



LJMU Research Online

Piel, A

Listening and watching: do camera traps or acoustic sensors more efficiently detect wild chimpanzees in an open habitat?

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/12083/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Piel, A Listening and watching: do camera traps or acoustic sensors more efficiently detect wild chimpanzees in an open habitat? Methods in Ecology and Evolution. ISSN 2041-210X (Accepted)

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Title: Listening and watching: do camera traps or acoustic sensors more efficiently detect wild chimpanzees in an open habitat?

Authors: Anne-Sophie Crunchant¹, David Borchers², Hjalmar Kühl³, Alex Piel¹

Affiliations: ¹Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street, L33AF, Liverpool, UK, ²Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling, University of St Andrews, The Observatory, Buchanan Gardens, St Andrews Fife KY16 9LZ, UK, ³Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher Platz 6, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

Correspondence author: Anne-Sophie Crunchant, Email: as.crunchant@gmail.com.

Running headline: Acoustic and visual chimpanzee detectability

14 **Abstract**

15 **1.** With one million animal species at risk of extinction, there is an urgent need to regularly
16 monitor threatened species. However, in practice this is challenging, especially with wide-
17 ranging, elusive and cryptic species or those that occur at low density.

18 **2.** Here we compare two non-invasive methods, passive acoustic monitoring (n=12) and camera
19 trapping (n=53), to detect chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) in a savanna-woodland mosaic habitat
20 at the Issa Valley, Tanzania. With occupancy modelling we evaluate the efficacy of each
21 method, using the estimated number of sampling days needed to establish chimpanzee absence
22 with 95% probability, as our measure of efficacy.

23 **3.** Passive acoustic monitoring was more efficient than camera trapping in detecting wild
24 chimpanzees. Detectability varied over seasons, likely due to social and ecological factors that
25 influence party size and vocalisation rate. The acoustic method can infer chimpanzee absence
26 with less than ten days of recordings in the field during the late dry season, the period of highest
27 detectability, which was five times faster than the visual method.

28 **4. *Synthesis and applications:*** Despite some technical limitations, we demonstrate that passive
29 acoustic monitoring is a powerful tool for species monitoring. Its applicability in evaluating
30 presence/absence, especially but not exclusively for loud call species, such as cetaceans,
31 elephants, gibbons or chimpanzees provides a more efficient way of monitoring populations
32 and inform conservation plans to mediate species-loss.

33

34 **Keywords:** chimpanzee; occupancy modelling; passive acoustic monitoring; Tanzania;
35 savanna-woodland mosaic habitat; seasonality; videos; vocalisations

36

Introduction

With the sixth extinction crisis ongoing, triggered and exacerbated by anthropogenic disturbance (Barnosky et al., 2011; Ceballos et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2017), there is an urgent need to prioritize conservation actions to monitor and ultimately, mediate species-loss. Typically, conservation planners focus efforts on the most diverse or vulnerable species or else those suffering from intense human activity. To provide critical data that reveal patterns of species distribution over time, systematic monitoring is necessary to assess the impacts of management decisions and evaluate wildlife recovery (Akçakaya et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2018). However, in practice, wildlife monitors must overcome numerous challenges, especially when direct observations are nearly impossible, e.g. when studying nocturnal, cryptic, elusive or hunted species that have changed their activity pattern/behaviour. Consequently, innovative biomonitoring methods are revolutionising the way, the speed, and the reliability of providing the necessary data on not only the threats, but also how animals distribute themselves in ever-changing landscapes.

Detecting species presence is the first and fundamental step for population monitoring. Occupancy is the proportion of an area used by a species (MacKenzie et al., 2006). Occupancy statistical models then use detection/non detection data from multiple visits of a given area to infer the probability of species presence. Occupancy modelling provides a useful tool to assess the population status i.e. declining, stable or increasing, of any species and can be applied to numerous species. It has been successfully used with diverse taxa, including tiger (*Panthera tigris*) monitoring (Karanth et al., 2011) and Antarctic sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) occupancy and diel behaviour (Miller & Miller, 2018). In long-term monitoring programs, occupancy modelling can further reveal the effect of disturbance on animal presence by providing data that reveal landscape-use changes and site colonization and extinction, as well as reveal multi-species interactions as disturbance levels oscillate (Mackenzie et al., 2002;

MacKenzie, Nichols, Hines, Knutson, & Franklin, 2003). Occupancy modelling allows us to refine species distribution models in conservation planning and adjust policy priorities. Whilst these models offer valuable information on species presence and the probability of occupancy, challenges remain to control for detection bias.

Detection probability is the likelihood to detect a species when it is present. Imperfect detection is a common issue and a challenge for species monitoring (MacKenzie et al., 2002), as it can lead to underestimates of occupancy, e.g. type II errors. Occupancy models account for imperfect detection (MacKenzie et al., 2002), which can arise from a variety of causes, including a sensor's placement (Cusack et al., 2015) and detection zone (i.e. closed forest or open area), habitat characteristics, use of baits (Comer et al., 2018), timing and duration of sampling, or animal density and behaviour (Neilson, Avgar, Burton, Broadley, & Boutin, 2018) among others.

Autonomous methods such as passive acoustic methods (PAM) and camera trap (CT) monitoring are two ways to remotely monitor wildlife presence, distribution, and behaviour (Rowcliffe & Carbone, 2008; Burton et al., 2015; Sugai, Silva, Ribeiro Jr, & Llusia, 2019), and both provide data for occupancy models. These methods are non-invasive and for both methods, sensors can be deployed for significantly longer periods (months or years) than time typically used in e.g. traditional approaches like point count surveys (Alquezar & Machado, 2015). Furthermore, multiple locations that may be difficult to access by researchers can be monitored simultaneously by autonomous recording units. This is particularly useful for detecting species that occur at low density.

