



HAL
open science

Using single visits into integrated occupancy models to make the most of existing monitoring programs

Valentin Lauret, H el ene Labach, Matthieu Authier, Olivier Gimenez

► To cite this version:

Valentin Lauret, H el ene Labach, Matthieu Authier, Olivier Gimenez. Using single visits into integrated occupancy models to make the most of existing monitoring programs. *Ecology*, 2021, 102 (12), pp.e03535. <10.1002/ecy.3535>. <hal-03649791>

HAL Id: hal-03649791

<https://hal.science/hal-03649791v1>

Submitted on 23 Apr 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.



HAL Authorization

1 **Running head: Integrated single-visit occupancy models**

2 **Title: Using single visits into integrated occupancy models to make the most of existing**
3 **monitoring programs**

4 **Authors: Valentin Lauret¹, H  l  ne Labach^{1,2}, Matthieu Authier^{3,4}, Olivier Gimenez¹**

5 (1) CEFE, Universit   Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Universit   Paul Val  ry Montpellier 3,
6 Montpellier, France

7 (2) MIRACETI, Connaissance et conservation des c  tac  s, Place des traceurs de pierres, 13500
8 La Couronne, France

9 (3) ADERA, 162 avenue Albert Schweitzer, 33608 Pessac Cedex

10 (4) Observatoire PELAGIS, UMS 3462 CNRS-La Rochelle Universit  , 5 all  e de l'Oc  an,
11 17000 La Rochelle

12 **Corresponding author:** Valentin Lauret, valentin.lauret@ens-lyon.fr, CEFE 1919 Route de
13 Mende, 34090 Montpellier, France.

14 **Open Research Statement:** This submission uses novel code, which is provided as

15 Supporting Information to be evaluated as part of the submission.

16 After publication, codes and data will be stored on the following permanent repository

17 <https://github.com/valentinlauret/IntegratedSingleVisitOccupancy>

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 A major challenge in statistical ecology consists of integrating knowledge from different
22 datasets to produce robust ecological indicators. To estimate species distribution, occupancy
23 models are a flexible framework that can accommodate several datasets obtained from different
24 sampling methods. However, repeating visits at sampling sites is a prerequisite for using
25 standard occupancy models. Occupancy models were recently developed to analyze
26 detection/non-detection data collected during a single visit. To date, single-visit occupancy
27 models have never been used to integrate several different datasets. Here, we showcase an
28 approach that combines two datasets into an integrated single-visit occupancy model. As a case
29 study, we estimated the distribution of common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) over
30 the North-western Mediterranean Sea by combining 24,624 km of aerial surveys and 21,464
31 km of at-sea monitoring. We compared the outputs of single- vs. repeated-visit occupancy
32 models into integrated occupancy models. Integrated models allowed a better sampling
33 coverage of the targeted population, which provided a better precision for occupancy estimates
34 than occupancy models using datasets in isolation. Overall, single- and repeated-visit integrated
35 occupancy models produced similar inference about the distribution of bottlenose dolphins. We
36 suggest that single-visit occupancy models open promising perspectives for the use of existing
37 ecological datasets.

38 **Keywords**

39 *Bottlenose dolphins, Ecological monitoring, Integrated species distribution models, Multi-*
40 *method, Occupancy models, Single-visit*

41 **Introduction**

42 In large-scale ecological analysis, several parallel monitoring programs are often carried
43 out to collect ecological data (Zipkin and Saunders 2018). Ecological monitoring programs are
44 conducted by organizations operating across different time scales, geographic scales and

45 funding initiatives (Lindenmayer and Likens 2010). A major challenge is integrating
46 knowledge from different monitoring programs to produce robust ecological indicators that
47 may be used to inform decision-making (Fletcher et al. 2019, Zipkin et al. 2021). Recently,
48 modelling tools have emerged to combine multiple data sources to estimate species
49 distributions and *Integrated models* refer to the approaches that combine different data sources
50 (Miller et al. 2019, Isaac et al. 2019). The main purpose of integrated models is to improve the
51 accuracy of ecological indicators (Fletcher et al. 2019, Zipkin et al. 2019). Species distributed
52 over large areas could particularly benefit from integrated models because they allow for a
53 global coverage of species occurrence by combining different data sources collected at different
54 spatial scales (Miller et al. 2019). To estimate species distribution in the face of uncertainties
55 inherent to data collection, occupancy models are commonly used statistical tools (Mackenzie
56 et al., 2002). Occupancy models have been developed to estimate species distribution while
57 accounting for false negatives in the observation process (Mackenzie et al. 2002). Estimating
58 occupancy when species detection is not perfect requires performing *repeated visits* to a set of
59 sites to assess the detection probability (MacKenzie 2006). However, repeating visits is
60 sometimes unfeasible due to associated costs and logistical issues. In this context, two relevant
61 developments of occupancy models have been recently proposed. First, integrated occupancy
62 models combine data from different monitoring programs to improve the estimation of species
63 distribution (Nichols et al. 2008, Miller et al. 2019, Fletcher et al. 2019). Second, Lele et al.,
64 (2012) used occupancy models to estimate species distribution and detectability while having
65 only one visit at the sampling site, i.e. hereafter *single-visit* occupancy models. An increasing
66 number of studies suggest that under certain conditions, single-visit models produce robust
67 estimates of occupancy without repeating visits at the sampling sites (Lele et al. 2012, Sólymos
68 and Lele 2016, Peach et al. 2017). Besides, single-visit occupancy offers the possibility to work
69 with existing datasets that did not carry out repeated visits, which is relevant to population

