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#### Abstract

We consider a stage-structured model of a harvested fish population and we are interested in the problem of estimating the unknown stock state for each class. The model used in this work to describe the dynamic evolution of the population is a discrete time system including a nonlinear recruitment relationship. To estimate the stock state, we build an observer for the considered fish model. This observer is an auxiliary system that uses the catch data over each time interval and gives a dynamical estimation of the stock state for each stage class. The observer works well even if the recruitment function in the considered model is not well known. The same problem for an age-structured model has been addressed in a previous work.


Keywords: Discrete-time system, Stage structured population models, Estimation, Harvested Fish Population, Observers.

## 1 Introduction

Overfishing has affected negatively the stock of renewable marine resource. Analyzing the catch data during the last decade, we notice that catch fishing have considerably decreased in many countries and some species are threatened by extinction. The collapse of catch fishing and extinction of species can be explained in most cases by a gap in management policies due in part to the complex problem of controlling the dynamic evolution of marine resource. To improve the efficiency of exploiting stock and preventing the collapse of key fishery,it's essential to understand well the mechanism evolution of the stock and to have a good estimation of the stock fish population. To overcome these types of problems in fishery management, mathematical models are very often used to describe the dynamic evolution of some fish population. With these models it becomes easier to observe and hence to regulate the dynamics of a given fish population.

In this paper, We are interested in the estimation problem of the unknown stock state of a harvested fish population whose dynamics are modeled by a discrete time system including a nonlinear stock recruitment relationship. As already mentioned in the abstract, the estimation problem of the stock state for a harvested fish population was first investigated [18] by considering an age-structured fish-population model. However determining the age for a fish population is a difficult task. In practice, it would be easier and more pertinent to classify a fish population by other quantities that correlate with age such as size or weight. Moreover, most of time the catch data that we have access to, are generally evaluated in term of size or weight. Hence a stage structured fish population model is more realistic and general than an age structured one. The stage-structured fish model we consider here is the following (see for instance Getz's book: page 84 and 35):

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
x_{1}(k+1)= & \left(1-p_{1}\right) s_{1}(k) x_{1}(k)+s_{0} f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i} x_{i}(k)\right)  \tag{1}\\
x_{2}(k+1)= & p_{1} s_{1}(k) x_{1}(k)+\left(1-p_{2}\right) s_{2}(k) x_{2}(k) \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
x_{n-1}(k+1)= & p_{n-2} s_{n-2}(k) x_{n-2}(k)+\left(1-p_{n-1}\right) s_{n-1}(k) x_{n-1}(k) \\
x_{n}(k+1)= & p_{n-1} s_{n-1}(k) x_{n-1}(k)+s_{n}(k) x_{n}(k)
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where

- $n$ is the number of stage-classes.
- $x_{i}(k)$ is the number of individuals in the $i$ th class at time $k$.
- $b_{i}$ is the fecundity rate of class $i$.
- $s_{0}$ is the individual survival rate of newborn.
- $s_{i}(k)$ is the individual survival rate in the stage class $i$ at times $k$ :
$s_{i}(k)=e^{-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k) \tau}($ see Getz book: pp 221)
- $M_{i}$ is the natural mortality rate of class $i$.
- $q_{i}$ is the catchability coefficient of individuals of the $i$ th class.
- $E(k)$ is the fishing effort at time $k$.
- $p_{i}$ is the proportion of individuals in stage class $i$ that move to the next stage class $i+1$ after the time interval $[k, k+1[$.
- $\tau$ is the length of harvesting season.
- $f$ is the stock-recruitment function.

The widely-used recruitment functions $[9,4,17,20,22]$ are:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Beverton and Holt } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0} /\left(1+\beta x_{0}\right) ; \\
\text { Ricker } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0} e^{-\beta x_{0}} ; \\
\text { Powerfunction } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0}^{1-\beta} ; \\
\text { Shepherd } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0} /\left(1+\beta x_{0}^{c}\right),(c>0) . \\
\text { Deriso - Schnute } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0}\left(1-\beta x_{0}\right)^{1 / \gamma} \\
\text { Saila - Lorda } & f\left(x_{0}\right)=\alpha x_{0}^{\gamma} e^{-\beta x_{0}} .
\end{array}
$$

Where $\alpha, \beta$ and $\gamma$ are positive parameters and $x_{0}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i} x_{i}$ is the number of newborns.
The recruitment function is very difficult to model because many factors such as water temperature, air speed and other natural phenomena can often perturbe growth of young individuals that are too vulnerable. A weakness of the model (1) is that most of the suggested mathematical expressions for the recruitment function are only valid for some restricted hypotheses. For example Beverton and Holt justified there recruitment function by making hypotheses on food competition and the Ricker recruitment function is based one egg and juveniles predation. Hence the recruitment term in the first equation of model (1) is not well known and we can rewrite the model (1) by considering the recruitment function $s_{0} f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i} x_{i}(k)\right)$ as an unknown input $r(x(k))$
to obtain the linear model with unknown single input $r(x(k))$ :

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
x_{1}(k+1)  \tag{2}\\
x_{2}(k+1) \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
x_{n}(k+1)
\end{array}\right)=A(k)\left(\begin{array}{c}
x_{1}(k) \\
x_{2}(k) \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
x_{n}(k)
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{c}
r(x(k)) \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
A(k)=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
\left(1-p_{1}\right) s_{1}(k) & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
p_{1} s_{1}(k) & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\
0 & p_{2} s_{2}(k) & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \left(1-p_{n-1}\right) s_{n-1}(k) & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & p_{n-1} s_{n-1}(k) & s_{n}(k)
\end{array}\right)
$$

Remark 1 Note that if $p_{i}=1$, for $i=1, \ldots, n$ we obtain the age-structured model for which we have build an observer in [18].
While we focus one analyzing a fish-population model subjected to fishing action, quantifying the fishing catch has great importance for the synthesis of the estimator stock states. Regarding the model we address above, the fish number catch over the time period $[k, k+1[$ in each stage class $i$ is given by (see Getz book 's: pp 146):

