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#### Abstract

Independent Port Sampling was conducted on catches landed or transshipped by purse seiners and carriers in Papua New Guinea from May 2009 to April 2010. The size of sampling reflected approximately $20 \%$ of the catch for the respective vessels sampled. Species composition of the catch was dominated by Skipjack (71.3\%), followed by Yellowfin (24.3\%), Bigeye (1.7\%) and Other Species made up the remaining 2.7\%. Percentages of Skipjack increased in the last quarter of 2009 through to 2010 from 52.7 $70.5 \%$ (low) to 71.3-78.6\% (high) while Yellowfin decreased from 23.3-42\% (high) to 17.8 - $24.6 \%$ (low). Inter-annual trends in length frequencies were observed for all the major tuna species (Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye) with the shifting of the modal and mean lengths indicating progressive changes in fish sizes. More rigorous analysis is needed to compare these results with previous studies and inter-annual variations for management purposes. Other species were mainly made up of Bullet tuna (62\%), Frigate tuna (22\%), Mackerel scad (7\%), Triggerfish (4\%), Rainbow runner (2\%) and Black triggerfish (1\%) while the rest were below $1 \%$ composition. These non-target species should become priority in future analysis.


## INTRODUCTION

Purse seine fishing activities has increased dramatically over years in the Papua New Guinea's (PNG) Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) as a result of the increase in the number of vessels. The rising effort had caused the purse seine catches to almost double in the past 10 years. (Nicol et al, 2009). The fishery mainly targets Skipjack tuna (SKJ) but Yellowfin (YFT) and Bigeye tuna (BET) which are common in the catches are also classified as a major species because of their commercial value. Fish aggregating devises (FAD) are widely utilized by purse seiners to increase fishing efficiency in PNG waters.

With the growing fishing pressure on the fish populations in PNG EEZ, it is imperative to monitor the condition and health of the stock. Size and catch composition are important primary indicators that can reveal changes in the population due to fishing or other environmental factors. Understanding and monitoring of these changes is vital for sustainable management of the fishery.

The PNG National Fisheries Authority started collecting species and length data from independent port sampling projects occasionally in 1999, 2005 and 2008. A 12 month extensive sampling was conducted in 2009 to 2010 with the aim of increasing the temporal scale of the data. This paper provides a descriptive analysis on the species composition of the catch by purse seiners in Papua New Guinea from May, 2009 to May, 10 and the size (length frequencies) of major tuna species, Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye. Compositions of other species that interact with the purse seine fishery were also studied.

## METHODS

Port Sampling was carried out in major tuna ports of Papua New Guinea (Madang, Lae, Wewak and Rabaul) during the months of May, 2009 to May, 2010. A total of 180 port visits made by 54 catcher vessels and 18 carriers that either landed or transshipped their catches in port were sampled by trained port samplers.

## Sampling

A fish storage well in a vessel was divided into three layers; Top, Middle and Bottom in which a number of nets were selected from each and were sampled. The number of nets per layer depended on the total weight of the catch in the well to obtain an estimated $20 \%$ of the catch that were unloaded or transshipped. This was done for all storage wells that catch were taken out from. All fish including non-targeted species in the net were identified to species level and their fork lengths were measured to the nearest centimeter using a standard observer caliper. Vessel and catch information were obtain from the the log sheets.

## Data Entry and Analysis

All data were entered into a Microsoft Access database designed to cater for all port sampling data including vessel set and catch storage information. Data was then exported into Microsoft Excel were all the analysis were performed.

## Species Composition

Species composition analysis was done for major tuna species, Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye while the rest of the by-catch species were grouped as Other Species. Other species included tuna-like species (eg, Bullet and Frigate tuna), other finfishes, sharks, marine mammals (e.g dolphins), marine reptiles (e.g turtles) and unidentified species that were found in the purse seine catches. Overall species composition and species composition by month were analyzed.

## Length Frequency

Frequencies were calculated for individual lengths and length frequency charts were generated by month for Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye tuna. Descriptive statistics were also performed on the lengths for each tuna species using Microsoft Excel Data Analysis Tool Pack.

## Other Species

Percentage composition of the Other species were calculated and listed from the most dominant to the least.

