

Summary of data registered in SeaSketch

1. Participants

		Number of participants	Answers not included in the study	Answers included in the study	Gender*
Recreational fishing	Boat fishing	9	0	9	100 % M
	Spearfishing	7	0	7	14 % F - 86 % M
	Shore angling	1	1	0	-
Recreational SCUBA diving		18	1	17	24 % F - 76 % M
Total		35	2	33	15 % F - 85 % M

* F: Female; M: Male

2. Answers

	Valuation		Conservation	
	Rec. fishers	Rec. divers	Rec. fishers	Rec. divers
Nº answers	16	17	14	16
Nº polygons	59	88	25	37
Mean nº polygons per participant	3.7	5.2	1.79	2.32
Total area (Km ²)	5,476.37	771.22	2,469.97	300.17
Smallest polygon (Km ²)	0.12	0.005	0.12	0.01
Biggest polygon (Km ²)	1,321.53	456.36	503.92	244.1
Mean area of polygons (Km ²)	127.41	12.85	112.79	8.41
Standard deviation of area (Km ²)	251.28	57.45	119.65	40.16
Minimum score polygon	2	2	10	5
Maximum score polygon	80	50	80	50
Mean score of polygons	27.12	19.32	36.6	22.7
Standard deviation of score	19.43	12.34	20.91	13.10
Correlation coef. (area and score)	0.06	0.33	-0.02	0.37

3. Reasons to stop using, or not, valuable areas for the purpose of conservation

	Would you stop using any of the previously indicate areas for conservation?	Why?
Recreational fishers	Yes (2 out of 7 polygons)	In the first one, the access for spearfishers is difficult, but fishing boats approach the coast and I have noticed changes in the last 3 years. The second is already a protected area and still many people go fishing there.
	Yes (3 out of 3 polygons)	Because recreational fishing is not my main activity.
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	Because that is my favourite one.
	Yes (2 out of 2 polygons)	Because in 15 years practicing spearfishing there, there has been a huge reduction in the amount of marine life. It is important that the restrictions are for all types of fishing.
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	I would give up that area temporarily, for educational reasons and to raise awareness, but I usually do catch and release.
	No	Spearfishing has zero impact. There must be done a lot of educational work with professional fishers.
	Yes (1 out of 5 polygons)	It is very important to protect, but also to inspect this area.
	No	Those are areas of migratory fish species, it does not make sense to protect them.
	Yes (1 out of 6 polygons)	Because it is the most destroyed area and with more potential. It is important to have surveillance.
	Yes (2 out of 2 polygons)	For sustainability reasons, the need to protect the marine environment in order to continue having fish in the future.
	Yes (2 out of 5 polygons)	Because those are the biggest and richest areas, although recreational fishing has rules (units and sizes) and it is quite sustainable.
	Yes (4 out of 4 polygons)	I would be willing to renounce to any of the areas and close them temporarily in order to repopulate them.
	Yes (1 out of 5)	It is close to an already protected area and there is a lot of marine life.
	Yes (2 out 3 polygons)	Because I have seen a decrease in the amount of fish over the years. (Additional comment: I would also like to mention the amount of lost or abandoned fishing gear in important grounds, such as Mar da Prata).
	Yes (1 out of 6 polygons)	Because there is less fish, it is more exploited.
	Yes (2 out of 2 polygons)	Because I also like to dive and see the fishes. If they were selected to be protected areas based on scientific reasons, I would accept it.

	Would you stop using any of the previously indicate areas for conservation?	Why?
Recreational SCUBA divers	Yes (4 out of 4 polygons)	It is comforting to know that those places will continue to be beautiful and with a lot of biodiversity, even though I cannot be there physically.
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	It is the one with more life, bigger fishes and I think that it has to be protected.
	Yes (4 out of 4 polygons)	I would renounce to all of them if it was shown that there is a reason (some species that breeds there, protected species ...)
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	-
	Yes (2 out of 7 polygons)	Because it can be noticed the lack of fishes due to spearfishing. It is the one that needs more protection. The other because it is an essential habitat for fishes, juveniles, growth... and there is also pressure from spearfishing and tuna fishing boats to catch bait in there.
	Yes (1 out of 7 polygons)	It is an area where there are juveniles and rare species such as seahorses.
	Yes (2 out of 4 polygons)	One of them because of the biodiversity and the type of species existing there, pelagic species (tunas, manta rays, dorados...) and demersal species. The other for the presence of rare species such as morey eels, sting rays, groupers and other rocky fishes; fishes that are not seen in other spots.
	Yes (1 out of 6 polygons)	It is a seamount with a lot of life, schools of de barracudas, scorpionfishes, groupers, anthias, mobulas, etc.
	Yes (4 out of 4 polygons)	I would rather protect life than entertainment.
	Yes (2 out of 6 polygons)	Because they are nursery areas.
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	Because I recognise the importance of marine reserves, the importance of not having extraction.
	No	Because the areas have been always exploited for extraction and right now, what can be gained showing them, has more value than close them.
	Yes (1 out of 6 polygons)	Because is not protected at all and it is a spot extremely rich in marine biodiversity. In addition, the geomorphology of the bottom is quite diverse, providing habitats for resident and migratory species. I have noticed over the years a pronounced decrease in the number of species of different taxa presents in the spot.
	Yes (1 out of 11 polygons)	Because it is centric and protecting that area would influence other spots, because is an area with a lot of juveniles.
	Yes (1 out of 3 polygons)	To keep the spot as it is now, isolated and with less human impact.
	Yes (6 out of 6 polygons)	Those are areas with high biological potential. I am not a very experienced diver and I think that many people are not either, which somehow hams the environment.
	Yes (5 out of 5 polygons)	I would renounce to any of them for conservation.