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i}(k)=\int_{k}^{k+\tau} q_{i} E(k) x_{i}(t) d t \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The total fish number catch is then:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(k)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{k}^{k+\tau} q_{i} E(k) x_{i}(t) d t \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

After few computations we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(k)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{q_{i} E(k)}{q_{i} E(k)+M_{i}}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k)\right) \tau}\right) x_{i}(k) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $C_{i}(k)=\frac{q_{i} E(k)}{q_{i} E(k)+M_{i}}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k)\right) \tau}\right)$, then $y(k)$ can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y(k)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{i}(k) x_{i}(k) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

To summarize the model we consider in this work is:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
x(k+1) & =A(k) x(k)+D r(x)  \tag{7}\\
y(k) & =C(k) x(k)
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $A(k)$ is defined below, $C(k)=\left(C_{1}(k), \ldots, C_{n}(k)\right)$ and $D=(1,0, \ldots, 0)^{t}$.
Now we assume that the linear model with unknown single input (2) which can be written as (7) describes successfully the dynamics of the considered harvested fish population. To compute the state $x(k)$ at time $k$, we need to know the value of the state $x\left(k_{0}\right)$ at a given time $k_{0}<k$. However the model does not give any information about the unknown state value $x\left(k_{0}\right)$. The model provides only information about relation between two consecutive states $x(k)$ and $x(k+1)$, the model gives also measure of captures over time interval $[k, k+1[$. To make the model (2) useful, we have to find how to estimate the unknown value $x(k)$, that is the main concern we will address in this paper. To achieve this goal, we will use a tool from control theory called an observer. We construct an another dynamic system whose state $\hat{x}$ will provide an estimation of the unknown state of the considered model and this will be true regardless of the initial condition of the observer. We briefly recall the definition of an observer in control theory. Let us consider the following dynamic system:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x(k+1)=\mathcal{F}(x(k), u(k))  \tag{8}\\
y(k)=\mathcal{H}(x(k), u(k))
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is the state of the system,$u(k) \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ is the input or the control and $y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{q}$ is the measurable output at time $k$.

Definition 1 A observer for the dynamical system (8) consists of another dynamical system $\Sigma$ whose inputs are the inputs and the outputs of system (8) and whose state $\hat{x}(k)$ satisfies $x(k)-\hat{x}(k)$ tends to zero as time $k$ goes to infinity and must remain small if it starts small.
$\Sigma$ is an exponential observer of (8) if there exists $\rho<1$ in such a way that for all $k \geq 0$ and for all initial conditions $(x(0), \hat{x}(0))$, one has

$$
|\hat{x}(k)-x(k)| \leq \rho^{k}|\hat{x}(0)-x(0)|
$$

More details on observer notions can be found in [24, 12]. Observer theory for linear discrete-time system with known inputs is well established. For linear invariant-time systems, the synthesis of the observer is completely given by the Luenberger method [16]. For linear time varying systems, several robust algorithms have been developed, one can cite for instance $[6,3,1,14,15]$. In the special case of unknown inputs the synthesis of observers is still a very difficult task. Some algorithms have been developed for some classes of linear systems with unknown inputs $[5,11,23,21,13,25,10,7,19]$. However, most of the available results concern linear time invariant systems. Here we are interested in the design of a global observer for the fishery system (2) which is linear time varying system with known input $E(k)$ and unknown input $r(x(k))$.

## 2 Observer for linear time varying systems with unknown inputs

Let's consider the following system:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
x(k+1) & =\Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda \zeta,  \tag{9}\\
y(k) & =\theta(k) x(k),
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $x(k)$ and $y(k)$ are respectively the state and the measurable output at time $k, \Gamma(k)$ et $\theta(k)$ are respectively time varying matrix, $\Lambda$ is an appropriated column vector and $\zeta$ is a scalar unknown input. In [10] M. Hou and P.C. Muller have developed a technique to synthesize observers for linear continuous time-invariant systems with unknown inputs. We adapt this technique for linear discrete time-varying systems with unknown inputs of the form (9).
Let $y(k)$ be the measurable output of the system (9), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
y(k+1) & =\theta(k+1) x(k+1) \\
& =\theta(k+1)(\Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda \zeta) \\
& =\theta(k+1) \Gamma(k) x(k)+\theta(k+1) \Lambda \zeta
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that $\theta(k+1) \Lambda$ is invertible $\forall k \geq 0$, we obtain:

$$
\zeta=(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1}(y(k+1)-\theta(k+1) \Gamma(k) x(k))
$$

Then we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(k+1) & =\Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda \zeta \\
& =\Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda\left((\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1}(y(k+1)-\theta(k+1) \Gamma(k) x(k))\right) \\
& =\Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} y(k+1)-\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} \theta(k+1) \Gamma(k) x(k) \\
& =\left(\Gamma(k)-\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} \theta(k+1) \Gamma(k)\right) x(k)+\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} y(k+1) \\
& =\left(I_{n \times n}-\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} \theta(k+1)\right) \Gamma(k) x(k)+\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} y(k+1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We define:

$$
\bar{\Gamma}(k)=\left(I_{n \times n}-\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1} \theta(k+1)\right) \Gamma(k),
$$

and

$$
\bar{\theta}(k)=\Lambda(\theta(k+1) \Lambda)^{-1}
$$

Thus we obtain:

$$
x(k+1)=\bar{\Gamma}(k) x(k)+\bar{\theta}(k) y(k+1)
$$

A candidate observer for system (9) is then given by:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
z(k+1) & =(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) z(k)+(L(k)+(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) \bar{\theta}(k-1)) y(k) .  \tag{10}\\
\hat{x}(k) & =z(k)+\bar{\theta}(k-1) y(k) .
\end{align*}\right.
$$

