Are acoustic spatial capture-recapture models also robust to misspecified detection functions?

David K. E. Chan^{1,2}, Janice Seo¹, and Ben C. Stevenson² ¹ Department of Mathematics, University of Waikato, ²Department of Statistics, University of Auckland

A statistical method to infer animal density from spatially indexed capture-recapture data.

• The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.



Let $N \sim \text{Poisson}(Da)$, where D is animal density and a is the "area" of the survey region. The points represent animals' activity centres and are uniformly distributed across the region.

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.



Out of the *N* animals, *n* animals were detected and these animals' activity centres are a realisation of a thinned point process.

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.





We only explicitly observe the detected animals when they "interact" with the detector.

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.



 $\omega_1 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.



 $\omega_2 = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)$

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.



 $\omega_3 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.
- We can still estimate a detection function with this data and, hence, a detection surface.



Let $g\{d(s_i, x_i); \theta\}$ be the detection function. One example is $g\{d(s_i, x_j); \theta\} = 1 - \exp[-\lambda_0 \exp\{-d(s_i, x_j)^2/2\sigma^2\}]$, where $d(s_i, x_j)$ is the distance between an activity centre location x_i and a detector location x_i .

- The animals' activity centres are a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- Detected animals' activity centres occur with higher intensity near the detectors.
- We only observe the capture histories of detected animals.
- We can still estimate a detection function with this data and, hence, a detection surface.



The thinned point process is a realisation of the Poisson point process thinned by the probability of detecting an animal at all, $p(s) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{J} [1 - g\{d(s_i, x_i); \theta\}].$







Figure: Example of (cartoon) taxa that we can survey.

Email: david.chan@waikato.ac.nz



Acoustic surveys

A survey mode where the target population is detected acoustically.



Figure: Example of (cartoon) taxa that we can survey.

Email: david.chan@waikato.ac.nz





Acoustic spatial capture-recapture (ASCR)

Efford, Dawson, and Borchers (2009) first applied SCR to acoustic survey data, and Stevenson et al. (2015) formalised the framework.

Acoustic spatial capture-recapture (ASCR) Efford, Dawson, and Borchers (2009) first applied SCR to acoustic survey data, and Stevenson

et al. (2015) formalised the framework.

SCR ----> ASCR

1. Observational units are now animal *calls*.



Animation: What a capture-recapture of an animal call looks like.

Acoustic spatial capture-recapture (ASCR) Efford, Dawson, and Borchers (2009) first applied SCR to acoustic survey data, and Stevenson

et al. (2015) formalised the framework.

SCR ----> ASCR

- 1. Observational units are now animal calls.
- 2. The *calling* locations are now a realisation of a Poisson point process.



Animation: What a capture-recapture of an animal call looks like.

Acoustic spatial capture-recapture (ASCR) Efford, Dawson, and Borchers (2009) first applied SCR to acoustic survey data, and Stevenson

et al. (2015) formalised the framework.

SCR ----> ASCR

- 1. Observational units are now animal calls.
- 2. The *calling* locations are now a realisation of a Poisson point process.
- 3. Inference on *call* density and the detection probability of *calls*.



Animation: What a capture-recapture of an animal call looks like.

Is SCR's density estimator robust to detection function misspecification?

SCR literature on misspecified detection functions

Choice of detection function is usually not critical, and the default 'HN' is usually adequate.

— Efford (2023)

SCR literature on misspecified detection functions

Choice of detection function is usually not critical, and the default 'HN' is usually adequate.

Density estimates and confidence intervals were not noticeably affected by the form used for p_s (halfnormal, hazard or negative exponential; Fig. 2), and asymptotic intervals resembled profile likelihood intervals (Table 3).

— Efford (2023)

- Efford, Borchers, & Byrom (2009)

SCR literature on misspecified detection functions

Choice of detection function is usually not critical, and the default 'HN' is usually adequate.

Density estimates and confidence intervals were not noticeably affected by the form used for p_s (halfnormal, hazard or negative exponential; Fig. 2), and asymptotic intervals resembled profile likelihood intervals (Table 3).

Based on our simulation study, we can make recommendations for SCR users regarding the choice of a detection function. First, density and population size estimates are largely immune to misspecifications of the detection function.

