow fresh line injury is visible above a more profound leading-edge injury (Figure 2A). By the time these injuries have fully healed and repigmented, the shallow line injury is barely visible (Figure 2C, F). Since most wounds repigment in false killer whales, having photos of an individual from multiple encounters within or between years increases the likelihood of being able to detect injuries before they are completely healed, with information to assess the origin of the injury. The possible reasons for the differences among stocks are not mutually exclusive, and all may contribute to the higher rate of injuries for the MHI population. Continued efforts to obtain both mouthline and dorsal fin photos of sufficient quality from pelagic stock false killer whales are needed to reduce uncertainty and better understand the possible causes of this difference. One potential source of photos of pelagic false killer whales are fisheries observers or crew on pelagic longline vessels, and obtaining photos from these sources would be of long-term value for reducing uncertainty.

The relative lack of injuries consistent with fisheries interactions for the NWHI population (1.1% for dorsal fin injuries, 0% for mouthline injuries, albeit with a small sample size of mouthline photos) compared to the MHI population is as expected, given the relative levels of fishing effort in the core ranges of the two populations (Kittinger et al. 2010, Baird et al. 2021). Prior to 1980, foreign longline fishing effort did occur around the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (Yong & Wetherall, 1980). Starting in October 1991, longline fishing was excluded within 50 nautical miles of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands to protect Hawaiian monk seals (*Monachus schauinslandi*), and since June 2011, all commercial fishing for pelagic species (e.g., from trolling) and for bottomfish has been prohibited. The two populations do overlap off Kauaʻi and Niʻihau (Baird 2016, Kratofil et al. 2023), but there is limited fishing effort there compared to elsewhere in the main Hawaiian Islands (McCoy et al. 2018, Baird et al. 2021). Based on both sighting rates and satellite tag data, that area is also not a high use area for either population (Baird 2016), although information on space use is comparatively limited for the NWHI stock (Baird et al. 2013, Kratofil et al. 2023). This is due to the fact that the main Hawaiian Islands are more accessible for small-boat dedicated research efforts than the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, which also contributes to the limited NWHI stock sightings overall and re-sightings of NWHI individuals in our study. Our sample of individuals from the NWHI population (87 with dorsal fins assessed) is relatively small compared to the most recent abundance estimate for the population (477 individuals, CV=1.71, Bradford et al. 2020). Thus, it is possible that we have missed entire social groups with varying levels (either higher or lower) of fisheries-related injuries. The majority of biological research within Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument is not focused on cetaceans, but other boat-based research efforts may serve as platforms-of-opportunity for obtaining photographs that could be used to assess the presence of injuries on individuals in this population. Continued efforts to expand satellite-tag datasets for this stock (Baird et al. 2013) will be particularly valuable for understanding how different social groups overlap with fisheries effort, in addition to dedicated large- or small-boat research efforts to photographically document this population.

As expected, since most hookings likely occur in the mouth and only a subset of individuals end up struggling in such a way that they would also acquire line injuries on the dorsal fin, we found higher proportions of individuals with mouthline than dorsal fin injuries for both the MHI insular and pelagic populations (e.g., 16.9% versus 12.8% for mouthline and dorsal fin injuries for the MHI insular population). This was not the case for NWHI stock individuals, but the sample size of individuals with mouthline photos (n=17) was small relative to the total number of individuals with dorsal fin photos (n=87). However, our estimates based on mouthline injuries are negatively biased, since mouthline injuries tend to be visible from only one side, and photographs of the entire mouthline are rarely available (the median percentage of mouthline visible for individuals considered in these analyses was only 60% for MHI and NWHI individuals, and 50% for pelagic stock individuals, Table SF). Attempting to obtain both left and right side head photos in future research efforts will help reduce this bias, and the potential confounding effect it may have on analyses when individuals with injuries are incorrectly being treated as not having injuries. Additionally, it may be worth expanding analyses to include other areas of the body that are likely to bear injuries from fisheries interactions, such as the peduncle and pectoral fins. While we made note of instances where such injuries were readily visible, we did not systematically quantify them, partially due to limited availability of high-quality images of these areas. Collecting high-quality underwater video footage of animals will likely improve the availability of complete views of not only mouthlines, but also the pectoral fins, peduncle, and fluke.

Our analyses of sex bias in the likelihood of acquiring such injuries showed that females were significantly more likely to have fisheries-related dorsal fin injuries than males (17.4% versus 5.3%), accounting for the difference in the number of known females versus males. There was a similar trend for mouthline injuries (17.8% for females versus 12.2% for males), although this difference was not statistically significant. Interestingly, at least for dorsal fin injuries there appears to be an interaction between age and sex. For males, adults and non-adults acquired dorsal fin injuries consistent with fisheries interactions at similar rates, while for females, the likelihood of acquiring dorsal fin injuries was much higher for adults (Table SD). False killer whales are sexually dimorphic as adults, with adult females being about 83-84% of the length of adult males (Ferreira et al. 2014). Baird et al. (2015) speculated that this larger size may allow adult males to break free from gear without struggling in a way that might lead to dorsal fin injuries. For our analyses we considered individuals to be adults when they are sexually mature, at 10 years of age, but false killer whales continue to grow until about 25 years of age (Ferreira et al. 2014). Additionally, our analyses of the age at which individuals first acquire such injuries suggest that some males may be interacting with fishing gear at much younger ages (i.e., as sub-adults), well before sexually-dimorphic body size differences would be apparent. Thus, it is unlikely that body size differences leading to a reduced likelihood of dorsal fin injuries for adult males is entirely responsible for this difference. Why the difference exists for dorsal fin injuries but not for mouthline injuries is unclear. As suggested by Baird et al. (2015), it is possible that the higher energetic needs of females that are pregnant or lactating may influence their likelihood of depredating catch. However, among some odontocete populations, adult males have been shown to have higher rates of interaction with fishing gear and anthropogenic markings than adult females, suggesting that such demographic trends are likely species or potentially even population specific (Powell & Wells 2011, Adimey et al. 2014, Feyrer et al. 2021). Among all stocks of Hawaiian false killer whales, sex is known for approximately half of the individuals. Confirming sex of more individuals using genetic methods (Morin et al. 2005) would be of value to better understand the interactions between sex and age in relation to the likelihood of interacting with fisheries.