Let $e(k)=x(k)-\hat{x}(k)$ the estimation error, the error dynamics are described by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
e(k+1)= & x(k+1)-\hat{x}(k+1) \\
& =\bar{\Gamma}(k) x(k)+\bar{\theta}(k) y(k+1)-z(k+1)-\bar{\theta}(k) y(k+1) \\
= & \bar{\Gamma}(k) x(k)-(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) z(k)-(L(k)+(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) \bar{\theta}(k-1)) y(k) \\
= & (\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) x(k)-(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) z(k) \\
& -(\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) \bar{\theta}(k-1) y(k)) \\
= & (\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k))(x(k)-\hat{x}(k)) \\
e(k+1)= & (\bar{\Gamma}(k)-L(k) \theta(k)) e(k)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, if the pair of matrices $(\bar{\Gamma}(k), \theta(k))$ is uniformly observable, one can choose the gain matrix $L(k)$ such that the error $e(k)$ tend to zero when $k$ tend to $+\infty$. This means that system (10) is an observer for system (9).

## 3 Stock estimation via an observer

Our aim is to propose an observer for the considered system (2) with the output given by equation (5). To this end we introduce the following notations:
$E_{\min }$ and $E_{\max }$ are respectively the minimum and the maximum fishing effort for all time $k$.
$q_{\min }$ and $q_{\max }$ are respectively the minimum and the maximum catchability coefficient for all stage class $i$.
$m$ and $M$ are respectively the minimum and the maximum mortality rate for all stage class $i$.
We assume that $q_{1} \neq 0$.
System (2) can be written in the form (9) with:

$$
\Gamma(k)=A(k), \Lambda=D, \zeta=r(x(k)) \text { and } \theta(k)=C(k)
$$

Assume that $q_{1} \neq 0$, then $\theta(k+1) \Lambda=C(k+1) D$ is invertible for all $k \geq 0$
since $C(k+1) D=C_{1}(k+1)=\frac{q_{1} E(k+1)}{q_{1} E(k+1)+M_{1}}\left(1-e^{-\left(M_{1}+q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)$ does not vanish if $q_{1} \neq 0$.
Applying the construction of Section 2 we have

$$
\bar{A}(k)=\left(I_{n \times n}-\frac{1}{C_{1}(k+1)} D C(k+1)\right) A(k)
$$

and

$$
\bar{\theta}(k)=\frac{1}{C_{1}(k+1)} D
$$

Therefore a candidate observer for (2) is given by:

$$
\begin{cases}z(k+1) & =\bar{A}(k) z(k)+\bar{A}(k) \bar{\theta}(k-1)) y(k)  \tag{11}\\ \hat{x}(k) & =z(k)+\bar{\theta}(k-1) y(k)\end{cases}
$$

This can be written in more detailed form:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
& z_{1}(k+1)=-\frac{C_{2}(k+1) p_{1} s_{1}(k)}{C_{1}(k+1)} z_{1}(k)-\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\left(p_{i} s_{i}(k) \frac{C_{i+1}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)}+\left(1-p_{i}\right) s_{i}(k) \frac{C_{i}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)}\right) z_{i}(k) \\
&-\frac{C_{n}(k+1) s_{n}(k)}{C_{1}(k+1)} z_{n}(k)-\frac{C_{2}(k) p_{1} s_{1}}{C_{1}(k)^{2}} y(k) \\
& z_{2}(k+1)= p_{1} s_{1}(k) z_{1}(k)+\left(1-p_{2}\right) s_{2} z_{2}(k)+\frac{p_{1} s_{1}}{C_{1}(k)} y(k), \\
& \vdots \\
& \vdots \\
& z_{n-1}(k+1)= p_{n-2} s_{n-2}(k) z_{n-2}(k)+\left(1-p_{n-1}\right) s_{n-1}(k) z_{n-1}(k), \\
& z_{n}(k+1)= p_{n-1} s_{n-1}(k) z_{n-1}(k)+s_{n}(k) z_{n}(k)  \tag{12}\\
& \hat{x}_{1}(k)= z_{1}(k)+\frac{1}{C_{1}(k)} y(k) \\
& \hat{x}_{i}(k)=
\end{align*}\right.
$$

The main result can then be stated as follows
Proposition 1 Assume that $q_{1} \neq 0$. There exists $\eta>0$ such that if $E_{\min }>\eta$, then the system (11) (or system (12)) is a global exponential observer for system (2).

Proof. Let $e(k)=x(k)-\hat{x}(k)$ be the error state estimation. The error equation is simply $e(k+1)=\bar{A}(k) e(k)$ where $\bar{A}(k)=\left(I_{n}-\frac{1}{C_{1}(k+1)} D C(k+1)\right) A(k)$.
We shall use the following matrix norm: $\|\bar{A}(k)\|_{1}=\max _{j} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\bar{a}_{i j}(k)\right|$. To prove that system (11) is a global exponential observer for system (2), it is sufficient to prove that $\|\bar{A}(k)\|_{1} \leq \delta<1$. We have $\|\bar{A}(k)\| \leq\left\|I_{n \times n}-\frac{1}{C_{1}(k+1)} D C(k+1)\right\|\|A(k)\|$. It is easy to see that

$$
\left\|I_{n \times n}-\frac{1}{C_{1}(k+1)} D C(k+1)\right\|=\max _{i}\left(\frac{C_{i}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)}+1\right), \text { and }\|A(k)\|=\max _{i} s_{i}(k) .
$$

Hence

$$
\|\bar{A}(k)\| \leq \max _{i}\left(\frac{C_{i}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)}+1\right) \max _{i} s_{i}(k)
$$

The remaining part of the proof is quite similar to the proof of the main result of [18]. We give it here in order to be self-contained.