CT is widely used among conservationists and researchers to study birds and medium to large mammals (Rovero, Tobler, & Sanderson, 2010). Originally, PAM was developed for use with marine mammals (Spiesberger & Fristrup, 1990) and continues to be widely employed for studies of cetacean ranging and abundance (Mellinger, Stafford, Moore, Dziak, & Matsumo,

2007; Sugai, Silva, Ribeirao Jr & Llusia, 2019). However, recent advances in bioacoustics have expanded the applications of acoustic sensors for terrestrial species (Blumstein et al., 2011; Wrege, Rowland, Keen, & Shiu, 2017). More recently applications include study of gibbons (*Nomascus gabriellae*) (Vu & Tran, 2019), and wolves (*Canis lupus*) (Papin, Pichenot, Guérold, & Germain, 2018), among others. Both methods allow for diverse applications (Burton et al., 2015; Gibb, Browning, Glover-Kapfer, & Jones, 2019; Sugai, Silva, Ribeiro Jr & Llusia, 2019), ranging from revealing occurrence and occupancy (Rovero, Collett, Ricci, Martin, & Spitale, 2013; Campos-Cerqueira & Aide, 2016), population size and density (e.g. Marques, Munger, Thomas, Wiggins, & Hildebrand, 2011), demography (e.g. McCarthy et al., 2018), activity patterns (e.g. Oberosler, Groff, Iemma, Pedrini, & Rovero, 2017) and behaviour (e.g. Tsutsumi et al., 2006).

With numerous studies reporting the dramatic, global decline of chimpanzees over the past decades (e.g. Campbell, Kuehl, N’Goran Kouamé, & Boesch, 2008; Junker et al., 2012; Kühl et al., 2017), we need reliable, efficient, and affordable methods to monitor their population status. Like cetaceans, chimpanzees have wide ranges, and rely on loud calls to communicate. Seasonality influences activity patterns, ranging and feeding behaviour of chimpanzees (Doran, 1997), and may consequently influence chimpanzee detectability with CT and PAM. CT studies on chimpanzees have been conducted to study uncommon behaviour, e.g. stone throwing (Kühl et al., 2016) and crab-hunting (Koops et al., 2019), but also for abundance and density estimation (Després-Einspenner, Howe, Drapeau, & Kühl, 2017; Cappelle, Després-Einspenner, Howe, Boesch, & Kühl, 2019) among others. Only a few studies have employed PAM with chimpanzees; those have focused on group ranging and territory use (Kalan et al., 2015, 2016) and temporal patterns of vocalisations (Piel, 2018).

What conservation planners most need, however, is information on the reliability of these methods for application into understanding chimpanzee presence and distribution. Thus, the

primary aim of the study was to compare the efficacy in chimpanzee detection from these two non-invasive methods, namely PAM and CT. Specifically, we had three objectives and for both PAM and CT we sought to: (1) estimate chimpanzee detection probabilities from occupancy modelling; (2) identify the parameters that influence the detectability and more specifically to what extent seasonality plays a role in detectability; and (3) estimate and compare the sampling effort needed to produce precise occupancy estimates and make recommendations for wildlife managers regarding which is the more suitable appropriate method for wildlife surveys. We hypothesized that chimpanzee detectability would be higher with PAM compared to CT, given the larger area covered by the acoustic sensors.

Method

1) Study site

The study was conducted between March and December 2018, in the Issa Valley, western Tanzania (Fig. 1). The area is comprised of a series of valleys separated by steep mountains and flat plateaus, with an altitudinal gradient ranging from 1050 to 1650 m above sea level. Vegetation is dominated by miombo woodland and also includes grassland, swamp and riverine forest. For analyses, we collapsed these categories into just two: 'open' (woodland, grassland, swamp) and 'closed' (riparian forest). It hosts eight primate and four large carnivore species (spotted hyena, lion, leopard, wild dog), and over 260 species of birds (Moyer et al., 2006). The region is one of the driest and most open habitat inhabited by chimpanzees (Moore, 1992). At the time of data collection, the mean monthly rainfall was $118.4 \pm 92\text{mm}$ during the wet season (mid-October to mid-May) and $0.6 \pm 0.9\text{mm}$ during the dry season. Mean minimum and maximum temperatures per day were $16.6 \pm 1.7^\circ\text{C}$ and $27.7 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$, respectively for the dry season and $16.9 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ and $25.7 \pm 2.2^\circ\text{C}$ for the wet season. Data points were measured every five minutes by a weather station (HOBO model RX3000, Onset Corp., Bourne, MA) situated

near the research station. The study site covers the territory of at least one chimpanzee community.

2) Study design

a. Camera trap deployment

For nine months, we deployed twenty-one camera traps (Bushnell Trophy Cam) in a systematic layout (henceforth ‘systematic’ cameras), in grid cells of 1.67km x 1.67km. We deployed thirty-two additional camera traps (Bushnell Trophy Cam) at targeted locations, i.e. animal paths or termite mounds (seven of them) (henceforth ‘targeted’ cameras, Fig. 1). We attached cameras to trees 90cm above the ground and were triggered by movement, which activated a 60s recording, followed by a minimum 1s break before another recording began. For technical reasons, some cameras recorded 15s videos instead of 60s and videos recorded within the same minute have been combined into one video for the analyses. Cameras monitored continuously and were checked once or twice a month to change batteries and SD cards.

b. PAM deployment

We deployed twelve acoustic sensors (SM2, Wildlife Acoustics) for the same nine-month period that were secured on trees at a height of approximately 1.65m, at the top of the valleys to maximize the chance of recording calls. We recorded sounds at a 16kHz sample rate and 16 bit/s in uncompressed .wav format. We scheduled the sensors to record for 30 minutes of every hour from 6:00 to 19:30 (7h/day) to maximize capturing calls when chimpanzees are the most vocally active. We set up the sensors in three clusters of four sensors/cluster, two sensors on each side of a valley (Fig. 2), with inter-sensor distance ~500m to allow for later sound localization. We drew a 500m buffer around each acoustic sensor, corresponding to the area within which a call could reliably be detected (Piel, unpublished data). We rotated the clusters

to new locations within the study area every two weeks (four arrays, Fig. 2). We replaced batteries and SD cards every two weeks.