Findings from the age analyses indicate that false killer whales begin interacting with fisheries at younger ages, which aligns with what would be expected given the importance of group hunting in this species. Social learning is an important part of many odontocete societies, including killer whales (*Orcinus* spp.), where cultural transmission of foraging strategies and knowledge of hunting grounds is conferred to other members of the community by example and learned through imitation (Foote et al. 2016). False killer whales are known to engage in communal hunting and prey sharing, a behavior thought to reinforce cultural and social bonds among individuals by sharing knowledge of hunting strategies with younger members of the community (Baird 2016). Thus, cultural transmission of high-risk, high-reward behavior such as depredating catch off fishing lines is likely. False killer whale calves, which are slow to mature and require significant maternal investment, likely engage in prolonged social learning of hunting practices, watching adults before participating themselves. In observer data from the offshore longline fishery, smaller individuals are frequently recorded as hooked or entangled (Bradford & Forney 2016). While it is unknown how many younger animals are killed during interactions with fisheries, they are clearly exposed to and at least occasionally engage with fisheries from a young age. However, it is difficult to confirm whether such cultural transmission is occurring using quantitative approaches (e.g., Hasenjager et al. 2020), as our knowledge of which individuals are interacting with fisheries is limited to only those individuals who have obtained easily visible external injuries from these interactions. Further, our knowledge of when these injuries occur is constrained by sampling effort, photo quality, and ability to obtain high quality images of the injured area, particularly mouthlines. Future efforts to estimate the age structure of these populations (at the very least, the MHI stock) are imperative to understanding how serious injury and mortality of young individuals may impact overall population dynamics.

While the information on evidence of fisheries interactions through photographic methods, as documented here, is valuable for monitoring efforts, there are a number of limitations of such indirect methods. Most notably, not all individuals who interact with fisheries and survive may have clear evidence of such interactions that we are able to capture with photographs. Unlike some closely related species (e.g., pygmy killer whales (*Feresa attenuata*), Baird 2016), external injuries on false killer whales typically repigment to the original skin color as they heal; thus, in order for a fishery interaction to be visible once fully healed, there must be some degree of permanent disfigurement or tissue loss (Figure 2). This wound healing and repigmenting process obscures the origin of smaller, less invasive injuries, biasing the assessment of fishery interactions toward a narrow band of more profound interactions that are more likely to result in serious injury but not mortality. As noted previously, fisheries-related injuries to the dorsal fin were more likely to be documented for individuals with excellent quality photos (Table SC), yet our analyses also include those only with good quality photos, thus our estimates of dorsal fin injury rates are likely negatively biased across all groups. Additionally, aspects of how data collection has changed over the study period limits our ability to draw firm conclusions about temporal trends in injury rates, particularly for mouthline injuries, as high quality mouthline photos were more frequently available after the switch from film to digital cameras in the field in the early 2000s. More importantly, this methodology only represents individuals that survive fisheries interactions. Thus, while fisheries-related injuries may provide an indication of how widespread hooking is among the populations and how it varies by sex and social cluster, they do not directly address bycatch rates per se. While beyond the scope of this study, information on which individuals are known to have evidence of prior fisheries interactions could be used to compare survival or reproduction of those with and without fisheries-related injuries. However, it is important to note that many individuals in the “without evidence” category may have cryptic injuries that were not detected, due to a lack of or limited mouthline photos, or only good quality (versus excellent quality) dorsal fin photos.

Additional strategies to supplement photographic monitoring include analysis of space use and movements from satellite tagging in relation to fisheries, which has been informative for Hawaiian false killer whales (Anderson et al. 2020, Baird et al. 2021, Fader et al. 2021). However, without the precise locations of fishing vessels, inference from satellite tagging methods is generally limited to broad scale overlap (e.g., Baird et al. 2021) and, for rarely encountered populations (e.g., pelagic, NWHI), only a small sample size of tagged animals are available to infer associations with fisheries (Anderson et al. 2020, Fader et al. 2021). Visual monitoring methods would be the most direct, informative approach for understanding how false killer whales interact with fishing gear and from which solutions can be more effectively developed. Observer monitoring programs are commonly implemented for monitoring marine mammal bycatch, although these are costly and observer coverage is often only a small proportion of the actual operating fleet. Observers are placed on U.S. longline vessels that operate within the range of the pelagic false killer whale stock; however, at the existing coverage (20% in recent years, but decreasing to ~13% in 2024), information on the nature of interactions remains limited. Observer coverage in the range of the endangered MHI stock – the population with the highest rates of injuries consistent with fisheries interactions – is nonexistent, which creates a barrier to understanding the full extent of risk that fisheries pose to the declining population. Electronic monitoring programs have gained recent attention for their cost efficiency and ability to document bycatch across a broader proportion of the fleet (e.g., Kindt-Larsen et al. 2012). Given our results, some form of monitoring (observers and/or electronic monitoring) is warranted for nearshore fisheries that overlap with the endangered MHI false killer whale population. There are over a thousand commercially licensed fishermen in Hawaiʻi, as well as a large number of non-commercial (i.e., recreational or subsistence) fishermen, and choosing how such monitoring should be allocated will be difficult. Baird et al. (2021) developed an index of overlap between false killer whales and commercial fishermen, using whale satellite tag data and commercial marine license data for fishing effort, and identified areas where individual fishermen are likely to have higher interaction rates. Given likely limited monitoring resources, it would be prudent to monitor fisheries in areas where the interaction rates are likely to be highest.

Efforts to reduce bycatch in the Hawaiʻi-based longline fishery since 2013 have largely been ineffective (Oleson et al. 2023). For the main Hawaiian Islands insular population, fisheries-related efforts have been limited to outreach and education, providing information to help fishers discriminate between false killer whales and other similar species (i.e., pygmy killer whales, melon headed whales *Peponocephala electra*, and short-finned pilot whales *Globicephala macrorhynchus*), and encouraging fishers to move out of the area when false killer whales are present. In spite of these efforts, we have demonstrated that fisheries interactions are ongoing for the endangered main Hawaiian Islands population and a large proportion of the population appears to interact with fishing gear. Individuals begin to acquire fisheries-related injuries at young ages, and new injuries have continued to be documented across the past 20 years, including repeated injuries for some individuals. We have also demonstrated that the impacts of bycatch are not evenly distributed between or even within stocks, which carries implications for population dynamics and should be taken into account by managers. Continued resources should be dedicated to monitoring the impacts of fishery interactions among Hawaiian false killer whales, both through indirect studies such as the analysis presented here, and through direct monitoring via observer coverage or electronic monitoring.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many other researchers and community scientists contributed photographs used in these analyses and we particularly want to thank Chuck Babbitt, Colin Cornforth, Captain Zodiac, Cynthia Hankins, Mark Deakos, Dolphin Excursions, Paul Johnson, Lynn Opritoiu, Doug Perrine, Daniel J. McSweeney, Deron Verbeck, and Kimberly Wood. Funding for photo analyses was provided by grants from the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC) to Cascadia Research Collective (CRC) and a contract from the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center to Cascadia Scientific Services LLC. Photos were collected under NMFS Scientific Research Permits 926, 731-1509, 731-1774, 15330 and 20605 (issued to CRC), 774-1437, 774-1714, and 14097 (issued to Southwest Fisheries Science Center), 20311 and 15420 (issued to PIFSC), as well as GA21, 468-1574, LOC13427, 16479, LOC18101, and 21321 (issued to Pacific Whale Foundation). Thanks to Stephen Raverty for feedback on wound healing. We also thank Jason Baker and members of the Pacific Scientific Review Group for helpful comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