For $i=1 \ldots n$, Let: $\gamma_{i}(k)=\frac{C_{i}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)}$. We have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{i}(k)= & \frac{q_{i} E(k+1)\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}{M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)} \frac{M_{1}+q_{1} E(k+1)}{q_{1} E(k+1)\left(1-e^{-\left(M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right)^{2}}\right)} \\
\gamma_{i}(k)= & \frac{M_{1} q_{i}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}{q_{1}\left(M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)\right)\left(1-e^{\left.\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau\right)}\right.} \\
& +\frac{q_{i} q_{1} E(k+1)\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}{q_{1}\left(M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)\right)\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\frac{q_{i} q_{1} E(k+1)}{q_{1}\left(M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)\right)}<1$, we can write

$$
\gamma_{i}(k) \leq \frac{M_{1} q_{i}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}{q_{1}\left(M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)\right)\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}\right)}+\frac{1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}
$$

The map $x \mapsto \frac{1-e^{-x \tau}}{x}$ is decreasing, hence

$$
\frac{1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}{M_{i}+q_{i} E(k+1)} \leq \frac{1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right)} \tau}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }}
$$

So we obtain

$$
\gamma_{i}(k) \leq \frac{M q_{\max }}{q_{1}} \frac{\left(1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}\right)}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }} \frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}+\frac{1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}
$$

Since $0<e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau} \leq 1$, we have $1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k+1)\right) \tau} \leq 1$. Therefore, we have for $i=1 \ldots n-1$,

$$
\gamma_{i}(k) \leq \frac{M q_{\max }}{q_{1}} \frac{\left(1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}\right)}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }} \frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}+\frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}}
$$

The map $x \mapsto \frac{1}{1-e^{-x \tau}}$ is decreasing, it follows that:

$$
\frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-M_{1}-q_{1} E(k+1)\right) \tau}} \leq \frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-m-q_{m i n} E_{m i n}\right) \tau}}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\gamma_{i}(k) \leq \frac{M q_{\max }}{q_{1}} \frac{1}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }}+\frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}}, \forall i=1, \ldots, n
$$

Otherwise $s_{i}(k) \leq e^{-m-q_{\text {min }} \tau E_{\text {min }}} \leq e^{\left(-m-q_{\text {min }} E_{\text {min }}\right)}, \forall i=1, \ldots, n$.
Hence

$$
\bar{A}(k) \leq\left(\frac{M q_{\max }}{q_{1}} \frac{1}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }}+\frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}}+1\right) e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}
$$

We pose:

$$
\delta\left(E_{\min }\right)=\left(\frac{M q_{\max }}{q_{1}} \frac{1}{m+q_{\min } E_{\min }}+\frac{1}{1-e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}}+1\right) e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{\min }\right) \tau}
$$

We will show now that there exists $\eta>0$ in such a way that $E_{\text {min }}>\eta$ implies $\delta\left(E_{\text {min }}\right)<1$. Let $X=e^{\left(-m-q_{\min } E_{m i n}\right) \tau}$ and consider

$$
P(X)=-\frac{\tau M q_{\max } X}{q_{1} \log (X)}+\frac{X}{1-X}+X-1 .
$$

One can remark that $P(X)=\delta\left(E_{\min }\right)-1$.
We have $\lim _{X \rightarrow 0} P(X)=-1$ and $\lim _{X \rightarrow 1^{-}} P(X)=+\infty$. So there exists $\left.x_{1} \in\right] 0,1[$ such that $P\left(x_{1}\right)=0$. Let $x^{*}=\inf \{x \in] 0,1[/ P(x)=0\}$ then we have $P(X)<0$ for all $X$ satisfying $0<$ $X<x^{*}$. Now, $0<X<x^{*}$ is equivalent to $E_{\min }>\frac{-\log \left(x^{*}\right)}{q_{\min } \tau}-\frac{m}{q_{\min }}$ since $X=e^{\left(-m-q_{m i n} E_{m i n}\right) \tau}$. It is then sufficient to choose $\eta=\frac{-\log \left(x^{*}\right)}{q_{\min } \tau}-\frac{m}{q_{\min }}$ and this completes the proof of Proposition 1.

Remark 2 When we assume that $p_{i}=1$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$, the model (2) is equivalent to the age structured fish model (see for instance [9]) for which an observer has been build in [18] using the same techniques.

Remark 3 When the natural mortality rates are all equal, it is possible to give a weaker condition on the minimal value of the fishing effort that ensures the convergence of the observer.

Proposition 2 Assume that $q_{1} \leq q_{i} \forall i=2, \ldots, n$, and moreover that the natural mortality coefficient is the same for all stages, that is, $M_{1}=M_{2}=\ldots=M_{n}=m$. Then, the system (12) is a global exponential observer for the system (2) if

$$
E_{\min }>\frac{1}{q_{1}}\left(\frac{1}{\tau} \log \left[\frac{q_{\max }}{q_{1}}+1\right]-m\right) .
$$

Remark 4 In general, the fishery 's literature provide the fishing mortality rates instead of the catchability parameters. On the other hand the available catch data usually give the total weight of the fishes caught during a season. Therefore we can consider that the measurable output is the seasonal biomass yield, i.e., the total weight of harvested fishes over each period $[k, k+1)$ instead of their number. If we denote by $w_{i}$ the mean weight of individuals of class $i$, then the seasonal biomass yield is