We manually processed acoustic recordings by visualizing spectrograms and aurally confirming any detection, with the aid of the acoustic software Raven (Bioacoustics Research Program, 2014). Duplicate detections were controlled for by pooling detections from the four sensors belonging to the same cluster into one detection.

3) Occupancy modelling

a. Modelling framework

Occupancy modelling estimates two parameters: Ψ , the probability that a species is present within a site, i.e. probability of occupancy, and p , the probability that a species present is detected within a site, i.e., probability of detection (MacKenzie et al., 2006). For a discussion of assumptions, see (MacKenzie et al., 2006; Kalan et al., 2015).

For both datasets, we divided the sampling period into sampling occasions (SO) of eight days each, resulting in 34 and 35 occasions per site, for PAM and CT respectively. Detection histories were compiled into a matrix containing two different values: (0) non detection and (1) detection. When no survey was conducted during a SO (e.g. due to camera or audio recorder malfunctioning or not deployed), a value of NA was assigned. To estimate the occupancy and detection probabilities, we used a single-season model. We applied the “occu” function from the “unmarked” package in R (Fiske & Chandler, 2011).

b. Covariates

To account for imperfect detection and heterogeneity in occupancy as well as detection probabilities across sampling sites and occasions, we incorporated covariates into the model. To explain the variability in chimpanzee occupancy, we created six vegetation/topography

combination categories: A- closed/slope, B- closed/valley, C- closed/plateau, D- open/plateau, E- open/slope and F- open/valley. We did not include site covariates for PAM, as acoustic sensors were only deployed in one type of location.

For the CT dataset, variables that could influence the detectability were the number of camera-trap days a camera was functioning during a SO (henceforth 'days'), and whether the camera was set-up on a systematic or targeted deployment (henceforth 'method'). For the PAM dataset, variable that could influence the detectability was the number of 30-min occasions the sensors were recording (henceforth 'hours'). For both datasets, we included the seasons (early and late wet, early and late dry) as a covariate. We defined the beginning of the dry season as the first week with no rain (i.e. from 16th of May) and the beginning of the wet season the first week with rain (i.e. from 14th October).

Camera trap days and acoustic sensor hours covariates were z-transformed to a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1 before running the models.

c. Model selection

To determine the factors that best explained chimpanzee detection, we compared all possible combinations of covariates that can influence the detection probability, p . Akaike weights were used to evaluate the weight of evidence for each model and were summed for all models containing each predictor variable. Variables resulting in high summed model weights were considered more important in explaining heterogeneity in detection. For CT we first considered covariates for chimpanzee detectability (p) while keeping occupancy (Ψ) constant and evaluated the best model. We included season, camera placement and days as covariates. Then we evaluated the effect of the vegetation and topography on chimpanzee occupancy. For PAM, we evaluated the effect of seasonality on chimpanzee detectability (p), by evaluating the best model based on the AIC values.

‘occu’ models produce estimates with lower and upper bounds for both occupancy and detection probability on the logit scale. Hence, values were transformed to the original scale using the functions ‘predict’ of the package “Unmarked” (Fiske & Chandler, 2011).

To assess goodness-of-fit of the models, we used the parametric bootstrap procedure (MacKenzie & Bailey, 2004) with the function ‘parboot’ from “unmarked” package (Fiske & Chandler, 2011), using 1000 simulations. We found no indication of lack of fit for our best models ($P > 0.05$).

With the estimation of the detection probability (p), it is possible to estimate the necessary number of sampling visits (N) to infer chimpanzee absence (Kéry, 2002). The probability α to not detect a chimpanzee after N visits is: $\alpha = (1-p)^N$ (McArdle, 1990; Kéry, 2002).

Thus, for $\alpha=0.05$, corresponding to a confidence level of 95%, the minimum number of sampling visits N_{min} is: $N_{min} = \log(0.05)/\log(1 - p)$ (Kéry, 2002).

We estimated the number of trap days corresponding, by multiplying N_{min} by eight for CT and PAM given that one visit corresponds to eight CT days.

All analyses were conducted in R studio version 1.2.1335; R Core Team, 2018; available online at: <https://www.r-project.org>) and maps were created in QGIS version 3.6.2 Noosa; QGIS Development team, 2018; available online at: <http://www.qgis.org>).

Results

1) Visual vs acoustic detections

For the total duration of the study, the cameras were functional for 11,342 camera days across 21 systematic CT and 32 targeted CT. It resulted in 3349 chimpanzee videos. 125 videos were recorded on 12 systematic cameras and 3224 on 32 targeted cameras (table 1). The acoustic sensors recorded for 5316 cluster hours (15344 sensors hours). Of the 10632 30-min occasions analysed, at least one detection has been detected in 1024 occasions (9.6%) and detections have been made on all sites surveyed. Calls have

been made at each hour of the day with a higher proportion early morning (6am and 7am). Both methods reveal a similar strict pattern of seasonal detection with a peak in detections during the late dry and early wet seasons (Fig. 3).

2) Factors influencing detectability

The best model to predict chimpanzee detectability for PAM comprised season as a covariate (Table 2). The best model to predict chimpanzee detectability for CT comprised all covariates: days, season and camera placement (Table 2) and was strongly supported ($\Sigma w > 0.95$; $\Delta AIC < 2$) (Burnham & Anderson, 2002) and ranked higher than the constant model ($\Delta AIC = 148.64$).

Vegetation/topography had no significant effect on chimpanzee occupancy.

Detection probabilities were lower during the late wet and early dry seasons and higher during the late dry and early wet seasons (Fig. 4). Detection probabilities were higher for the targeted placement compared to the systematic placement.

To infer chimpanzee absence with a confidence level of 95%, the number of trap days required was lower for PAM during the late dry and early wet seasons (Fig. 5).