Adimey NM, Hudak CA, Powell JR, Bassos-Hull K and others (2014) Fishery gear interactions from stranded bottlenose dolphins, Florida manatees and sea turtles in Florida, U.S.A.. Mar Pollut Bull 81:103-115

Anderson D, Baird RW, Bradford AL, Oleson EM (2020) Is it all about the haul? Pelagic false killer whale interactions with longline fisheries in the central North Pacific. Fish Res 230:105665

Badger JJ, Baird, RW, Johnson DS, Bradford AL and others (2024) Accounting for spatiotemporal sampling bias in a long-term dataset establishes a decline in abundance of endangered false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in the main Hawaiian Islands. Document PSRG_2024_06 submitted to the Pacific Scientific Review Group

Baird RW, Gorgone AM, McSweeney DJ, Webster DL and others (2008) False killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian Islands: long-term site fidelity, inter-island movements, and association patterns. Mar Mamm Sci 24:591-612

Baird RW (2009) A review of false killer whales in Hawaiian waters: biology, status, and risk factors. Report prepared for the US Marine Mammal Commission under Order No. E40475499, Cascadia Research Collective, Olympia, WA

Baird, RW (2016) The lives of Hawai‘i’s dolphins and whales: natural history and conservation. University of Hawai‘i Press, Honolulu, HI

Baird RW, Gorgone AM (2005) False killer whale dorsal fin disfigurements as a possible indicator of long-line fishery interactions in Hawaiian waters. Pac Sci 59:593-601

Baird RW, Hanson MB, Schorr GS, Webster DL and others (2012) Range and primary habitats of Hawaiian insular false killer whales: informing determination of critical habitat. Endang Species Res 18:47-61

Baird RW, Oleson EM, Barlow J, Ligon AD, Gorgone AM, Mahaffy SD (2013) Evidence of an island-associated population of false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Pac Sci 67:513-521.

Baird RW, Mahaffy SD, Gorgone AM, Cullins T and others (2015) False killer whales and fisheries interactions in Hawaiian waters: evidence for sex bias and variation among populations and social groups. Mar Mamm Sci 31:579-590

Baird RW, Mahaffy SD, Gorgone AM, Beach KA and others (2017) Updated evidence of interactions between false killer whales and fisheries around the main Hawaiian Islands: assessment of mouthline and dorsal fin injuries. Document PSRG-2017-16 submitted to the Pacific Scientific Review Group

Baird RW (2018) *Pseudorca crassidens* (errata version published in 2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018:e.T18596A145357488

Baird RW, Anderson DB, Kratofil MA, Webster DL (2021) Bringing the right fishermen to the table: indices of overlap between endangered false killer whales and nearshore fisheries in Hawai‘i. Biol Conserv 255:108975

Baird RW, Cornforth CJ, Mahaffy SD, Lerma JK, Harnish AE, Kratofil MA (2023) Field studies and analyses from 2020 through 2022 to support the cooperative conservation and long-term management of main Hawaiian Islands insular false killer whales. Report to the State of Hawai‘i Board of Land and Natural Resources, under Contract No. 68819. Cascadia Research Collective, Olympia, WA

Bayless AR, Oleson EM, Baumann-Pickering S, Simonis AE, Marchetti J, Martin S, Wiggins SM (2017) Acoustically monitoring the Hawai‘i longline fishery for interactions with false killer whales. Fish Res 190:122-131

Boggs CH, Ito RY (1993) Hawaii’s pelagic fisheries. Mar Fish Rev 55:69-82

Borgatti SP (2002). NetDraw software for network visualization. Analytic Technologies, Lexington, KY

Bradford AL, Forney KA (2016) Injury determinations for marine mammals observed interacting with Hawaii and American Samoa longline fisheries during 2009-2013. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-50

Bradford AL, Oleson EM, Baird RW, Boggs CH, Forney KA, Young NC (2015) Revised stock boundaries for false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in Hawaiian waters. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-47

Bradford AL, Becker EA, Oleson EM, Forney KA, Moore JE, Barlow J (2020) Abundance estimates of false killer whales in Hawaiian waters and the broader central Pacific. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-104

Carretta JV, Oleson EM, Forney KA, Weller DW and others (2023) U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments: 2022. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-684

Chivers SJ, Baird RW, Martien KM, Taylor BL and others (2010) Evidence of genetic differentiation for Hawai‘i insular false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-458

Croft DP, Krause J, James R (2004) Social networks in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). Proc R Soc B 271:516-S519

Davidson AD, Boyer AG, Kim H, Pompa-Mansilla S and others (2012) Drivers and hotspots of extinction risk in marine mammals. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109:3395-3400

Fader JE, Baird RW, Bradford AL, Dunn DC, Forney KA, Read AJ (2021) Patterns of depredation in the Hawai‘i deep-set longline fishery informed by fishery and false killer whale behavior. Ecosphere 12:e03682

Ferreira IM, Kasuya T, Marsh H, Best PB (2014) False killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) from Japan and South Africa: differences in growth and reproduction. Mar Mamm Sci 30:64-84

Feyrer LJ, Stewart M, Yeung J, Soulier C, Whitehead H (2021) Origin and persistence of markings in a long-term photo-identification dataset reveal the threat of entanglement for endangered northern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*). Front Mar Sci 8:620804

Foote A, Vijay N, Ávila-Arcos M, Baird RW and others (2016) Genome-culture coevolution promotes rapid divergence of killer whale ecotypes. Nat Commun 7:11693

Forney KA, Kobayashi DR, Johnston DW, Marchetti JA, Marsik MG (2011) What's the catch? Patterns of cetacean bycatch and depredation in Hawaii-based pelagic longline fisheries. Mar Ecol 32:380-391

Glazier EW (2007) Hawaiian fishermen. Wadsworth-Cengage Publishers, Belmont, CA

Hamer DJ, Childerhouse SJ, Gales NJ (2012) Odontocete bycatch and depredation in longline fisheries: a review of available literature and potential solutions. Mar Mamm Sci 28:E345-E374

Hasenjager MJ, Leadbeater E, Hoppitt W (2020) Detecting and quantifying social transmission using network-based diffusion analysis. J Anim Ecol 90:8-26

He X, Bigelow KA, Boggs CH (1997) Cluster analysis of longline sets and fishing strategies within the Hawaii-based fishery. Fish Res 31:147-158

Jog K, Sutaria D, Diedrich A, Grech A, Marsh H (2022) Marine mammal interactions with fisheries: review of research and management trends across commercial and small-scale fisheries. Front Mar Sci 9:758013

Kindt-Larsen L, Dalskov J, Stage B, Larsen F (2012) Observing incidental harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* bycatch by remote electronic monitoring. Endang Species Res 19:75-83

Kiszka J, Pelourdeau D, Ridoux V (2008) Body scars and dorsal fin disfigurements as indicators of interaction between small cetaceans and fisheries around the Mozambique Channel Island of Mayotte. West Indian Ocean J Mar Sci 7:185-193

Kittinger JN, Duin KN, Wilcox BA (2010) Commercial fishing, conservation and compatibility in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Mar Policy 34:208-217

Kratofil MA, Ylitalo GM, Mahaffy SD, West KL, Baird RW (2020) Life history and social structure as drivers of persistent organic pollutant levels and stable isotopes in Hawaiian false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). Sci Total Environ 46:35-48

Kratofil MA, Harnish AE, Mahaffy SD, Henderson EE and others (2023) Biologically important areas II for cetaceans within U.S. and adjacent waters — Hawai‘i region. Front Mar Sci 10:1053581

Kratofil MA, Mahaffy SD, Martien KK, Archer FI, West KL, Baird RW (In prep) Deriving probabilistic age estimates using common photo-identification catalog information: an application to endangered Hawaiian false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*).