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y(k)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{q_{i} E(k)}{M_{i}+q_{i} E(k)}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k)\right) \tau}\right) w_{i} x_{i}(k) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $m_{i}(k)=w_{i} x_{i}(k)$ be the biomass in stage class $i$, then we can write the observer as:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
z_{1}(k+1)= & -\frac{w_{2} C_{2}(k+1) p_{1} s_{1}(k)}{w_{1} C_{1}(k+1)} z_{1}(k) \\
& -\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\left(p_{i} s_{i}(k) \frac{w_{i+1} C_{i+1}(k+1)}{w_{1} C_{1}(k+1)}+\left(1-p_{i}\right) s_{i}(k) \frac{w_{i} C_{i}(k+1)}{w_{1} C_{1}(k+1)}\right) z_{i}(k) \\
& -\frac{w_{n} C_{n}(k+1) s_{n}(k)}{w_{1} C_{1}(k+1)} z_{n}(k)-\frac{w_{2} C_{2}(k) p_{1} s_{1}}{w_{1} C_{1}(k)^{2}} Y(k) \\
z_{2}(k+1)= & p_{1} s_{1}(k) z_{1}(k)+\left(1-p_{2}\right) s_{2} z_{2}(k)+\frac{p_{1} s_{1}}{w_{1} C_{1}(k)} Y(k),  \tag{14}\\
& \vdots \\
z_{n-1}(k+1)= & p_{n-2} s_{n-2}(k) z_{n-2}(k)+\left(1-p_{n-1}\right) s_{n-1}(k) z_{n-1}(k), \\
z_{n}(k+1)= & p_{n-1} s_{n-1}(k) z_{n-1}(k)+s_{n}(k) z_{n}(k), \\
\hat{m}_{1}(k)= & w_{1} z_{1}(k)+Y(k), \\
\hat{m}_{i}(k)= & w_{i} z_{i}(k) \text { for } i=2, \ldots n .
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $\hat{m}_{i}(k)$ is the estimator of the biomass $m_{i}(k)$

## 4 Numerical examples

We now give some simulations to illustrated the efficiency of the observer (12). We consider a three age-classes system with a Ricker stock-recruitment, and the following parameter values:

| Parameters of the Ricker function | $\alpha=1, \beta=0.0002$, |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fecundity parameters | $b=\left[\begin{array}{lll}2 & 5 & 7\end{array}\right]$, |
| Catchability coefficients | $q=\left[\begin{array}{lll}0.24 & 0.36 & 0.42\end{array}\right]$, |
| Natural mortality rates | $M=\left[\begin{array}{lll}0.2 & 0.2 & 0.2\end{array}\right]$, |
| Length of harvesting season | $\tau=1 / 2$, |
| Fishing effort | $E(k)=3+\sin (k)$ |

The simulations have been done with Scilab. The time evolutions of the state $x_{i}$ and it's corresponding estimator $\hat{x}_{i}$ for $i=1,2,3$ are drawn in Figures (1), (2) and (3). It can be noticed that the convergence of the error estimation towards zero is quite fast.


Figure 1: State $x 1$ and the corresponding estimator $\hat{x} 1$


Figure 2: State $x 2$ and the corresponding estimator $\hat{x} 2$


Figure 3: State $x 3$ and the corresponding estimator $\hat{x} 3$

## 5 Applications

### 5.1 Application using data from ICES

Now we try to illustrate the observer (14) of the fish model with real data. The report of ICES Advisory Committee on fisheries Management [2] (see also [26]) gives catch data for the Arctic cod population in the Atlantic North East for each year between 1946 and 2000. The considered population is structured in mature and immature individuals. The report gives also a biomass estimation for each class. Here using only the total catch for echa year, our observer (14) allows to give an estimation of both matures and immatures. The captures, the fishing mortality and the biomass estimation in [2] are reported in table 5.1. To compare our estimations with those of ICES Advisory Committee on fisheries Management, we represent in the same graph the two estimations. The result show that our estimations have the same allure of those of ICES Advisory Committee on fisheries Management.

Table: Biomass and catch in million tonnes of the Arctic cod in the North- Est between year 1946 and 2000. These data are from the "ICES Advisory Committee on Fisheries Management"
(Anon, 2001), table 3.7 (catch), table 3.19 (biomass) and tableau 3.23 (mature).

