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Angler apps as a source of recreational fisheries data: opportunities, challenges and proposed standards

Recreational fisheries surveys are limited in time and place in many countries. This lack of data limits scientific understanding and sustainable management. Smartphone applications (apps) allow anglers to record the details of their fishing trips and catches. In this study, we describe the opportunities and challenges associated with angler apps as a source of recreational fisheries data, and propose minimum standards for data collection via angler apps. Angler apps are a potentially valuable source of conventional and novel data that are both frequent and extensive, and an opportunity to engage anglers through data sharing and citizen science. Realizing this potential requires that we address significant challenges related to angler recruitment and retention, data quality and bias, and integration with existing fisheries programmes. We propose solutions to each of these challenges. Given that the angler app market is diverse, competitive and unpredictable, we emphasize minimum standards for data collection as a way to ensure large and reliable data sets that can be compared and integrated across apps. These standards relate to trips and catches, and angler demographics and behaviour, and should be supported through consultation and research. Angler apps have the potential to fundamentally change how anglers interact with the resource and with management.
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