Discussion

CT and PAM methods revealed similar patterns of chimpanzee spatiotemporal distribution, with peaks of detections by both methods occurring in the same valleys in function of the seasons. However, when we compared the deployment duration required of each method to infer chimpanzee absence at a confidence level of 95%, PAM was superior, with only ten and fifteen days needed during the late dry and early wet seasons, respectively. Alternatively, CT required up to five times longer (e.g. 51 and 33 days for the late dry and early wet seasons, respectively, in an area of known for chimpanzee presence – ‘targeted placement’) at the same times of year. Detection probabilities varied as a function of season, with higher vocal and

visual detections during the late dry and early wet seasons. We first discuss the efficiency of both methods, explore the ecological and social factors that can explain seasonal variability of detection, and then evaluate the advantages and limitations of these methods.

3) Efficacy of PAM and CT in chimpanzee detection

If we define efficacy as the shortest amount of time needed to detect a chimpanzee, PAM was more efficacious and acoustic detection rates were higher. The finding is similar to other studies comparing acoustic and visual methods in detecting southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*), sika deer (*Cervus nippon*) and Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*) (Rayment, Webster, Brough, Jowett, & Dawson, 2018; Enari, Enari, Okuda, Maruyama, & Okuda, 2019). This is likely due to the detection area with PAM being far larger than with CT, estimated to be up to 7000 times greater than those for CT in the study from Enari, Enari, Okuda, Maruyama & Okuda (2019).

Detection probabilities were higher on a targeted camera trap placement compared to a random placement, as expected. This suggests that when using the CT method, a pre-survey to find any feeding trees or animal paths will maximise the chance to capture an animal.

4) Ecological and social factors influencing detectability

We can assume that acoustic and visual detectability are influenced by party size. Indeed, parties with more chimpanzees call more often (Fedurek, Schel, & Slocombe, 2013). Likewise, there is a greater likelihood of chimpanzees being visually recorded on the cameras as party size increases. The variation in detection probabilities across seasons is likely due to seasonal differences in social grouping and ranging patterns.

At Issa, for example, mean dry season party size is nearly twice that of the wet season (unpublished data). In our study, we found higher detectability during the late dry and early wet

seasons. Fruit availability itself might not explain party size fluctuation but rather the interaction of food availability and food distribution.

The presence of females showing full swellings is another important factor that influences party size, with parties larger when a swollen female is present (Sakura, 1994; Wallis, 1995; Mitani, Watts, & Lwanga, 2002). Furthermore, male chimpanzees become more aggressive when they are in a party with oestrous females (Sobolewski, Brown, & Mitani, 2013) and are therefore more vocal (i.e. more vocalisations because fighting) (Fedurek, Donnellan, & Slocombe, 2014). At both Issa and Gombe National Park, females show full swellings more often during the late dry season (Gombe: Wallis, 1995; Issa, unpublished data). Consequently, these extrinsic factors may explain the higher detection probability during the late dry season, both by PAM because of the increased calling behaviour and CT, because parties are larger overall.

5) Potential applicability to other studies, advantages and limitations

This study confirms the applicability and potential of PAM compared to CT to detect chimpanzees. The methods used here are highly applicable to other loud-calling species, such as elephants (Wrege, Rowland, Keen & Shiu, 2017), gibbons (Kidney et al., 2016), howler monkeys (Aide et al., 2013), and could also be applied to insects or frogs (Aide et al., 2013). Species behaviour plays an important role in detection and should be taken into consideration during study design. For instance, deer detectability will be higher during the rutting season (Enari, Enari, Okuda, Maruyama & Okuda, 2019), just as we might be seeing for chimpanzees as well.

Despite PAM requiring less deployment time to confirm chimpanzee absence in this study, the limitations of the method are significant. In contrast to camera traps that record only when a detection is made, acoustic sensors record all sounds, continuously or on a pre-determined

312 schedule. This generates enormous datasets and sophisticated, big data processing and analyses
313 are required to post-process (e.g. filter) sounds of interest (See below; Knight et al., 2017). Data
314 storage can be problematic as well for both methods. Another challenge is power, with regular
315 visits needed to maintain the system. However, with only a few days required to detect a
316 chimpanzee combined with the development of new low cost sensors that can be recharged with
317 solar panels (e.g. Beason, Riesch, & Koricheva, 2018; Hill et al., 2018; Nazir et al., 2017; Sethi,
318 Ewers, Jones, Orme, & Picinali, 2018), current challenges are already being overcome. Lastly,
319 without automated detection, analyses of PAM and CT data are extremely time-consuming and
320 so not advisable when conducting regular surveys. For instance, in this study with 10 days
321 required for PAM to infer chimpanzee absence, this corresponds to 1120min of manual
322 processing ($10 \text{ (days)} \times 14 \text{ (audio files per day)} \times 2 \text{ (minutes to process one audio file)} \times 4$
323 (sensors)). In the past few years, major improvements in automated species detection algorithms
324 have transformed the way big data are analysed (e.g. Clink, Crofoot, & Marshall, 2019; Knight
325 et al., 2017; Wrege, Rowland, Keen, & Shiu, 2017). Different methods of machine learning
326 (e.g. neural networks) are available, see the review from Bianco and colleagues (2019) for more
327 details. A manual validation to clean false positives is, however, necessary (e.g. Campos-
328 Cerqueira, Aide, & Jones 2016; Cruncheon et al., 2017; Enari, Enari, Okuda, Maruyama &
329 Okuda 2019; Kalan et al., 2015) to control for false positives. With species with high call
330 variabilities, like chimpanzees, developing an algorithm is more challenging but as technology
331 improves rapidly, we can expect the development of a detection algorithm in the near future.
332 Lastly, these two approaches offer complementary information, and methods should be used in
333 accordance with particular objectives. For instance, CT allows for individual identification,
334 necessary to extract information on population abundance (e.g. Després-Einspenner et al.,
335 2017).

Similar to PAM, new technologies such as drones can offer an aerial perspective and provide real-time feedback for rapid surveys (Wich & Koh, 2018). By combining these two promising technologies, otherwise labour and time intensive species monitoring is on the cusp of being revolutionised by remotely recorded sounds with drone-mounted microphones. If the major drawback for using UAV in acoustic biomonitoring is the excessive UAV noise that can mask the targeted sound, new methods are already in progress, such as the development of signal processing algorithms that reduce noise in recording (Hioka, Kingan, Schmid, McKay, & Stol, 2019).