| Biomass <br> (million tonnes) |  |  | Catch <br> (million tonnes) |  | Fishing mortality <br> rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year <br> $(\mathrm{t})$ | Immature <br> $\left(x_{1}\right)$ | Mature <br> $\left(x_{2}\right)$ | Immature <br> $\left(C_{1}\right)$ | Mature <br> $\left(C_{2}\right)$ | Immature <br> $\left(f_{1}\right)$ | Mature <br> $\left(f_{2}\right)$ |
| 1946 | 3.3866 | 1.1206 | 0.4222 | 0.2633 | 0.1247 | 0.2350 |
| 1947 | 2.7283 | 1.1740 | 0.4959 | 0.4688 | 0.1818 | 0.3993 |
| 1948 | 2.8562 | 1.0264 | 0.5176 | 0.3510 | 0.1812 | 0.3420 |
| 1949 | 2.5528 | 0.7360 | 0.5503 | 0.2563 | 0.2156 | 0.3482 |
| 1950 | 2.5292 | 0.6206 | 0.4284 | 0.2444 | 0.1694 | 0.3938 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 3.0474 | 0.5741 | 0.5263 | 0.1940 | 0.1727 | 0.3379 |
| 1952 | 3.4114 | 0.5271 | 0.6951 | 0.2428 | 0.2038 | 0.4606 |
| 1953 | 3.8533 | 0.4010 | 0.5209 | 0.1425 | 0.1352 | 0.3554 |
| 1954 | 3.9139 | 0.4350 | 0.7196 | 0.1691 | 0.1839 | 0.3887 |
| 1955 | 3.2905 | 0.3512 | 0.9268 | 0.1526 | 0.2817 | 0.4345 |
| 1956 | 3.1074 | 0.3034 | 1.1425 | 0.1421 | 0.3677 | 0.4684 |
| 1957 | 2.6487 | 0.2103 | 0.7023 | 0.0900 | 0.2651 | 0.4280 |
| 1958 | 2.1979 | 0.1978 | 0.6019 | 0.0830 | 0.2739 | 0.4196 |
| 1959 | 2.2912 | 0.4382 | 0.6197 | 0.1806 | 0.2705 | 0.4121 |
| 1960 | 2.0169 | 0.3890 | 0.4343 | 0.1629 | 0.2153 | 0.4188 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 2.1368 | 0.4104 | 0.5113 | 0.2026 | 0.2393 | 0.4937 |
| 1962 | 1.9697 | 0.3167 | 0.5785 | 0.1574 | 0.2937 | 0.4970 |
| 1963 | 1.7560 | 0.2118 | 0.6335 | 0.1257 | 0.3608 | 0.5935 |
| 1964 | 1.3421 | 0.1892 | 0.3270 | 0.0989 | 0.2436 | 0.5227 |
| 1965 | 1.6769 | 0.1036 | 0.2991 | 0.0458 | 0.1784 | 0.4421 |
| 1966 | 2.7595 | 0.1224 | 0.3425 | 0.0499 | 0.1241 | 0.4077 |
| 1967 | 3.2925 | 0.1318 | 0.4620 | 0.0628 | 0.1403 | 0.4765 |
| 1968 | 3.2669 | 0.2306 | 0.9045 | 0.0914 | 0.2769 | 0.3964 |
| 1969 | 2.7351 | 0.1546 | 1.0495 | 0.0886 | 0.3837 | 0.5731 |
| 1970 | 1.9394 | 0.2281 | 0.7180 | 0.1175 | 0.3702 | 0.5151 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1971 | 1.4845 | 0.3167 | 0.4008 | 0.1546 | 0.2700 | 0.4882 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1972 | 1.7130 | 0.3523 | 0.2886 | 0.1895 | 0.1685 | 0.5379 |
| 1973 | 2.8488 | 0.3380 | 0.4363 | 0.1733 | 0.1532 | 0.5127 |
| 1974 | 2.3150 | 0.1669 | 0.7231 | 0.0839 | 0.3124 | 0.5027 |
| 1975 | 2.1793 | 0.1440 | 0.6522 | 0.0678 | 0.2993 | 0.4708 |
| 1976 | 2.0396 | 0.1738 | 0.6082 | 0.0755 | 0.2982 | 0.4344 |
| 1977 | 1.7767 | 0.3473 | 0.6734 | 0.1740 | 0.3790 | 0.5010 |
| 1978 | 1.6184 | 0.2460 | 0.4947 | 0.1469 | 0.3057 | 0.5972 |
| 1979 | 1.0343 | 0.1778 | 0.2649 | 0.0980 | 0.2561 | 0.5512 |
| 1980 | 0.8233 | 0.1102 | 0.2400 | 0.0590 | 0.2915 | 0.5354 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 0.8910 | 0.1699 | 0.2437 | 0.0942 | 0.2735 | 0.5544 |
| 1982 | 0.4938 | 0.3315 | 0.1283 | 0.1622 | 0.2598 | 0.4893 |
| 1983 | 0.4865 | 0.3328 | 0.1323 | 0.1916 | 0.2719 | 0.5757 |
| 1984 | 0.7402 | 0.2556 | 0.1484 | 0.1444 | 0.2005 | 0.5649 |
| 1985 | 0.9909 | 0.1966 | 0.2047 | 0.0977 | 0.2066 | 0.4969 |
| 1986 | 1.5661 | 0.1731 | 0.3319 | 0.0914 | 0.2119 | 0.5280 |
| 1987 | 1.1331 | 0.1203 | 0.4392 | 0.0724 | 0.3876 | 0.6018 |
| 1988 | 0.8044 | 0.2053 | 0.3171 | 0.1178 | 0.3942 | 0.5738 |
| 1989 | 0.7770 | 0.1970 | 0.2461 | 0.0904 | 0.3167 | 0.4589 |
| 1990 | 0.7320 | 0.3446 | 0.1112 | 0.0985 | 0.1519 | 0.2858 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 1.0702 | 0.6847 | 0.1425 | 0.1927 | 0.1332 | 0.2814 |
| 1992 | 1.3533 | 0.8847 | 0.2037 | 0.2960 | 0.1505 | 0.3346 |
| 1993 | 2.0052 | 0.7461 | 0.2974 | 0.2769 | 0.1483 | 0.3711 |
| 1994 | 1.9007 | 0.6137 | 0.4394 | 0.3248 | 0.2312 | 0.5292 |
| 1995 | 1.6134 | 0.5093 | 0.4738 | 0.2640 | 0.2937 | 0.5184 |
| 1996 | 1.3109 | 0.5804 | 0.4360 | 0.2856 | 0.3326 | 0.4921 |
| 1997 | 1.2144 | 0.5763 | 0.4373 | 0.3248 | 0.3431 | 0.5636 |
| 1998 | 1.2146 | 0.3961 | 0.3558 | 0.2326 | 0.2929 | 0.5872 |
| 1999 | 1.0585 | 0.2645 | 0.3388 | 0.1477 | 0.3201 | 0.5584 |
| 2000 | 1.0854 | 0.2264 | 0.2836 | 0.1285 | 0.2613 | 0.5676 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 4: ICES estimation and observer estimation of stage class 1


Figure 5: ICES estimation and observer estimation of stage class 2

### 5.2 Application using FAO data

As we mentioned it on Remark 1, when all the parameter $p_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$ are assumed to be equal one, the model (2) becomes:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
x_{1}(k+1)= & r(x)  \tag{15}\\
x_{2}(k+1)= & s_{1}(k) x_{1}(k) \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
x_{n-1}(k+1)= & s_{n-2}(k) x_{n-2}(k) \\
x_{n}(k+1)= & s_{n-1}(k) x_{n-1}(k)+s_{n}(k) x_{n}(k)
\end{align*}\right.
$$

which is exactly the corresponding age structured model (see for instance [9]).
We are going to apply the observer we have build to a set of data provided by the FAO. Since these data correspond to an age-structured population, the corresponding parameters $p_{i}$ in model (2) are all equal to 1 , that is: $p_{i}=1, i=1, \ldots, n$. The observer is then given by:

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
& z_{1}(k+1)=-\frac{C_{2}(k+1) s_{1}(k)}{C_{1}(k+1)} z_{1}(k)-\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} s_{i}(k) \frac{C_{i+1}(k+1)}{C_{1}(k+1)} z_{i}(k)  \tag{16}\\
&-\frac{C_{n}(k+1) s_{n}(k)}{C_{1}(k+1)} z_{n}(k)-\frac{C_{2}(k) s_{1}}{C_{1}(k)^{2}} y(k) \\
& z_{2}(k+1)= s_{1}(k) z_{1}(k)+\frac{s_{1}}{C_{1}(k)} y(k), \\
& \vdots \\
& \vdots \\
& z_{n-1}(k+1)= s_{n-2}(k) z_{n-2}(k), \\
& z_{n}(k+1)= s_{n-1}(k) z_{n-1}(k)+s_{n}(k) z_{n}(k), \\
& \hat{x}_{1}(k)= z_{1}(k)+\frac{1}{C_{1}(k)} y(k) \\
& \hat{x}_{i}(k)= z_{i}(k) \text { for } i=2, \ldots n .
\end{align*}\right.
$$

where $C_{i}(k)=\frac{q_{i} E(k)}{q_{i} E(k)+M_{i}}\left(1-e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k)\right) \tau}\right)$ and $s_{i}(k)=e^{\left(-M_{i}-q_{i} E(k)\right) \tau}$
To illustrate the observer (16) we consider data on a fish population given by the FAO report [8] (See http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/S4882F/S4882F09.htm) that we recapitulate on tables below:

Table 1: Trachurus spp. : Catch in millions of individuals by age classes (divisions 34.1.3. and 34.3.1) and total catch in thousand of tons.

|  | AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Catch ( $10^{6}$ <br> indi- <br> vidu- <br> als) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Catch } \\ (1000 \\ \text { t) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0+ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ |  |  |
| 1972 | 0,00 | 1492,00 | 798,10 | 403,90 | 188,00 | 106,40 | 52,00 | 18,50 | 3058.9 | 390,123 |
| 1973 | 0,00 | 2457,00 | 680,90 | 250,90 | 114,50 | 60,30 | 43,20 | 48,50 | 3625.3 | 383,052 |
| 1974 | 982,00 | 3273,20 | 947,30 | 240,40 | 44,90 | 26,20 | 12,30 | 11,80 | 4562.8 | 414,632 |
| 1975 | 964,30 | 2078,10 | 493,60 | 152,30 | 48,90 | 7,70 | 4,80 | 2,60 | 2803.9 | 302,317 |
| 1976 | 3153,20 | 3202,30 | 685,60 | 97,40 | 35,60 | 16,30 | 4,60 | 1,10 | 4060.3 | 394,145 |
| 1977 | 36,20 | 2927,20 | 1391,20 | 380,30 | 52,10 | 12,00 | 6,30 | 1,40 | 4787.6 | 392,572 |
| 1978 | 60,00 | 1650,40 | 1162,80 | 338,70 | 78,20 | 16,50 | 3,00 | 0,50 | 3268.1 | 294,151 |
| 1979 | 0,00 | 1323,30 | 534,70 | 231,00 | 99,00 | 29,60 | 10,00 | 0,80 | 2246.1 | 223,165 |
| 1980 | 0,00 | 150,20 | 676,60 | 582,10 | 799,60 | 306,60 | 86,00 | 11,40 | 2619.6 | 503,081 |
| 1981 | 0,00 | 230,40 | 415,20 | 462,20 | 357,90 | 207,20 | 72,60 | 14,10 | 1764.0 | 357,935 |
| 1982 | 0,00 | 310,50 | 840,40 | 542,40 | 254,10 | 71,50 | 8,10 | 1,10 | 2045.5 | 310,464 |
| 1983 | 0,00 | 591,10 | 727,30 | 262,90 | 135,90 | 88,40 | 62,50 | 31,80 | 1886.6 | 280,000 |
| 1984 | 807,70 | 424,60 | 621,40 | 274,90 | 167,10 | 105,70 | 68,40 | 41,90 | 1680.6 | 300,000 |
| 1985 | 0,00 | 145,60 | 800,10 | 360,30 | 109,80 | 126,40 | 48,70 | 2,50 | 1609.4 | 320,000 |

* : estimated value Table 2: Trachurus spp. : Fishing mortality (divisions 34.1.3 and 34.3.1). $(\mathrm{P}=$ mean weight $)$