## RESULTS

## Species Composition

Skipjack dominated the total number of fish sampled with 1,714,372 (71.3\%), followed by Yellowfin with 585,298 (24.3\%) and Bigeye with 40,330 (1.7\%). The remaining 2.7\% $(64,184)$ were made up of Other species (Figure 1).

## Species Composition by Month

Figure 2 shows the percentage composition of Skipjack, Yellowfin, Bigeye and Other species for each of the sampling months from May 2009 to May 2010. Low percentages of Skipjack were observed from May to September, 2009 (52.7-70.5\%) with the lowest occurring in May, 2009 while higher percentages of Yellowfin were observed (23.3 $42 \%$ ) with highest occurring in May, 2009.

Higher percentages of Skipjack were observed from October 2009 to May, 2010 (71.3$78.6 \%$ ) with the highest percentage occurring in November, 2009 while lower
percentages of Yellowfin were observed (17.8-24.6\%) with lowest occurring in November.

Percentages of Bigeye ranged from lowest occurring in July and November, 2009 and highest in May, 2009. Percentage composition of Other species increased from $2.4 \%$ in May, 2009 to its highest at $4.4 \%$ in August, 2009 and then steadily declined to $1.1 \%$ in May, 2010.

## Length Frequencies of Major Tuna Species

## Skipjack

Figure 3 shows the length frequencies of Skipjack for each sampling months from May2009 to May-2010. The average mode of the distribution throughout the sampling period was 47.08 cm with fairly sharp peaks and an average mean of 45.08 cm . Increase in smaller sized Skipjack ( $28-40 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) was evident in June, 2009 with a left-skewed distribution followed by a progressive increase in fish size in following months which resulted in broad mode projections. However, traces of larger sized fish ( $\approx 52-73 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) were observed in July, 2010 which became distinct later in the year (2010) increasing the average mean lengths of Skipjack from 42-43 cm to $44-47 \mathrm{~cm}$. The average mean lengths were higher in the months of November, 2009 to May, 2010 compared to the months of June to October, 2009. Distinct bimodal distributions were observed in the months of March, April and May, 2010 with the higher peak at $50-51 \mathrm{~cm}$ and the lower peak at $35-36 \mathrm{~cm}$.

## Yellowfin

Length frequencies of Yellowfin are shown in Figure 4. The overall average mode of the distribution was 56.84 cm with an average mean length of 61.53 cm . In most of the sampling months, the distributions were slightly skewed towards larger fish with one or two smaller peaks except in July, 2009 and May, 2010 where distribution showed three relatively high modes across a range of $21-109 \mathrm{~cm}$. Small peaks of fish size ( $22-44$ cm ) which were less than the average mode were also observed in the months of Jun-Sep, 2009 and possibly April, 2010 as well.

## Bigeye

Length frequencies of Bigeye in figure 5 showed clear peaks in the distribution over the sampling months. The average mode was 56.46 cm . A smaller peak at 40 cm relative to the larger at 56 cm was observed in July, 2009. The same bimodal distribution was also captured in August, September, and November, 2009 with the smaller peak at $45-50 \mathrm{~cm}$ and the larger at 60 cm while in October, the two peaks were both relatively high. Larger sizes Bigeye was observed in samples from January to Apr, 2010.

## Other Species

Bullet tuna dominated the sampled catches of Other species with more than $62 \%$ composition followed by Frigate tuna ( $22 \%$ ), Mackeral scad (7\%), Trigger fish (4\%), Rainbow runner ( $2 \%$ ) and Black trigger fish ( $1 \%$ ). Other species that were also quiet frequent in the samples were Dolphin fish ( $0.9 \%$ ), Kawakawa ( $0.3 \%$ ) and Yellowtail kingfish ( $0.2 \%$ ). All the other species contributed less than $0.1 \%$ to the overall composition of other species of the samples. These include a couple of shark species (Silky, Bignose, Longfinned mako and unidentified spp.), turtles (Leatherback, Olive Ridley and an unidentified spp.) and dolphins. Table 1 is a list of all the Other species that were sampled and their catch compostion.