— Efford (2023)

- Efford, Borchers, & Byrom (2009)

— Dey et al. (2022)

Number (#) of detectors in the literature

SCR Example #1	SCR Example #2			ASCR	ASCR Example #			
			+	+ +	· +	+	+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
		\succ	+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
			+	+	· +		+	+
							х	

Figure: The 94 detectors used in a SCR survey described by Efford, Borchers, & Byrom (2009).

41 ASCR Example #2



Goals of the investigation

1. Is SCR's density estimator robust to the choice of detection function?

1. That is, does 1. depend on the survey design.

Goals of the investigation

1. Is SCR's density estimator robust to the choice of detection function?

2. Does 1. depend on the number *and* spatial configuration of the detectors¹?

1. That is, does 1. depend on the survey design.

Goals of the investigation

1. Is SCR's density estimator robust to the choice of detection function?

- 2. Does 1. depend on the number *and* spatial configuration of the detectors¹?
- 3. Can model selection methods, like AIC, select an "appropriate" detection function?

Simulation study: Survey designs

We simulate ASCR data for seven survey designs.



Figure: The first set is linear arrangements based on an acoustic survey of gibbons conducted by Kidney et al. (2015).

We use the estimated parameter vector from an ASCR model fitted to one of the acoustic surveys conducted by Measey et al. (2017).

Signal strengths and times of arrival are modelled by conditioning contine observed capture histories.

We use the estimated parameter vector from an ASCR model fitted to one of the acoustic surveys conducted by Measey et al. (2017).

• Signal strength

Call densit

Detection Signal Stre

Times of a

Signal strengths and times of arrival are modelled by conditioning converses observed capture histories.

ty	59.72 calls per hectare per second.
<i>function</i> ength	β_0 = 158.68 dB. β_1 = -1.81 dB. σ_{ss} = 4.82 dB.
rrival	σ _t = 2.08 ms

We use the estimated parameter vector from an ASCR model fitted to one of the acoustic surveys conducted by Measey et al. (2017).

- Call densit • Signal strength
- Times of arrival

Detection Signal Stre

Times of a

Signal strengths and times of arrival are modelled by conditioning converses observed capture histories.

ty	59.72 calls per hectare per second.
<i>function</i> ength	β_0 = 158.68 dB. β_1 = -1.81 dB. σ_{ss} = 4.82 dB.
rrival	σ _t = 2.08 ms

We use the estimated parameter vector from an ASCR model fitted to one of the acoustic surveys conducted by Measey et al. (2017).

- Signal strength
- Times of arrival
- One of Ben's favourite species to model!



Signal strengths and times of arrival are modelled by conditioning converses observed capture histories.

Call density	59.72 calls per hectare per second.
<i>Detection function</i> Signal Strength	β_0 = 158.68 dB. β_1 = -1.81 dB. σ_{ss} = 4.82 dB.
Times of arrival	σ _t = 2.08 ms

Simulation study: Fitted detection functions

For each simulated dataset, we fit four different detection functions to answer our primary question of the investigation.



Figure: The **s**ignal **s**trength detection function used in the simulation study.

Simulation study: Fitted detection functions

For each simulated dataset, we fit four different detection functions to answer our primary question of the investigation. SS



Figure: The signal strength detection function used in the simulation study.

ΗN HR HHN



Figure: A fitted **s**ignal **s**trength detection function for one simulated dataset.

Results: Density estimator performance



Figure: The relative bias of the call density estimator (%) by detection function and if the fitted SCR model included the times of arrival data or not (solid or dotted-dashed line).

Results: AIC Support



Figure: These stacked bar plots visualise the distribution (%) of which misspecified detection function had the highest AIC support for each simulated acoustic SCR dataset by survey design and the inclusion of the times of arrival data.

Key takeaways

• The claim made by the literature is reasonable for typical SCR survey designs.

Key takeaways

- The claim made by the literature is reasonable for typical SCR survey designs.
- Misspecifying the detection function for typical ASCR survey designs will affect the bias of the density estimator.

Key takeaways

- The claim made by the literature is reasonable for typical SCR survey designs.
- Misspecifying the detection function for typical ASCR survey designs will affect the bias of the density estimator.
- Model selection methods, like AIC, can identify an appropriate detection function from the data.

Thanks!

Email: david.chan@waikato.ac.nz

17