Conservation applications

Regular surveys and monitoring are crucial for evaluating conservation efforts aimed at impeding the global decline of great apes and overall biodiversity. Developing an accurate and time-effective method of surveying animals especially in remote areas is critical. Here we demonstrated the usefulness of PAM compared to CT to evaluate the absence of an endangered species. The continuing development of new technologies and the increasing inter-disciplinary collaboration between engineers, field ecologists and bioinformaticians are driving new affordable and effective biomonitoring methods. The dramatic improvements in biomonitoring techniques over the last decade are altering the way we remotely study wildlife distribution by helping to plan surveys (e.g. Hodgson et al., 2018), identify hotspots and prioritize patrols (e.g. Hambrecht, Brown, Piel, & Wich, 2019), and how we monitor the wildlife response to ever-increasing anthropogenic disturbance to their environments (e.g. Buxton, Lendrum, Crooks, & Wittemyer, 2018).

Acknowledgments

We thank the Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) and Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) for permission to carry out research in Tanzania. This work was supported by the Primate Society of Great Britain through the Cyril Rosen Conservation Grant. Long term funding for ongoing research at Issa is supported by the UCSD/Salk Center for Academic Research and Training in Anthropogeny (CARTA). Thank you to the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (MPI EVA) for the field equipment. We are also extremely grateful to all field assistants of the Greater Mahale Ecosystem Research and Conservation (GMERC) for their help in the field. Many thanks to Noémie Bonnin, Ineke Knot, and two reviewers for their valuable feedback on earlier versions of the manuscript. Authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Data accessibility: all acoustic and video data are accessible upon request to the authors.

Author contribution: ASC, DB, HK, AP conceived the ideas and designed methodology; ASC collected and analysed the data; ASC and AP wrote the manuscript, and all authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

References

- Aide, T. M., Corrada-Bravo, C., Campos-Cerqueira, M., Milan, C., Vega, G., & Alvarez, R. (2013). Real-time bioacoustics monitoring and automated species identification. *PeerJ*, 1, e103. doi:10.7717/peerj.103
- Akçakaya, H. R., Bennett, E. L., Brooks, T. M., Grace, M. K., Heath, A., Hedges, S., ... Young, R. P. (2018). Quantifying species recovery and conservation success to develop an IUCN Green List of Species. *Conservation Biology*, 32(5), 1128–1138. doi:10.1111/cobi.13112
- Alquezar, R. D., & Machado, R. B. (2015). Comparisons between autonomous acoustic recordings and avian point counts in open woodland savanna. *The Wilson Journal of Ornithology*, 127(4), 712–723. doi:10.1676/14-104.1

- 385 Barnosky, A. D., Matzke, N., Tomiya, S., Wogan, G. O. U., Swartz, B., Quental, T. B., ...
 386 Ferrer, E. A. (2011). Has the Earth's sixth mass extinction already arrived? *Nature*,
 387 471(7336), 51–57. doi:10.1038/nature09678
- 388 Beason, R. D., Riesch, R., & Koricheva, J. (2018). AURITA: an affordable, autonomous
 389 recording device for acoustic monitoring of audible and ultrasonic frequencies.
 390 *Bioacoustics*, 4622, 1–16. doi:10.1080/09524622.2018.1463293
- 391 Bianco, M. J., Gerstoft, P., Traer, J., Ozanich, E., Roch, M. A., Gannot, S., & Deledalle, C.-A.
 392 (2019). Machine learning in acoustics: theory and applications. *Journal of Acoustical*
 393 *Society of America*, 1–39.
- 394 Bioacoustics Research Program. (2014). Raven Pro: interactive sound analysis software
 395 (version 1.5). Ithaca, NY: The Cornell Lab of Ornithology.
- 396 Blumstein, D. T., Mennill, D. J., Clemins, P., Girod, L., Yao, K., Patricelli, G., ... Kirschel, A.
 397 N. G. (2011). Acoustic monitoring in terrestrial environments using microphone arrays:
 398 applications, technological considerations and prospectus. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
 399 48(3), 758–767. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.01993.x
- 400 Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. (2002). *Model Selection and Multi-model Inference*. New
 401 York: Springer.
- 402 Burton, A. C., Neilson, E., Moreira, D., Ladle, A., Steenweg, R., Fisher, J. T., ... Boutin, S.
 403 (2015). Wildlife camera trapping: A review and recommendations for linking surveys to
 404 ecological processes. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 52(3), 675–685. doi:10.1111/1365-
 405 2664.12432
- 406 Buxton, R. T., Lendrum, P. E., Crooks, K. R., & Wittemyer, G. (2018). Pairing camera traps
 407 and acoustic recorders to monitor the ecological impact of human disturbance. *Global*
 408 *Ecology and Conservation*, 16, e00493. doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00493
- 409 Campbell, G., Kuehl, H., N'Goran Kouamé, P., & Boesch, C. (2008). Alarming decline of West