## DISCUSSION

## Species Composition

The overall species composition for this sampling period from May, 2009 to May, 2010 illustrated the expected Skipjack dominated purse catches (Fonteneau, 2008; Nicol et al, 2009). The species composition is fairly similar to the port sampling results conducted in 2008 (Kumoru et al, 2009) with a slight increase in Skipjack (1.3\%) and Other species ( $0.7 \%$ ) while Yellowfin and Bigeye declined by $1.7 \%$ and $0.3 \%$ respectively. However, both 2008 and 2009/10 species composition differed greatly from the 1999 and 2005 result presented in Koren, 2007 where Skipjack increased from $46.1-64 \%$ where as Yellowfin decreased from 44.9-35\% as well as Bigeye from $9-1 \%$. Koren, 2007 concluded that the difference may not necessarily represent a change in catch composition because the sample size for the 2005 data was too small due to only three months of sampling. With the two recent sampling periods we can presume changes in the composition in purse seine catches. The increase in purse seine activities and use of fish aggregating devises (FAD) to increase fishing efficiency has increased the catch of SKJ dramatically (Nicol et al, 2009) and the catch of non-targeted juvenile YFT and BET which contributed to their decline.

Species composition by month
An inverse relationship was observed between the catch composition of Skipjack and Yellowfin from May, 2009 to May, 2010. Yellowfin catches were relatively higher in the early months of sampling period. This may be due annual season patterns affecting horizontal and vertical movement behavior of the species. Due to insufficient analysis of the data it is impossible to say if the FAD closure in August-September had any role in the relatively high composition of Yellowfin and relatively low Skipjack. Other species also had a similar trend to Yellowfin percentage composition.

## Length Frequencies of Major Tuna Species

There were clear trends in monthly variations in the sizes of all major tuna species (Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye) indicating changes in fish sizes of purse seine catch.

However, the inter-annual trends were not the same with fish sampled in 1999 for specific months (Koren, 2007). 1999 samples were from locally based vessels that concentrated mainly in archipelagic waters whereas this port sampling covered vessels from other fleets including foreign that fish in PNG waters. Thus, a wider coverage of the PNG EEZ was represented including Solomon Seas.

The modes and means (APPENDIX 1) for Skipjack and Yellowfin were also lower than those sampled in 1999 indicating a possible decrease in sizes of these two species in purse seine catches. Since the purse seine effort in the PNG EEZ has almost doubled in the past ten years (Nicol et al, 2009), we question the effect of fishing pressure by purse seiners on the sizes and condition on the fish stock. The sizes of Bigeye in purse seine catches on the hand seemed to increase over the years as the modes and means were higher than the 1999 samples.

## Other Species

Dominant species in the catch composition of Other species were similar to the 2008 results (Kumoru et al, 2009) except the inclusion of Triggerfish with $4 \%$ in the current sampling period. However, the percentage of Bullet tuna decreased by $16 \%$ while Frigate tuna increased by $7 \%$. Catch composition of Mackerel scad and Rainbow runner increased by $3 \%$ and $0.98 \%$ respectively. Because of the difference in the sampling sizes between the sampling periods we cannot strongly conclude the changes in the catch composition to fishing or environmental impacts. Low percentages of Kawakawa, Dolphinfish and shark spp. were observed in both periods. Nicol et al, 2009, gave a detailed analysis of these non-targeted species using observer data which are more representative of the catch since data was collected at sea. However, most of the species were comparable with the port sampling data except for some, such as the Marlin spp. was not detected in port.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The comparison of the results with previous port sampling studies highlighted in the discussion of this paper indicated changes in the size and species composition of purse seine catches landed or transshipped in PNG over the years. However, more rigorous analysis is needed to confirm and determine the significance of these changes and its impact to fishery as whole. More studies into inter-annual variations are also vital for sustainable management and development of conservation measures. Non-targeted species (Other Species) should be a priority in future analysis.
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## TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. List of all non-target species that were found in purse seine catches from May, 2009 to May, 2010 and their percentage composition in relation to each other.