Lewison RL, Crowder LB, Wallace BP, Moore JE and others (2014) Global patterns of marine mammal, seabird, and sea turtle bycatch reveal taxa-specific and cumulate megafauna hotspots. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 111:5271-5276

Machernis AF, Stack SH, Olson GL, Sullivan FA, Currie JJ (2021) External scarring as an indicator of fisheries interactions with bottlenose (*Tursiops truncatus*) and pantropical spotted (*Stenella attenuata*) dolphins in Maui Nui, Hawai‘i. Aquat Mamm 47:482-498

Mahaffy SD, Baird RW, Harnish AE, Cullins T and others (2023) Identifying social clusters of endangered main Hawaiian Islands false killer whales. Endang Species Res 51:249-268

Mantel N (1967) The detection of disease clustering and a generalized regression approach. Cancer Res 27:209-220.

Martien KK, Chivers SJ, Baird RW, Archer FI and others (2014) Nuclear and mitochondrial patterns of population structure in North Pacific false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*). J Hered 105:611-626

MATLAB (2016) version 9.1.0.441655 (R2016b). The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA

McCoy KS, Williams ID, Friedlander AM, Ma H, Teneva L, Klittinger JN (2018) Estimating nearshore coral reef-associated fisheries production from the main Hawaiian Islands. PLOS ONE 13: e0195840

Mitchell JD, McLean DL, Collin SP, Langlois TJ (2018) Shark depredation in commercial and recreational fisheries. Rev Fish Biol Fish 28:715-748

Moore KT, Barco SG (2013) Handbook for recognizing, evaluating, and documenting human interactions in stranded cetaceans and pinnipeds. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-SWFSC-510

Morin PA, Nestler A, Rubio-Cisneros NT, Robertson KM, Mesnick SL (2005) Interfamilial characterization of a region of the ZFX and ZFY genes facilitates sex determination in cetaceans and other mammals. Mol Ecol 14:3275–3286

National Marine Fisheries Service (2022) Guidelines for distinguishing serious from non-serious injury of marine mammals pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. NMFS Service Procedure 02-238-01

Nitta ET, Henderson JR (1993) A review of interactions between Hawaii's fisheries and protected species. Mar Fish Rev 55:83-92

Oleson EM, Boggs CH, Forney KA, Hanson MB and others (2010) Status review of Hawaiian insular false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) under the Endangered Species Act. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFS- 22

Oleson EM, Bradford AL, Martien KK (2023) Developing a management area for Hawai'i pelagic false killer whales. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-150

Powell JR, Wells RS (2011) Recreational fishing depredation and associated behaviors involving common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. Mar Mamm Sci 27:111-129

Pryor K (1975) Lads before the wind – diary of a dolphin trainer. Sunshine Books, North Bend, WA

R Core Team (2022) R: a language and environment for statistical computing (version 4.2.1). R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna

Read AJ (2008) The looming crisis: interactions between marine mammals and fisheries. J Mammal 89:541-548

Reeves RR, Leatherwood S, Baird RW (2009) Evidence of a possible decline since 1989 in false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian Islands. Pac Sci 63:253-261

Schnell GD, Watt DJ, Douglas M E (1985) Statistical comparison of proximity matrices: applications in animal behaviour. Ani Behav 33:239–253.

Shallenberger EW (1981) The status of Hawaiian cetaceans. U.S. Marine Mammal Commission Report No. MMC-77/23

Silva IF, Kaufman GD, Rankin RW, Maldini D (2013) Presence and distribution of Hawaiian false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) in Maui County waters: a historical perspective. Aquat Mamm 39:409-414

Stack SH, Currie JJ, McCordic JA, Olson GL (2019) Incidence of odontocetes with dorsal fin collapse in Maui Nui, Hawaii. Aquat Mamm 45:257-265.

Thode A, Wild L, Straley J, Barnes D and others (2016) Using line acceleration to measure false killer whale (Pseudorca crassidens) click and whistle source levels during pelagic longline depredation. J Acoust Soc Am 140:3941-3951

Turvey ST, Pitman RL, Taylor BL, Barlow J and others (2007) First human-caused extinction of a cetacean species? Biol Lett 3:537-540.

Wade PR, Long KJ, Francis TB, Punt AE and others (2021) Best practices for assessing and managing bycatch of marine mammals. Front Mar Sci 8:757330

Whitehead H (2008) Analyzing animal societies: quantitative methods for vertebrate social analysis. Chicago University Press, Chicago, IL.

Whitehead H (2009) SOCPROG programs: Analysing animal social structures. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 63:765–778

Ylitalo GM, Baird RW, Yanagida GY, Webster DL and others (2009) High levels of persistent organic pollutants measured in blubber of island-associated false killer whales (*Pseudorca crassidens*) around the main Hawaiian Islands. Mar Pollut Bull 58:1932-19

Yong MYY, Wetherall JA (1980) Estimates of the catch and effort by foreign tuna longliners and baitboats in the fishery conservation zone of the central and western Pacific, 1965-77. NOAA Tech Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-2

Table 1. Summary of restrictions applied for different analyses of false killer whale dorsal fins and mouthlines.

Analysis	Restrictions
Dorsal fin – Stock	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, good or excellent photo quality, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals from known stocks
Dorsal fin – MHI cluster	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, good or excellent photo quality, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals from the MHI stock
Dorsal fin – Sex	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, good or excellent photo quality, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals of known sex
Dorsal fin – Age class	Only individuals seen in 1999 or later, individuals from the MHI stock, age class confidence ratings ≥ 3
Dorsal fin – Date injury occurred	None
Mouthline – Stock	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, > 50% of mouthline visible, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals from known stocks
Mouthline – MHI cluster	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, > 50% of mouthline visible, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals from the MHI stock
Mouthline – Sex	1999-2021, no "undeterminable" scores, > 50% of mouthline visible, highest distinctiveness > 1, individuals of known sex
Mouthline – Age class	Only individuals seen in 1999 or later, individuals from the MHI stock, age class confidence ratings ≥ 3
Mouthline – Date injury occurred	None

Table 2. Summary of false killer whale fishery interaction assessments by stock (and by cluster for the main Hawaiian Islands (MHI) population), using photos from 1999 through 2021. Numbers represent unique photo-identified individuals. Individuals considered not distinctive are not included. Dorsal fin numbers are restricted to individuals with good or better photo quality, and mouthlines are restricted to individuals with 50% or more of the mouthline visible in at least one sighting.