- 410 African chimpanzees in Côte d'Ivoire. *Current Biology*, 18(19), 903–904.
 411 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.08.015
- 412 Campos-Cerqueira, M., & Aide, T. M. (2016). Improving distribution data of threatened species
 413 by combining acoustic monitoring and occupancy modelling. *Methods in Ecology and*
 414 *Evolution*, 7(11), 1340–1348. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12599
- 415 Cappelle, N., Després-Einspenner, M.-L., Howe, E. J., Boesch, C., & Köhl, H. S. (2019).
 416 Validating camera trap distance sampling for chimpanzees. *American Journal of*
 417 *Primatology*. doi:10.1002/ajp.22962
- 418 Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R., Barnosky, A. D., García, A., Pringle, R. M., & Palmer, T. M.
 419 (2015). Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass
 420 extinction. *Science Advances*, 1(5), e1400253. doi:10.1126/sciadv.1400253
- 421 Clink, D. J., Crofoot, M. C., & Marshall, A. J. (2019). Application of a semi-automated vocal
 422 fingerprinting approach to monitor Bornean gibbon females in an experimentally
 423 fragmented landscape in Sabah, Malaysia. *Bioacoustics*, 28(3), 193–209.
 424 doi:10.1080/09524622.2018.1426042
- 425 Comer, S., Speldewinde, P., Tiller, C., Clausen, L., Pinder, J., Cowen, S., & Algar, D. (2018).
 426 Evaluating the efficacy of a landscape scale feral cat control program using camera traps
 427 and occupancy models. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1–9. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-23495-z
- 428 Crunchant, A.-S., Egerer, M., Loos, A., Burghardt, T., Zuberbühler, K., Corogenes, K., ...
 429 Köhl, H. S. (2017). Automated face detection for occurrence and occupancy estimation in
 430 chimpanzees. *American Journal of Primatology*, 79(3), 1–12. doi:10.1002/ajp.22627
- 431 Cusack, J. J., Dickman, A. J., Rowcliffe, J. M., Carbone, C., Macdonald, D. W., & Coulson, T.
 432 (2015). Random versus game trail-based camera trap placement strategy for monitoring
 433 terrestrial mammal communities. *PLoS ONE*, 10(5), e0126373.
 434 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126373

- Després-Einspenner, M.-L., Howe, E. J., Drapeau, P., & Kühl, H. S. (2017). An empirical evaluation of camera trapping and spatially explicit capture-recapture models for estimating chimpanzee density. *American Journal of Primatology*, (e22647), 1–12. doi:10.1002/ajp.22647
- Doran, D. (1997). Influence of seasonality on activity patterns, feeding behavior, ranging, and grouping patterns in Tai chimpanzees. *International Journal of Primatology*, 18(2), 183–206.
- Enari, H., Enari, H. S., Okuda, K., Maruyama, T., & Okuda, K. N. (2019). An evaluation of the efficiency of passive acoustic monitoring in detecting deer and primates in comparison with camera traps. *Ecological Indicators*, 98(July 2018), 753–762. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.11.062
- Fedurek, P., Donnellan, E., & Slocombe, K. E. (2014). Social and ecological correlates of long-distance pant hoot calls in male chimpanzees. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 68(8), 1345–1355. doi:10.1007/s00265-014-1745-4
- Fedurek, P., Schel, A. M., & Slocombe, K. E. (2013). The acoustic structure of chimpanzee pant-hooting facilitates chorusing. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67(11), 1781–1789. doi:10.1007/S00265-0
- Fiske, I. J., & Chandler, R. B. (2011). unmarked : An R package for fitting hierarchical models of wildlife occurrence and abundance. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 43(10), 1–23. doi:10.18637/jss.v043.i10
- Gibb, R., Browning, E., Glover-Kapfer, P., & Jones, K. E. (2019). Emerging opportunities and challenges for passive acoustics in ecological assessment and monitoring. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 169–185. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13101
- Hambrecht, L., Brown, R. P., Piel, A. K., & Wich, S. A. (2019). Detecting ‘poachers’ with drones: Factors influencing the probability of detection with TIR and RGB imaging in

- 460 miombo woodlands, Tanzania. *Biological Conservation*, 233, 109–117.
 461 doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2019.02.017
- 462 Hill, A. P., Prince, P., Piña Covarrubias, E., Doncaster, C. P., Snaddon, J. L., & Rogers, A.
 463 (2018). AudioMoth: Evaluation of a smart open acoustic device for monitoring
 464 biodiversity and the environment. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. doi:10.1111/2041-
 465 210X.12955
- 466 Hioka, Y., Kingan, M., Schmid, G., McKay, R., & Stol, K. A. (2019). Design of an unmanned
 467 aerial vehicle mounted system for quiet audio recording. *Applied Acoustics*, 155, 423–427.
 468 doi:10.1016/j.apacoust.2019.06.001
- 469 Hodgson, J. C., Mott, R., Baylis, S. M., Pham, T. T., Wotherspoon, S., Kilpatrick, A. D., ...
 470 Koh, L. P. (2018). Drones count wildlife more accurately and precisely than humans.
 471 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(5), 1160–1167. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12974
- 472 Johnson, C. N., Balmford, A., Brook, B. W., Buettel, J. C., Galetti, M., Guangchun, L., &
 473 Wilmshurst, J. M. (2017). Biodiversity losses and conservation responses in the
 474 Anthropocene. *Science*, 356(6335), 270–275. doi:10.1126/science.aam9317
- 475 Junker, J., Blake, S., Boesch, C., Campbell, G., Toit, L. du, Duvall, C., ... Kuehl, H. S. (2012).
 476 Recent decline in suitable environmental conditions for African great apes. *Diversity and*
 477 *Distributions*, 18(11), 1077–1091. doi:10.1111/ddi.12005
- 478 Kalan, A. K., Mundry, R., Wagner, O. J. J., Heinicke, S., Boesch, C., & Kühl, H. S. (2015).
 479 Towards the automated detection and occupancy estimation of primates using passive
 480 acoustic monitoring. *Ecological Indicators*, 54, 217–226.
 481 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.02.023
- 482 Kalan, A. K., Piel, A. K., Mundry, R., Wittig, R. M., Boesch, C., & Kühl, H. S. (2016). Passive
 483 acoustic monitoring reveals group ranging and territory use: a case study of wild
 484 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Frontiers in Zoology*, 13(1), 34. doi:10.1186/s12983-016-