| SpciesCode | Common Name | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BLT | Bullet tuna | 39,996 | 62.315 |
| FRI | Frigate tuna | 14,094 | 21.959 |
| MSD | Mackeral scad | 4,373 | 6.813 |
| TRI | Trigger fish | 2,642 | 4.116 |
| RRU | Rainbow runner | 1,324 | 2.063 |
| MEN | Black trigger fish | 797 | 1.242 |
| DOL | Dolphin Fish | 578 | 0.901 |
| KAW | Kawakawa | 166 | 0.259 |
| YTL | Yellowtail kingfish | 103 | 0.160 |
| ALB | Albacore tuna | 23 | 0.036 |
| TRE | Trevallies | 15 | 0.023 |
| FAL | Silky shark | 11 | 0.017 |
| LTB | Leatherback turtle | 8 | 0.012 |
| SHK | Shark unidentified | 8 | 0.012 |
| DLP | Dolphins/porpoises | 6 | 0.009 |
| BRZ | Pomfrets and Ocean breams | 5 | 0.008 |
| RRV | Yelloweye rockFish | 5 | 0.008 |
| TUN | Tuna unidentified | 5 | 0.008 |
| FLF | Filefishes | 4 | 0.006 |
| CXS | Bigeye Trevally | 3 | 0.005 |
| MAN | Manta Rays | 3 | 0.005 |
| TRC | Slimeheads nei | 3 | 0.005 |
| ALN | Scribbled leatherjacket filefish | 2 | 0.003 |
| CNT | Ocean Trigger Fish | 2 | 0.003 |
| CCA | Bignose shark | 1 | 0.002 |
| GLT | Golden trevally | 1 | 0.002 |
| LMA | Long finned mako | 1 | 0.002 |
| OLR | Olive Ridly turtle | 1 | 0.002 |
| STT | Stingrays | 1 | 0.002 |
| TST | Sickle pomfret | 1 | 0.002 |
| TTX | Marine turtle | 1 | 0.002 |
| UNG | Threespo swimming crab | 1 | 0.002 |
|  | Total | 64,184 | 100.000 |


$\square$ SKJ YFT BET Others

Figure 1: Overall species composition of purse seine catches sampled in port from May, 2009 to May 2010.


Figure 2: Species composition by month of purse seine catches sampled in port from May, 2009 to May, 2010.
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Figure 3: Length frequency distribution of Skipjack tuna caught by purse seiners from May, 2010 to May, 2010.
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Figure 3: continued...
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Figure 4: Length frequency distribution of Yellowfin tuna caught by purse seiners from May, 2009 to May, 2010.
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Figure 4: continued...
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Figure 5: Length frequency distribution of Bigeye tuna caught by purse seiners from May, 2009 to May, 2010.
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## APPENDIX 1 - Descriptive Statistical Tables.

Analysis of Skipjack length measurements (cm)