Stock	MHI cluster	# with dorsal fins assessed	# (%) with dorsal fin injuries consistent with fishery interactions	# (%) with dorsal fin injuries possibly consistent with fishery interactions	# with mouthlines assessed	# (%) with mouthline injuries consistent with fishery interactions	# (%) with mouthline injuries possibly consistent with fishery interactions	# with both dorsal fin and mouthline assessed	# (%) with both or either type of injury considered consistent with fishery interactions, of those individuals with both areas assessed
MHI	All	274	35 (12.8%)	37 (13.5%)	154	26 (16.9%)	17 (10.4%)	153	44 (28.7%)
MHI	1	69	9 (13.0%)	9 (13.0%)	40	5 (12.5%)	6 (15.0%)	40	10 (25.0%)
MHI	2	69	8 (11.6%)	10 (14.5%)	31	4 (12.9%)	0 (0.0%)	31	6 (19.4%)
MHI	3	86	15 (17.4%)	14 (16.3%)	55	12 (21.8%)	10 (18.2%)	55	21 (38.2%)
MHI	4	50	3 (6.0%)	4 (8.0%)	28	5 (17.9%)	1 (3.6%)	27	7 (25.9%)
NWHI	-	87	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	17	0 (0.0)%	3 (17.6%)	16	0 (0.0%)
Pelagic	-	134	7 (5.2%)	4 (3.0%)	24	3 (10.7%)	2 (7.1%)	17	2 (11.7%)
Unknown	-	9	2 (22.2%)	1 (11.1%)	6	1 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1	0 (0.0%)
All stocks	-	504	45 (8.9%)	43 (8.5%)	201	30 (14.9%)	21 (10.4%)	187	46 (24.6%)

Table 3. Stock, main Hawaiian Island (MHI) cluster, and sex classifications for individual false killer whales with dorsal fin injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions**,** using photos from 1999 through 2021. All individuals were seen in 1999 or later, and all but one individual included as consistent in only the age analysis (indicated with a ^) had no "undeterminable" scores, good or excellent photo quality, and a highest distinctiveness rating of >1. Dorsal fins are restricted to sightings with good or better photo quality. The date range when the injury occurred is noted. "Before" dates represent individuals that had injuries present the first time these individuals were photographically documented. Individuals documented with fisheries-related injuries from more than one interaction are listed multiple times, with subsequent date ranges noted in italics.

ID	**Stock**	**MHI cluster**	**Sex**	**Mean highest dorsal score**	**Best estimate of when injury occurred based on photos**
HIPc120	MHI	1	Female	3.00	Between 8-Nov-2007 and 26-Jun-2008
HIPc127	MHI	1	Unknown	3.00	Before 18-Feb-2000
HIPc134	MHI	1	Female	3.00	Between 8-Sep-2007 and 16-Jul-2008
HIPc203*	MHI	1	Female	2.75	Between 1996 and 21-Jan-2004
HIPc203	*MHI*	*1*	*Female*	*2.75*	*Between 26-Jun-2008 and 26-Jul-2008*
HIPc310	MHI	1	Female	3.00	Between 16-Nov-2015 and 8-Oct-2016
HIPc310	*MHI*	*1*	*Female*	*3.00*	*Between 2-Nov-2021 and 16-Nov-2021*
HIPc316	MHI	1	Female	3.00	Between 4-Aug-1999 and 16-Jul-2008
HIPc114	MHI	1	Male	3.00	Between 17-Apr-2014 and 1-Jan-2015
HIPc132[+]	MHI	1	Male	2.50	Before 5-Feb-1999
HIPc118[+]	MHI	1	Unknown	3.00	Before 16-May-1990
HIPc220	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Before 7-Aug-2005
HIPc220	*MHI*	*2*	*Female*	*3.00*	*Between 6-Jun-2015 and 8-Oct-2019*
HIPc222[+]	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Before 7-Aug-2005
HIPc230	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Between 8-Jul-1987 and 22-Oct-2005
HIPc231	MHI	2	Unknown	2.75	Between 14-Aug-2010 and 20-Sep-2016
HIPc398	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Before 23-Nov-2006
HIPc398	*MHI*	*2*	*Female*	*3.00*	*Between 23-Nov-2006 and 14-Aug-2020*
HIPc011	MHI	2	Unknown	2.50	Before 11-Nov-1987
HIPc662*	MHI	2	Unknown	3.00	Between 2013 and 6-Jun-2015
HIPc723*	MHI	2	Unknown	2.50	Between 2015 and 12-Oct-2017
HIPc155	MHI	3	Female	2.50	Between 11-Dec-2010 and 26-Oct-2011
HIPc166	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Before 26-May-2003
HIPc170	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Before 26-May-2003
HIPc171	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Between 22-Nov-2016 and 07-May-2019
HIPc173	MHI	3	Female	2.50	Between 26-May-2003 and 13-Sep-2004
HIPc177	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Before 26-May-2003
HIPc186	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Before 29-Mar-1999
HIPc357	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Between 08-Oct-2017 and 04-Nov-2017
HIPc190	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Between 4-Jul-2016 and 17-Nov-2017
HIPc201	MHI	3	Unknown	2.75	Before 03-Dec-2004
HIPc301	MHI	3	Male	2.50	Between 9-Nov-2013 and 17-May-2014
HIPc299	MHI	3	Unknown	3.00	Before 24-Apr-2008
HIPc364[+]	MHI	3	Unknown	2.50	Before 10-Dec-2009

HIPc407	MHI	3	Female	2.50	Between 25-Apr-2009 and 15-Oct-2010
HIPc645*	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Between 2013 and 5-Jun-2014
HIPc920^*	MHI	3	Unknown	2.50	Between 2019 and 21-Jul-2021
HIPc264	MHI	4	Female	3.00	Before 21-Mar-2003
HIPc270	MHI	4	Female	2.50	Between 21-Mar-2016 and 13-Nov-2017
HIPc805*	MHI	4	Male	3.00	Between 2013 and 19-Sep-2018
HIPc533	NWHI	-	Female	2.50	Before 14-Jun-2012
HIPc292	Pelagic	-	Female	2.50	Before 21-Apr-2008
HIPc746	Pelagic	-	Female	2.50	Before 12-Sep-2017
HIPc861	Pelagic	-	Female	2.50	Before 31-Oct-2019
HIPc767+	Pelagic	-	Male	2.75	Before 13-Sep-2017
HIPc290	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.75	Before 21-Apr-2008
HIPc608	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.50	Before 26-May-2013
HIPc753	Pelagic	-	Unknown	3.00	Before 12-Sep-2017
HIPc689	Unknown	-	Unknown	3.00	Before 3-Sep-2016
HIPc690	Unknown	-	Unknown	3.00	Before 3-Sep-2016