- 485 0167-8
- 486 Karanth, K. U., Gopalaswamy, A. M., Kumar, N. S., Vaidyanathan, S., Nichols, J. D., &
 487 Mackenzie, D. I. (2011). Monitoring carnivore populations at the landscape scale:
 488 Occupancy modelling of tigers from sign surveys. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 48(4),
 489 1048–1056. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02002.x
- 490 Kéry, M. (2002). Inferring the absence of a species : A case study of snakes. *The Journal of*
 491 *Wildlife Management*, 66(2), 330–338.
- 492 Kidney, D., Rawson, B. M., Borchers, D. L., Stevenson, B. C., Marques, T. A., & Thomas, L.
 493 (2016). An efficient acoustic density estimation method with human detectors applied to
 494 gibbons in Cambodia. *PLoS ONE*, 11(5), e0155066. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155066
- 495 Knight, E. C., Hannah, K. C., Foley, G. J., Scott, C. D., Brigham, R. M., & Bayne, E. (2017).
 496 Recommendations for acoustic recognizer performance assessment with application to
 497 five common automated signal recognition programs. *Avian Conservation and Ecology*,
 498 12(2), 14. doi:10.5751/ACE-01114-120214
- 499 Koops, K., Wrangham, R. W., Cumberlidge, N., Fitzgerald, M. A., van Leeuwen, K. L., &
 500 Rothman, J. M., Matsuzawa, T. (2019). Crab-fishing by chimpanzees in the Nimba
 501 Mountains, Guinea. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 133, 230–241.
- 502 Kühl, H. S., Kalan, A. K., Arandjelovic, M., Aubert, F., D’Auvergne, L., Goedmakers, A., ...
 503 Boesch, C. (2016). Chimpanzee accumulative stone throwing. *Scientific Reports*,
 504 6(November 2015), 1–8. doi:10.1038/srep22219
- 505 Kühl, H. S., Sop, T., Williamson, E. A., Mundry, R., Brugière, D., Campbell, G., ... Boesch,
 506 C. (2017). The critically endangered western chimpanzee declines by 80%. *American*
 507 *Journal of Primatology*, 79(9). doi:10.1002/ajp.22681
- 508 MacKenzie, D. I., & Bailey, L. L. (2004). Assessing the fit of site-occupancy models. *Journal*
 509 *of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 9(3), 300–318.

510 doi:10.1198/108571104X3361

511 MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Hines, J. E., Knutson, M. G., & Franklin, A. B. (2003).

512 Estimating site occupancy, colonization, and local extinction when a species is detected

513 imperfectly. *Ecology*, 84(8), 2200–2207.

514 MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Lachman, G. B., Droedge, S., Royle, J. A., & Langtimm, C.

515 A. (2002). Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one.

516 *Ecology*, 83(8), 2248–2255. doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083

517 MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Royle, J. A., Pollock, K. H., Bailey, L. L., & Hines, J. E.

518 (2006). *Occupancy estimation and modeling: inferring patterns and dynamics of species*

519 *occurrence*. Elsevier.

520 Marques, T. A., Munger, L., Thomas, L., Wiggins, S., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2011). Estimating

521 North Pacific right whale *Eubalaena japonica* density using passive acoustic cue counting.

522 *Endangered Species Research*, 13(3), 163–172. doi:10.3354/esr00325

523 Martin, T. G., Kehoe, L., Mantyka-Pringle, C., Chades, I., Wilson, S., Bloom, R. G., ... Smith,

524 P. A. (2018). Prioritizing recovery funding to maximize conservation of endangered

525 species. *Conservation Letters*, 1–9. doi:10.1111/conl.12604

526 McArdle, B. H. (1990). When Are Rare Species Not There ? *Nordic Society Oikos*, 57(2), 276–

527 277.

528 McCarthy, M. S., Després-Einspenner, M.-L., Samuni, L., Mundry, R., Lemoine, S., Preis, A.,

529 ... Kühl, H. S. (2018). An assessment of the efficacy of camera traps for studying

530 demographic composition and variation in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *American*

531 *Journal of Primatology*, 80(9), 1–10. doi:10.1002/ajp.22904

532 Mellinger, D., Stafford, K. M., Moore, S. E., Dziak, R. P., & Matsumo. (2007). An overview

533 of fixed passive acoustic observation methods for cetaceans. *Oceanography*, 20(4), 36–

534 45.

- 535 Miller, B. S., & Miller, E. J. (2018). The seasonal occupancy and diel behaviour of Antarctic
 536 sperm whales revealed by acoustic monitoring. *Scientific Reports*, 1–12.
 537 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-23752-1
- 538 Mitani, J. C., Watts, D. P., & Lwanga, J. S. (2002). Ecological and social correlates of
 539 chimpanzee party size and composition. In *Behavioural Diversity in Chimpanzees and*
 540 *Bonobos* (pp. 102–111). doi:10.1017/cbo9780511606397.011
- 541 Moore, J. (1992). Savanna chimpanzees. In T. Nishida, P. McGrew, P. Marler, M. Pickford, &
 542 F. de Waal (Eds.), *Topics in primatology, vol.1 human origins* (pp. 99–118). Tokyo:
 543 University of Tokyo Press.
- 544 Moyer, D., Plumptre, A. J., Pintea, L., Hernandez-Aguilar, A., Moore, J., Stewart, F., ...
 545 Mwangoka, M. (2006). *Surveys of chimpanzees and other biodiversity in Western*
 546 *Tanzania*. Arlington, VA: United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- 547 Nazir, S., Newey, S., Irvine, R. J., Verdicchio, F., Davidson, P., Fairhurst, G., & Van Der Wal,
 548 R. (2017). WiseEye: Next generation expandable and programmable camera trap platform
 549 for wildlife research. *PLoS ONE*, 12(1), 1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169758
- 550 Neilson, E. W., Avgar, T., Burton, A. C., Broadley, K., & Boutin, S. (2018). Animal movement
 551 affects interpretation of occupancy models from camera-trap surveys of unmarked
 552 animals. *Ecosphere*, 9(1), e02092. doi:10.1002/ecs2.2092
- 553 Oberosler, V., Groff, C., Iemma, A., Pedrini, P., & Rovero, F. (2017). The influence of human
 554 disturbance on occupancy and activity patterns of mammals in the Italian Alps from
 555 systematic camera trapping. *Mammalian Biology*, 87, 50–61.
 556 doi:10.1016/j.mambio.2017.05.005
- 557 Papin, M., Pichenot, J., Guérol, F., & Germain, E. (2018). Acoustic localization at large
 558 scales : a promising method for grey wolf monitoring. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 1–10.
- 559 Piel, A. K. (2018). Temporal patterns of chimpanzee loud calls in the Issa Valley, Tanzania:

- 560 Evidence of nocturnal acoustic behavior in wild chimpanzees. *American Journal of*
561 *Physical Anthropology*, 166(3), 530–540. doi:10.1002/ajpa.23609
- 562 Rayment, W., Webster, T., Brough, T., Jowett, T., & Dawson, S. (2018). Seen or heard ? A
563 comparison of visual and acoustic autonomous monitoring methods for investigating
564 temporal variation in occurrence of southern right whales. *Marine Biology*, 165(12).
565 doi:10.1007/s00227-017-3264-0
- 566 Rovero, F., Collett, L., Ricci, S., Martin, E., & Spitale, D. (2013). Distribution, occupancy, and
567 habitat associations of the gray-faced sengi (*Rhynchocyon udzungwensis*) as revealed by
568 camera traps. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 94(4), 792–800. doi:10.1644/12-mamm-a-235.1
- 569 Rovero, F., Tobler, M. W., & Sanderson, J. (2010). Camera trapping for inventorying terrestrial
570 vertebrates. In *Manual on field recording techniques and protocols for All Taxa*
571 *Biodiversity Inventories and Monitoring. The Belgian National Focal Point to the Global*
572 *Taxonomy Initiative* (pp. 100–128).
- 573 Rowcliffe, J. M., & Carbone, C. (2008). Surveys using camera traps: Are we looking to a
574 brighter future? *Animal Conservation*, 11(3), 185–186. doi:10.1111/j.1469-
575 1795.2008.00180.x
- 576 Sakura, O. (1994). Factors affecting party size and composition of chimpanzees (Pan
577 troglodytes verus) Bossou, Guinea. *International Journal of Primatology*, 15(2), 167–183.
578 doi:10.1007/BF02735272
- 579 Sethi, S. S., Ewers, R. M., Jones, N. S., Orme, C. D. L., & Picinali, L. (2018). Robust, real-time
580 and autonomous monitoring of ecosystems with an open, low-cost, networked device.
581 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(12), 2383–2387. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13089
- 582 Sobolewski, M. E., Brown, J. L., & Mitani, J. C. (2013). Female parity, male aggression, and
583 the Challenge Hypothesis in wild chimpanzees. *Primates*, 54(1), 81–88.
584 doi:10.1007/s10329-012-0332-4

- Spiesberger, J. L., & Fristrup, K. M. (1990). Passive localization of calling animals and sensing of their acoustic environment using acoustic tomography. *The American Naturalist*, 135(1), 107–153.
- Sugai, L. S. M., Silva, T. S. F., Ribeiro Jr., J. W., & Llusia, D. (2019). Terrestrial passive acoustic monitoring: review and perspectives. *BioScience*, 69(1), 5–11. doi:10.1093/biosci/biy147
- Tsutsumi, C., Ichikawa, K., Arai, N., Akamatsu, T., Shinke, T., Hara, T., & Adulyanukosol, K. (2006). Feeding behavior of wild dugongs monitored by a passive acoustical method. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 120(3), 1356–1360. doi:10.1121/1.2221529
- Vu, T. T., & Tran, L. M. (2019). An application of autonomous recorders for gibbon monitoring. *International Journal of Primatology*, (2).
- Wallis, J. (1995). Seasonal influence on reproduction in chimpanzees of Gombe National Park. *International Journal of Primatology*, 16(3).
- Wich, S. A., & Koh, L. P. (2018). *Conservation drones: : mapping and monitoring biodiversity*. Oxford University Press.
- Wrege, P. H., Rowland, E. D., Keen, S., & Shiu, Y. (2017). Acoustic monitoring for conservation in tropical forests: examples from forest elephants. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(10), 1292–1301. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12730

Tables

Table 1: Summary of the visual and acoustic deployments

	CT		PAM
	systematic	targeted	
Number of sensors	21	32	12
Detection distance/sensor (m)	Max. 29	Max. 29	500
Trap days (per CT or acoustic cluster)	217.1 [147-260]	211.9 [66-280]	68.2 [55-75]
Number of sites with detections (CT or acoustic cluster)	12	32	12
Total detections (videos or 30min audio files)	125	3224	1024
Average trap days with a detection (% per CT or acoustic cluster)	1.94 [0-13.8]	8.33 [0.4-22.1]	38.9 [24.6-52.8]

Table 2: Summary of occupancy modelling for the best models

Models	# Parameters	AIC	Δ	AIC weight
<i>PAM</i>				
p(season+hours) $\Psi(.)$	6	135.17	0.00	1
p(season) $\Psi(.)$	5	161.64	26.47	1.8×10^{-6}
p(hours) $\Psi(.)$	3	173.15	37.98	5.7×10^{-9}
p(.) $\Psi(.)$	2	188.68	53.51	2.4×10^{-12}
<i>CT</i>				
p(season+method+days) $\Psi(\text{vegetation/topography})$	12	1507.38	0.00	0.95
p(season+method+days) $\Psi(.)$	7	1513.33	5.95	0.049




Figure 1: Study site and camera trap locations (targeted and systematic placements) in Issa Valley, Western Tanzania.




Figure 2: Location of acoustic sensors: each set-up (A, B, C, D) remained two weeks before being rotated to another one. Detectability is the area where a call can reach a sensor, defined as a 500m buffer around a sensor.




Figure 3: Heatmap of chimpanzee detections (proportion of recording days with at least one detection, call or video) for the CT (A) and PAM (B) datasets, in function of the four seasons, early/late wet and early/late dry.




Figure 4: Detection probabilities for each method (PAM, systematic and targeted CT) depending on the season. Error bars represent upper and lower bounds.




Figure 5: Number of trap days necessary to infer chimpanzee absence at a confidence level of 95% in function of seasons and methods. Error bars represent upper and lower bounds.