|  | Sampling Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Descriptive Statistics | May-09 | Jun-09 | Jul-09 | Aug-09 | Sep-09 | Oct-09 | Nov-09 | Dec-09 | Jan-10 | Feb-10 | Mar-10 | Apr-10 | May-10 | Average |
| Mean | 45.75456 | 43.53855 | 42.33301 | 44.02574 | 43.2525 | 43.12902 | 44.37865 | 45.35714 | 46.46725 | 45.87804 | 47.81007 | 46.45578 | 47.69689 | 45.08286 |
| Standard Error | 0.024437 | 0.023703 | 0.019146 | 0.01432 | 0.013454 | 0.01393 | 0.017081 | 0.016117 | 0.014968 | 0.019149 | 0.016933 | 0.018785 | 0.026857 | 0.018375 |
| Median | 46 | 45 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 47 | 46 | 49 | 48 | 50 | 45.53846 |
| Mode | 47 | 47 | 48 | 45 | 45 | 42 | 46 | 46 | 48 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 47.07692 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.133779 | 6.363615 | 7.221244 | 5.952185 | 5.894799 | 5.896799 | 6.535311 | 6.343507 | 5.194933 | 6.447685 | 6.329113 | 8.057926 | 6.808251 | 6.321473 |
| Sample Variance | 26.35569 | 40.49559 | 52.14636 | 35.42851 | 34.74866 | 34.77224 | 42.71029 | 40.24008 | 26.98733 | 41.57265 | 40.05767 | 64.93017 | 46.35228 | 40.52289 |
| Kurtosis | 15.18233 | 2.97917 | 2.10819 | 4.163761 | 6.538716 | 6.512717 | 6.549583 | 4.652739 | 4.304972 | 5.353495 | 9.287644 | 4.028399 | 9.154463 | 6.216629 |
| Skewness | 1.406371 | -0.21269 | 0.627536 | 0.935233 | 0.87186 | 1.222834 | 1.470385 | 0.662159 | 0.038606 | 0.050567 | 0.276447 | -0.23255 | -0.06677 | 0.542307 |
| Range | 98 | 92 | 90 | 130 | 83 | 97 | 97 | 87 | 81 | 96 | 88 | 96 | 83 | 93.69231 |
| Minimum | 10 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 19 | 18 | 11 | 20 | 12 | 22 | 14.38462 |
| Maximum | 108 | 103 | 103 | 101 | 106 | 108 | 108 | 106 | 99 | 107 | 108 | 108 | 105 | 105.3846 |
| Sum | 2019286 | 3138128 | 6021828 | 7606504 | 8302836 | 7728893 | 6496147 | 7026048 | 5597259 | 5201285 | 6679545 | 8548236 | 3065193 | 5956245 |
| Count | 44133 | 72077 | 142249 | 172774 | 191962 | 179204 | 146380 | 154905 | 120456 | 113372 | 139710 | 184008 | 64264 | 132730.3 |
| Confidence Level(95.0\%) | 0.047898 | 0.046458 | 0.037527 | 0.028067 | 0.02637 | 0.027302 | 0.033479 | 0.03159 | 0.029337 | 0.037532 | 0.033188 | 0.036818 | 0.052639 | 0.036016 |

## Analysis of Yellowfin length measurements (cm)

|  | Sampling Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Descriptive Statistics | May-09 | Jun-09 | Jul-09 | Aug-09 | Sep-09 | Oct-09 | Nov-09 | Dec-09 | Jan-10 | Feb-10 | Mar-10 | Apr-10 | May-10 | Average |
| Mean | 60.19134 | 56.76375 | 58.70401 | 53.70903 | 59.37336 | 59.61944 | 62.29037 | 61.03067 | 63.34514 | 61.72126 | 66.48313 | 64.60994 | 72.04596 | 61.5298 |
| Standard Error | 0.095472 | 0.112736 | 0.075002 | 0.039988 | 0.05117 | 0.073654 | 0.119186 | 0.10698 | 0.124042 | 0.123169 | 0.092183 | 0.096837 | 0.167344 | 0.09829 |
| Median | 54 | 53 | 60 | 54 | 56 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 60 | 59 | 75 | 56.76923 |
| Mode | 51 | 52 | 65 | 56 | 58 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 88 | 56.84615 |
| Standard Deviation | 17.38945 | 17.83973 | 16.8763 | 11.36954 | 16.03558 | 17.82736 | 21.70067 | 20.96641 | 23.2092 | 19.39282 | 20.10099 | 21.34272 | 22.63603 | 18.97591 |
| Sample Variance | 302.393 | 318.2558 | 284.8093 | 129.2665 | 257.1399 | 317.8149 | 470.9191 | 439.5901 | 538.6668 | 376.0813 | 404.05 | 455.5118 | 512.3898 | 369.7606 |
| Kurtosis | 0.424927 | 1.611251 | -0.05309 | 4.962982 | 3.049708 | 0.802902 | -0.15438 | 0.997904 | 0.295845 | 0.794862 | 0.320847 | 0.1162 | -0.78823 | 0.95244 |
| Skewness | 0.998525 | 1.247973 | 0.376608 | 1.490918 | 1.573438 | 1.168906 | 0.973093 | 1.281919 | 1.112554 | 1.265313 | 0.934833 | 0.798118 | -0.01031 | 1.016299 |
| Range | 134 | 149 | 150 | 148 | 183 | 175 | 141 | 153 | 160 | 156 | 180 | 143 | 140 | 154.7692 |
| Minimum | 19 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.76923 |
| Maximum | 153 | 160 | 160 | 158 | 193 | 185 | 151 | 163 | 170 | 166 | 190 | 153 | 150 | 165.5385 |
| Sum | 1996908 | 1421421 | 2972184 | 4341784 | 5830880 | 3492745 | 2064988 | 2344188 | 2217650 | 1530070 | 3161140 | 3138428 | 1318225 | 2756201 |
| Count | 33176 | 25041 | 50630 | 80839 | 98207 | 58584 | 33151 | 38410 | 35009 | 24790 | 47548 | 48575 | 18297 | 45558.23 |
| Confidence Level(95.0\%) | 0.187128 | 0.220969 | 0.147005 | 0.078377 | 0.100292 | 0.144363 | 0.233609 | 0.209683 | 0.243127 | 0.241419 | 0.18068 | 0.189803 | 0.32801 | 0.192651 |