+First seen with more than one injury but unknown whether from independent events.
*For individuals first documented with injuries as calves, juveniles, or sub-adults a start year is noted for "between" dates based on the year the individual was estimated to be 1-year old, restricted to those with age estimate confidence ratings of 3 or higher (see Kratofil et al. in prep).
^Included in age/year analyses, but removed from stock, cluster, and sex assessments after restrictions

Table 4. Summary of dorsal fin results for individual false killer whales by age class, restricted to individuals with age class confidence of 3 or higher. Individuals documented across multiple age classes are counted for each class that they were seen in, thus the sum of individuals over all age classes is greater than the total number of individuals included in this analysis. A total of 288 unique individuals with dorsal fin photos were included in the age analysis, of which 20 were considered to have injuries consistent with fishery interactions.

Age class	**# scored**	**# (%) with injuries consistent with fishery interactions**	**Range of ages when injuries first documented in this age class**
Calf	50	2 (4.0%)	2
Juvenile	91	5 (5.5%)	3
Sub-adult	98	5 (5.1%)	6-9 (median = 8)
Adult	133	15 (11.3%)	10-40 (median = 22)

Table 5. Details on stock, main Hawaiian Island (MHI) cluster, and sex classifications for individual false killer whales with mouthline injuries considered consistent with fisheries interactions. All individuals were seen in 1999 or later, and all but one individual included as consistent in only the age analysis (indicated with a ^) had no "undeterminable" scores, >50% of the mouthline visible, and a highest distinctiveness rating of >1. The date range when the injury occurred is noted. "Before" dates represent individuals that had injuries present the first time these individuals were photographically documented.

ID	Stock	MHI cluster	Sex	Mean highest mouthline score	Best estimate of when injury occurred based on photos
HIPc127	MHI	1	Unknown	2.75	Before 17-Apr-2014
HIPc134	MHI	1	Female	2.75	Before Sep-2004
HIPc358	MHI	1	Female	2.75	Before 10-Nov-2017
HIPc210	MHI	1	Male	3.00	Before 16-Oct-2009
HIPc281[^]*	MHI	1	Male	2.50	Between 2005 and 26-Jul-2008
HIPc717	MHI	1	Unknown	3.00	Between 25-Feb-2018 and 31-Jan-2020
HIPc230	MHI	2	Female	2.75	Before 22-Oct-2005
HIPc338*	MHI	2	Female	2.75	Between 2000 and 1-Nov-2008
HIPc339	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Before 14-Aug-2010
HIPc398	MHI	2	Female	3.00	Before 20-Aug-2011
HIPc177	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Before 15-Oct-2010
HIPc218	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Before 24-Apr-2008
HIPc346	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Before 12-Nov-2017
HIPc356	MHI	3	Female	3.00	Before 5-Jun-2014
HIPc365	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Before 10-Dec-2009[+]
HIPc578*	MHI	3	Female	2.75	Between 2008 and 9-Oct-2016
HIPc161	MHI	3	Male	3.00	Before 26-Oct-2011
HIPc164	MHI	3	Male	2.75	Before 28-Sep-2016
HIPc201	MHI	3	Unknown	2.75	Before 3-Dec-2004[+]
HIPc337*	MHI	3	Unknown	3.00	Between 2006 and 15-Oct-2012
HIPc277*	MHI	3	Unknown	2.75	Between 2007 and 22-Nov-2016
HIPc687	MHI	3	Male	2.50	Between 20-Jun-2019 and 11-Nov-2021
HIPc111	MHI	4	Unknown	2.75	Before 15-Mar-2019
HIPc516	MHI	4	Female	2.50	Between 25-Dec-2013 and 3-Dec-2020
HIPc104	MHI	4	Male	3.00	Before 19-Dec-2009
HIPc185	MHI	4	Unknown	2.75	Before 1-Jan-1999
HIPc800	MHI	4	Unknown	2.75	Before 4-Mar-2018[+]
HIPc284	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.75	Before 21-Apr-2008[+]
HIPc829	Pelagic	-	Unknown	3.00	Before 12-Apr-2018[+]
HIPc865	Pelagic	-	Unknown	3.00	Before 31-Oct-2019[+]
HIPc810	Unknown	-	Unknown	2.50	Before 3-Sep-2016[+]

[+]Mouthline photos available for injury assessment in first encounter with these individuals

*For individuals first documented with injuries as calves, juveniles, or sub-adults a start year is noted for "between" dates based on the year the individual was estimated to be 1-year old, restricted to those with age estimate confidence ratings of 3 or higher (see Kratofil et al. in prep).

[^]Included in age/year analyses, but removed from stock, cluster, and sex assessments after restrictions

Table 6. Summary of mouthline results for individual false killer whales by age class. Some individuals first documented as calves or juveniles were counted in multiple age classes as they were later documented in older classes. A total of 188 unique individuals with mouthline photos were included in the age analysis, of which 14 were considered to have injuries consistent with fishery interactions.

Age class	**# scored**	**# (%) with injuries consistent with fishery interactions**	**Range of ages when injuries first documented in this age class**
Calf	34	0 (0.0%)	NA
Juvenile	58	1 (1.7%)	4
Sub-adult	46	6 (13.0%)	6-9 (median = 9)
Adult	104	11 (10.6%)	11-28 (median = 21)

Table 7. Summary of scoring by ID for individual false killer whales that had both dorsal fin and mouthline scores, using photos from 1999 through 2021. Numbers presented are on an individual basis. Dorsal fins are restricted to sightings with good or better photo quality, and mouthlines are restricted to sightings with 50% or more of the mouthline visible.

	Total	**Number (%) with consistent mouthline scores**	**Number (%) with possibly consistent mouthline scores**	**Number (%) with not consistent mouthline scores**
Total	187	27 (14.4%)	21 (11.2%)	139 (74.3%)
Number (%) with consistent dorsal fin scores	25 (13.4%)	6 (3.2%)	5 (2.7%)	14 (7.5%)
Number (%) with possibly consistent dorsal fin scores	22 (11.8%)	6 (3.2%)	2 (1.1%)	14 (7.5%)
Number (%) with not consistent dorsal fin scores	140 (74.9%)	15 (8.0%)	14 (7.5%)	111 (59.4%)



Figure 1. Examples of injuries considered consistent with fishery interactions for individuals from the MHI insular population. (A) Collapsed dorsal fin of HIPc186 with damage to the leading edge of the fin, © C. Babbitt. (B) Damage to the leading edge of the dorsal fin of HIPc264, © J.K. Lerma/Cascadia Research. (C) A narrow slice to the trailing edge of the dorsal fin of HIPc805, likely caused by an interaction with a monofilament line, © Pacific Whale Foundation. (D) Depigmentation along the mouthline of HIPc230, © E.A. Weiss/Cascadia Research. (E) Large gap in the mouthline of HIPc339 with teeth visible, © E.A. Weiss/Cascadia Research. (F) Multiple notches in the mouthline of HIPc356, © K.A. Wood/Cascadia Research.