|  |  |  |  | AGE |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} F \\ \text { PON- } \\ \text { DERE } \\ 1-5 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0+ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ |  |
| 1972 | 0,000000 | 0,511725 | 0,788882 | 0,841723 | 0,767820 | 0,616278 | 0,322343 | 0,705246 | 0,705287 |
| 1973 | 0,000000 | 0,710480 | 0,691405 | 0,962460 | 0,953076 | 0,933614 | 0,833445 | 0,850099 | 0,850218 |
| 1974 | 0,082420 | 0,911205 | 1,462620 | 0,858620 | 0,660721 | 0,921245 | 0,740458 | 0,879356 | 0,879611 |
| 1975 | 0,057783 | 0,351619 | 0,472105 | 0,686220 | 0,617037 | 0,312602 | 0,620453 | 0,488036 | 0,487918 |
| 1976 | 0,139428 | 0,387599 | 0,261425 | 0,221046 | 0,483193 | 0,632487 | 0,445506 | 0,397193 | 0,397150 |
| 1977 | 0,002260 | 0,258610 | 0,413621 | 0,318220 | 0,245832 | 0,424763 | 0,816728 | 0,332598 | 0,332224 |
| 1978 | 0,005763 | 0,184893 | 0,215220 | 0,232136 | 0,136975 | 0,167873 | 0,248101 | 0,185781 | 0,185410 |
| 1979 | 0,000000 | 0,233446 | 0,115179 | 0,082385 | 0,135158 | 0,096253 | 0,187148 | 0,132838 | 0,132484 |
| 1980 | 0,000000 | 0,030647 | 0,250393 | 0,245816 | 0,651817 | 1,229370 | 0,641243 | 0,481579 | 0,481609 |
| 1981 | 0,000000 | 0,045911 | 0,152152 | 0,383773 | 0,330540 | 0,502452 | 2,385422 | 0,283060 | 0,282977 |
| 1982 | 0,000000 | 0,098016 | 0,327470 | 0,430687 | 0,546851 | 0,139337 | 0,043822 | 0,308936 | 0,308472 |
| 1983 | 0,000000 | 0,168887 | 0,496638 | 0,224000 | 0,253589 | 0,540531 | 0,241525 | 0,337494 | 0,336677 |
| 1984 | 0,186031 | 0,134262 | 0,380006 | 0,511330 | 0,341390 | 0,457392 | 0,010983 | 0,357427 | 0,357427 |
| 1985 | 0,040390 | 0,063021 | 0,577001 | 0,577000 | 0,577000 | 0,577000 | 0,577000 | 0,530840 | 0,530840 |
| M | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 | 0,50 |  |


| pig | 19,00 | 65,00 | 99,00 | 175,00 | 274,00 | 401,00 | 483,00 | 563,00 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 3: Trachurus spp. :Abundance in millions individuals per age class (divisions 34.1.3 and 34.3.1) and total biomass in thousand tons.

|  | AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BIO- <br> MASS 0-7+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0+ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ |  |
| 1972 | 9836,60 | 4635,10 | 1800,00 | 871,700 | 432,000 | 286,600 | 236,600 | 45,1000 | 1191,90 |
| 1973 | 11053,1 | 5966,20 | 1685,30 | 496,000 | 227,900 | 121,600 | 93,9000 | 104,000 | 1066,50 |
| 1974 | 15718,7 | 674,100 | 1779,00 | 512,000 | 114,900 | 53,3000 | 29,0000 | 24,7000 | 1080,90 |
| 1975 | 21772,0 | 8779,60 | 1634,80 | 379,000 | 131,600 | 36,0000 | 12,9000 | 8,40000 | 1273,90 |
| 1976 | 30610,6 | 12463,9 | 3746,50 | 618,400 | 115,700 | 43,1000 | 16,0000 | 4,20000 | 1929,90 |
| 1977 | 20373,3 | 16140,9 | 5130,70 | 1749,60 | 300,700 | 43,3000 | 13,9000 | 6,20000 | 2360,90 |
| 1978 | 13264,6 | 12329,1 | 7563,30 | 2057,80 | 771,900 | 142,600 | 17,2000 | 3,70000 | 2441,40 |
| 1979 | 10411,7 | 7999,20 | 6215,70 | 3699,10 | 989,500 | 408,200 | 73,9000 | 8,10000 | 2455,60 |
| 1980 | 10737,7 | 6315,00 | 3841,60 | 3359,80 | 2066,20 | 524,300 | 224,900 | 37,2000 | 2488,70 |
| 1981 | 6939,10 | 6512,70 | 3714,70 | 1813,90 | 1593,70 | 653,000 | 93,0000 | 71,8000 | 2024,30 |
| 1982 | 7913,90 | 4208,80 | 3772,90 | 1935,00 | 749,600 | 694,500 | 239,700 | 5,20000 | 1738,60 |
| 1983 | 7041,20 | 4800,00 | 2314,40 | 1649,30 | 763,000 | 263,100 | 366,500 | 139,100 | 1533,40 |
| 1984 | 6000,00 | 4270,70 | 2458,90 | 854,500 | 799,600 | 359,100 | 93,0000 | 174,600 | 1290,90 |
| 1985 | 7300,00 | 3021,40 | 2264,90 | 1019,90 | 310,800 | 357,800 | 137,900 | 7,50000 | 1037,30 |

Although the FAO data provide the catches by age class, we use for our observer only the total catch which is easier to measure in practice. Hence we add in catch table a column which gives the total catch in each time period. Though the FAO data we note that in some time there is no catch in the class $0^{+}$, for technical reason we will assume that population in class $0^{+}$is immature and the recruitment class is the class 1 , thus population in age class $0^{+}$will not be considered. We will to use the catch data to estimate the stock fish population via the observer we have build an compare the result with the FAO estimation. To construct the observer (estimator) we need the value of the total catch $y(k)$, the fishing mortality in each class $i$ given by $q_{i} \tau E(k)$ and the natural mortality rate $M_{i}$. In figure (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11) and (12) are drown respectively the FAO estimation stock and two corresponding estimation stock of the observer we build for the fish population in age class $1,2,3,4,5,6$ and 7 .
Simulations show that the estimated values given by the observer are close to the ones of the FAO regardless of the initial condition for the observer we consider.


Figure 6: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 1


Figure 7: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 2


Figure 8: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 3


Figure 9: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 4


Figure 10: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 5


Figure 11: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 6


Figure 12: FAO estimation and observer estimation of age class 7

## 6 Conclusion

We build an observer for a stage-structured model of a harvested fish population. The model we consider is a dynamical discrete-time system including nonlinear relationship. We use the catch data to give an estimation of the stock of each class of the fish population. The observer estimator has the particularity of not using the recruitment function which is very poorly known. We note otherwise that the observer we build is easy to implement and it is successfully test by some real data from FAO and ICES Advisory Committee on fisheries Management. Historically the tools and techniques of automatic control have been developed for artificial engineering systems but nowadays they are more and more applied to "natural systems". The work we address in this paper is an example showing how control theory and computer sciences can be help full for good policies in management fishery.
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