## Analysis of Bigeye length measurements (cm)

|  | Sampling Months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Descriptive Statistics | May-09 | Jun-09 | Jul-09 | Aug-09 | Sep-09 | Oct-09 | Nov-09 | Dec-09 | Jan-10 | Feb-10 | Mar-10 | Apr-10 | May-10 | Average |
| Mean | 57.53442 | 56.2054 | 55.49369 | 60.31887 | 59.88566 | 60.54036 | 61.95304 | 55.12894 | 62.19629 | 59.92001 | 66.95738 | 64.82563 | 62.02607 | 60.22967 |
| Standard Error | 0.228444 | 0.170069 | 0.276787 | 0.133217 | 0.143903 | 0.236216 | 0.339063 | 0.233476 | 0.288547 | 0.20704 | 0.27165 | 0.206309 | 0.430444 | 0.243474 |
| Median | 55 | 55 | 56 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 64 | 54 | 59 | 56 | 63 | 61 | 61 | 58.76923 |
| Mode | 54 | 54 | 56 | 60 | 60 | 50 | 65 | 53 | 52 | 50 | 64 | 56 | 60 | 56.46154 |
| Standard Deviation | 10.41112 | 9.199471 | 10.73775 | 10.92868 | 11.73231 | 14.03649 | 11.91553 | 9.666008 | 14.05906 | 13.07473 | 14.71178 | 12.69263 | 14.10648 | 12.09785 |
| Sample Variance | 108.3915 | 84.63028 | 115.2993 | 119.4361 | 137.6472 | 197.0229 | 141.98 | 93.4317 | 197.6572 | 170.9485 | 216.4365 | 161.1028 | 198.9928 | 149.4597 |
| Kurtosis | 1.898107 | 4.784375 | 1.51413 | 1.59619 | 1.660762 | 0.469757 | 1.754761 | 4.599848 | 4.192793 | 1.12868 | 1.567266 | 0.835991 | 0.6978 | 2.053882 |
| Skewness | 1.137005 | 1.236228 | 0.346509 | 0.572415 | 0.765411 | 0.817443 | 0.453215 | 1.455555 | 1.530789 | 1.047833 | 1.050759 | 0.895475 | 0.487459 | 0.907392 |
| Range | 79 | 85 | 84 | 115 | 104 | 90 | 88 | 83 | 107 | 102 | 134 | 93 | 88 | 96.30769 |
| Minimum | 30 | 28 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 22 | 29 | 29 | 34 | 25 | 29 | 24 | 28 | 27.61538 |
| Maximum | 109 | 113 | 108 | 142 | 134 | 112 | 117 | 112 | 141 | 127 | 163 | 117 | 116 | 123.9231 |
| Sum | 119499 | 164457 | 83518 | 405946 | 398060 | 213768 | 76512 | 94491 | 147654 | 238961 | 196386 | 245365 | 66616 | 188556.4 |
| Count | 2077 | 2926 | 1505 | 6730 | 6647 | 3531 | 1235 | 1714 | 2374 | 3988 | 2933 | 3785 | 1074 | 3116.846 |
| Confidence Level(95.0\%) | 0.448003 | 0.333468 | 0.542929 | 0.261148 | 0.282097 | 0.463134 | 0.665203 | 0.457928 | 0.56583 | 0.405915 | 0.532643 | 0.404488 | 0.844607 | 0.477492 |