Figure 2. Time series showing progression of wound healing and reinjury for false killer whale HIPc310 from Cluster 1 of the main Hawaiian Islands insular population. (A) Initial photo of the injury on 08 October 2016, © A.M. Gorgone. (B) Left lateral view of the healed injury on 22 June 2020, © A.M. Nix. (C) Right side view of the healed injury on 02 November 2021, © M.C. Hill/PIFSC. (D and E) Left and right side views of reinjury on 16 November 2021, © E. Davis/Wild Side Specialty Tours. (F) View of the avulsed wound on 10 February 2023, © C.J. Cornforth. Note the narrow longitudinal linear furrows dorsal to and parallel to the main injury across the leading edge of the fin and corresponding linear scar extending across the side of the fin when the initial injury was fresh (A). Smaller skin wounds such as these furrows or abrasions often appear cryptic after healing (F), and are difficult to identify or attribute to a specific cause.



Figure 3. Ridgeline plots illustrating the density of mean highest fisheries interaction scores by ID vs stock for animals from known stocks. Each datapoint is indicated below the ridgelines with a vertical tick mark. The median mean highest fisheries interaction score by ID for each stock is indicated with a vertical line (note that the median is not visible for any stock with assessed dorsal fins, as the medians are all 1.0).



Figure 4**.** Ridgeline plots illustrating the density of mean highest fisheries interaction scores by ID vs cluster for MHI animals. Each datapoint is indicated below the ridgelines with a vertical tick mark. The median mean highest fisheries interaction score by ID for each cluster is indicated with a vertical line (note that the median is not visible for any cluster with assessed dorsal fins, as the medians are all 1.0).



Figure 5. Ridgeline plots of mean highest fisheries interaction scores by ID vs sex for individuals with known sex. Each datapoint is indicated below the ridgelines with a vertical tick mark. The median mean highest fisheries interaction score by IDs for males and females are indicated with a vertical line (note that the median is not visible for either sex with assessed dorsal fins, as the medians are both 1.0).



Figure 6. False killer whale social networks for individuals sighted from 1999 through 2021 that were considered at least slightly distinctive with fair or better quality photos. Individuals with injuries consistent with fisheries interactions are indicated by symbol type (up triangles – dorsal fin, down triangles – mouthline, box – both dorsal fin and mouthline, circular – none). A. All populations, color coded by population. B. Main Hawaiian Islands insular population, color coded by cluster.

Table SA. Stock, main Hawaiian Island (MHI) cluster, and sex classifications for individual false killer whales with dorsal fin injuries considered possibly consistent with fisheries interactions, using photos from 1999 through 2021. Individuals considered not distinctive are not included. Dorsal fins are restricted to sightings that had no "undeterminable" scores, good or excellent photo quality, and a highest distinctiveness rating of >1. The date range when the injury occurred is noted. "Before" dates represent individuals that had injuries present the first time these individuals were photographically documented. Individuals documented with possible fisheries-related injuries from more than one interaction are listed multiple times, with subsequent date ranges noted in italics.

ID	**Stock**	**MHI cluster**	**Sex**	**Mean highest dorsal score**	**Best estimate of when injury occurred based on photos**
HIPc117	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Before 1-Feb-1998
HIPc138	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Between 8-Jan-2008 and 16-Jul-2008
HIPc208	MHI	1	Female	2.00	Between 28-Feb-2001 and 3-May-2005
HIPc208	*MHI*	*1*	*Female*	*2.00*	*Between 23-Mar-2006 and 26-Jul-2008*
HIPc276	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Between 21-Jan-2004 and 15-Aug-2007
HIPc276	*MHI*	*1*	*Female*	*2.25*	*Between 26-Feb-2009 and 7-Apr-2009*
HIPc129	MHI	1	Male	2.25	Between 9-Sep-2006 and 16-Jul-2008
HIPc039	MHI	1	Unknown	2.00	Before 16-May-1990
HIPc040	MHI	1	Unknown	2.00	Before 1-Feb-1998
HIPc040	*MHI*	*1*	*Unknown*	*2.00*	*Between 12-Aug-1999 and 18-Feb-2005*
HIPc215	MHI	1	Unknown	2.00	Between 3-Mar-2005 and 11-Apr-2006
HIPc272	MHI	1	Unknown	2.25	Between 15-Sep-18 and 23-Jan 2019
HIPc272	*MHI*	*1*	*Unknown*	*2.25*	*Between 17-Nov-2020 and 20-Jan-2021*
HIPc153	MHI	2	Female	2.00	Before 30-Sep-2002
HIPc339	MHI	2	Female	2.00	Before 1-Nov-2008
HIPc381	MHI	2	Female	2.00	Before 14-Aug-2010
HIPc382	MHI	2	Female	2.25	Before 31-Mar-2006
HIPc499	MHI	2	Female	2.25	Before 20-Aug-2011
HIPc196	MHI	2	Male	2.25	Between 6-Jun-2015 and 20-Sep-2016
HIPc197	MHI	2	Male	2.25	Before 2-Oct-1986
HIPc390	MHI	2	Unknown	2.00	Before 20-Aug-2011
HIPc656	MHI	2	Unknown	2.25	Before 1-Mar-2015
HIPc695	MHI	2	Unknown	2.25	Before 20-Sep-2016
HIPc159	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Between 26-May-2003 and 13-Sep-2004
HIPc198	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Before 3-Dec-2004
HIPc218	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Between 5-Jan-2015 and 18-Nov-2017
HIPc713	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Between 23-Sep-2015 and 27-May-2017
HIPc161	MHI	3	Male	2.25	Between 15-Oct-2010 and 26-Oct-2011
HIPc164	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 26-May-2003
HIPc187	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Between 6-Oct-2004 and 10-Dec-2009
HIPc192	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Between 10-Dec-2008 and 15-Oct-2010
HIPc200	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 3-Dec-2004
HIPc280	MHI	3	Male	2.25	Before 29-Mar-1999
HIPc337	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Between 15-Oct-2012 and 27-May-2017
HIPc366	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 10-Dec-2009

HIPc714	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 1-Jan-2015
HIPc277	MHI	3	Unknown	2.00	Between 5-Jun-2014 and 22-Nov-2016
HIPc184	MHI	4	Male	2.00	Before 1999
HIPc704	MHI	4	Male	2.25	Between 29-Aug-2014 and 21-Oct-2015
HIPc113	MHI	4	Unknown	2.25	Before 9-Jan-2000
HIPc353	MHI	4	Unknown	2.00	Between 4-Feb-2009 and 3-Jul-2010
HIPc676	NWHI	-	Unknown	2.00	Before 6-Sep-2015
HIPc247	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.25	Before 9-Apr-2006
HIPc485	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.00	Before 10-Nov-2010
HIPc593	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.25	Before 15-May-2013
HIPc599	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.25	Before 15-May-2013
HIPc905	Unknown	-	Male	2.00	Before 3-Jan-2021

Table SB. Contingency table comparison of numbers of individuals by dorsal fin injury consistency score for those with photos of both sides of the fin available versus those with only one side available, restricted to individuals assessed by all four reviewers. A Fisher's exact test was used to compare consistency when one or both side photos were available, and showed that there is no relationship (p = 1.0).

Dorsal fin score category	**Number (% of total by row) of individuals**	
	With both sides photos	**With only one side photos**
Consistent	33 (73.3)	12 (26.7)
Possibly consistent	31 (72.1)	12 (27.9)
Not consistent	94 (72.9)	35 (27.1)

Table SC. Contingency table comparison of numbers of individuals by dorsal fin injury consistency score for those with good versus excellent photo quality. A Fishers's exact test was used to compare consistency against photo quality score, and showed a statistically significant relationship between these two variables (p = 0.005), i.e., individuals with excellent quality photos were more likely to have dorsal fin injuries consistent or possibly consistent with fishery interactions than those with good quality photos.

Dorsal fin score category	**Number (% of total by row) of individuals**	
	With good photo quality	**With excellent photo quality**
Consistent	8 (17.8)	37 (82.2)
Possibly consistent	8 (18.6)	35 (81.4)
Not consistent	170 (40.9)	246 (59.1)

Table SD. Summary of when injuries were first documented by age class and sex for all known-sex individuals that were included in the age class assessment. Percentages represent the number of individuals with injuries first documented in an age class, out of the total number of individuals documented in an age class.

Age class	**Dorsal fin**		**Mouthline**	
	Males % age class injury first documented	**Females % age class injury first documented**	**Males % age class injury first documented**	**Females % age class injury first documented**
calves, juveniles, subadults	5.7	4.8	11.8	8.0
adult	4.2	16.9	8.1	7.8

Table SE. Stock, main Hawaiian Island (MHI) cluster, and sex classifications for individual false killer whales with mouthline injuries considered possibly consistent with fisheries interaction, using photos from 1999 through 2021. Individuals considered not distinctive are not included. Mouthlines are restricted to individuals with sightings with 50% or more of the mouthline visible, and no "undeterminable" scores. The date range when the injury occurred is noted. "Before" dates represent individuals that had injuries present the first time these individuals were photographically documented.

ID	Stock	MHI cluster	Sex	Mean highest mouthline score	Best estimate of when injury occurred based on photos
HIPc117	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Before 5-Aug-2010
HIPc120	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Before 17-Feb-2007
HIPc135	MHI	1	Female	2.25	Between 16-Jul-2008 and 22-Jun-2020
HIPc114	MHI	1	Male	2.00	Between 16-Jul-2008 and 1-Jan-2015
HIPc281	MHI	1	Male	2.25	Before 26-Jul-2008
HIPc573	MHI	1	Unknown	2.00	Before 22-Oct-2012
HIPc155	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Before 4-Jun-2019
HIPc158	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Before 27-May-2017
HIPc173	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Between 13-Sep-2004 and 25-Apr-2009
HIPc198	MHI	3	Female	2.25	Before 26-Oct-2011
HIPc367	MHI	3	Female	2.00	Before 9-Oct-2016
HIPc176	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 4-Jun-2019
HIPc281	MHI	3	Male	2.25	Before 26-Jul-2008
HIPc654	MHI	3	Male	2.00	Before 28-Jul-2021
HIPc364	MHI	3	Unknown	2.00	Before 8-Aug-2021
HIPc712	MHI	3	Unknown	2.25	Before 27-May-2017
HIPc101	MHI	4	Female	2.25	Before 15-Mar-2019
HIPc431	NWHI	-	Female	2.25	Before 6-Sep-2015
HIPc456	NWHI	-	Unknown	2.00	Before 7-Oct-2010
HIPc677	NWHI	-	Unknown	2.00	Before 6-Sep-2015
HIPc625	Pelagic	-	Female	2.25	Before 22-Oct-2013
HIPc819	Pelagic	-	Unknown	2.00	Before 30-Jul-2017

Table SF. Summary of mean highest percent mouthline visible by ID for various groupings. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs were used to test for differences in highest % visible by ID by stock and cluster, but there was little evidence to support such differences (H = 1.91, p = 0.384 for stocks, and H = 2.47, p = 0.480 for MHI clusters). A Mann-Whitney U test was used to test for differences in highest % visible by ID by sex, but there was no evidence to support such differences (W = 1448.5, p = 0.762).

	Min/Max mean highest % visible by ID	**Median mean highest % visible by ID**
Stock		
MHI	50/100	60
NWHI	50/100	50
Pelagic	50/100	60
MHI cluster		
1	50/100	60
2	50/100	50
3	50/100	50
4	50/100	80
Sex		
Female	50/100	50
Male	50/100	60

Table SG. Contingency table comparison of mean % mouthline visible by ID by varying degrees of consistency. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVAs were used to compare the highest % mouthline visible by ID by degree of mouthline consistency for each of the three categories of dorsal fin consistency, but no statistical relationships were found (consistent dorsal fin scores H = 0.112, p = 0.946, possibly consistent dorsal fin scores H = 1.949, p = 0.378, not consistent dorsal fin scores H = 1.402, p = 0.496).

Dorsal fin score category	**Median mean highest % mouthline visible by ID for**		
	Consistent mouthline scores	**Possibly consistent mouthline scores**	**Not consistent mouthline scores**
Consistent	55	50	55
Possibly consistent	85	75	50
Not consistent	80	50	50

Table SH. Comparison of associations between individuals with fishery-related injuries (FI) and those without (non-FI). Restricted to individuals slightly distinctive and above with fair or better photo quality that were seen on at least five days. Values shown are means (SD)

	# Individuals	Maximum HWI	*Strength*	*Eigenvector centrality*	*Clustering Coefficient*
FI Classes					
FI	46	0.60 (0.15)	9.92 (3.95)	0.04 (0.05)	0.23 (0.05)
Non-FI	129	0.60 (0.12)	10.71 (3.64)	0.05 (0.06)	0.24 (0.05)
Population	175	0.60 (0.13)	10.51 (3.73)	0.05 (0.06)	0.24 (0.05)
Association (within and between classes)					
FI with FI			2.53 (1.09)	0.10 (0.11)	0.27 (0.10)
FI with non-FI			9.77 (4.06)	-	-
Non-FI with FI			2.59 (0.80)	-	-
Non-FI to Non-FI			8.08 (3.02)	0.06 (0.06)	0.30 (0.08)