70 biology and management. In this paper, we develop an integrated approach that combines two
71 single-visit occupancy models and demonstrate that combining several datasets into integrated
72 single-visit occupancy models leads to accurate ecological parameter estimation. We also
73 investigate the performance of single-visit vs. repeated-visit occupancy models. As a case
74 study, we focused on the distribution of Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the North-
75 Western Mediterranean Sea. We combined aerial surveys and at-sea monitoring into integrated
76 occupancy models and we compared the outputs of integrated occupancy models to occupancy
77 models using each dataset in isolation. Last, we discuss the advantages of integrated single-
78 visit occupancy models to deal with existing ecological monitoring programs.

79 **Methods**

80 MODEL DESCRIPTION

81 **Latent ecological process**

82 Occupancy models estimate spatial distribution while accounting for imperfect species
83 detection (Mackenzie et al. 2002). The formulation of occupancy models as state-space models
84 allows distinguishing the latent ecological state process (i.e. species present or absent at a grid-
85 cell) from the detection process (Royle and Kéry 2007). We denote z_i the latent occupancy of
86 grid-cell i ($z = 1$, presence; $z = 0$, absence). We assume z_i is drawn from a Bernoulli distribution
87 with Ψ_i the probability that the species is present at grid-cell i :

$$88 \quad z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\Psi_i)$$

89 We modelled Ψ as a function of some environmental covariate on a logit scale, say habitat.

90 $\text{logit}(\Psi_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_l \text{habitat}_i$ where parameters β_0 , and β_l are to be estimated.

91 **Repeated-visit observation process**

92 In standard occupancy designs, each grid-cell is visited J times to estimate the detection
93 probability. We denote $y_{i,j}$ ($y_{i,j} = 0$, no detection ; $y_{i,j} = 1$, detection) the observations
94 corresponding to the data collected at grid-cell i during visit j ($j = 1, \dots, J$). Repeating visits at a

95 grid-cell allows estimating species detectability, with p_{ij} being the probability of detecting the
96 species at visit j given it is present at grid-cell i :

$$97 \quad y_{ij} | z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(z_i p_{i,j})$$

98 **Single-visit observation process**

99 The difference with repeated-visit occupancy models lies in the number of sampling
100 occasions which is $J = 1$ in single-visit occupancy models. The j subscript is dropped and we
101 denoted y_i the observation corresponding to the data collected at site i . Subsequently, p_i is the
102 probability of detecting the species during the single visit given it is present at site i : $y_i | z_i \sim$
103 $\text{Bernoulli}(z_i p_i)$. Single-visit occupancy models require certain conditions to be fulfilled for
104 estimating detection probabilities reliably. First, different continuous covariates should be used
105 to estimate detection and occupancy probabilities (Lele et al. 2012, Peach et al. 2017). Second,
106 the number of detections may affect the estimation of occupancy in the case of rare or
107 ubiquitous species (Peach et al. 2017). Third, the use of inappropriate link functions to model
108 the detection process may lead to model misspecification and biased interpretation (e.g. log-
109 link and scaled logit link function on detection, Knape & Korner-Nievergelt, 2015). However,
110 most often, the logit link function is used for detection, which makes the single-visit approach
111 valid (Sólymos and Lele 2016). Despite these concerns, simulation studies have showed that
112 situations where single-visit occupancy models fail are rare (Sólymos and Lele 2016, Peach et
113 al. 2017) and, in practice, the conditions for a valid application of single-visit occupancy models
114 are often fulfilled (Sólymos and Lele 2016). We detailed the modeling assumptions of single-
115 visit occupancy models in Appendix S4. Because the number of detections is an important
116 condition to accurately estimate single-visit occupancy parameters (Peach et al. 2017), we
117 expect that integrated approaches will be beneficial to single-visit occupancy modelling by
118 increasing the number of detections (true occupancy) available.

119 **Integrated occupancy models**

120 We developed an integrated occupancy model using data from two independent
 121 monitoring programs, say A and B. The state process driving the latent occupancy state of site
 122 i , z_i , remains unchanged and is drawn from a Bernoulli distribution with probability ψ , which
 123 is modeled as a function of environmental covariates. The observation of the targeted species
 124 at site i during occasion j may take four values with $y_{i,j} = 0$ for no detection, $y_{i,j} = 1$ for detection
 125 in dataset A, $y_{i,j} = 2$ for detection in dataset B, and $y_{i,j} = 3$ for detection in both datasets A and
 126 B. For convenience, we drop the subscripts in the notation as the formulation of the integrated
 127 observation process is identical whether we consider single-visit occupancy (i.e. $J = 1$) or
 128 repeated-visit occupancy ($J > 1$). Assuming that detection methods are independent, the
 129 observation process can be written using detection probability by the monitoring program A
 130 (p_A) and detection probability by the monitoring program B (p_B):

$$131 \quad y|z \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, z\pi) \text{ with}$$

$$132 \quad \pi = [p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3] = [\text{pr}(y = 0), \text{pr}(y = 1), \text{pr}(y = 2), \text{pr}(y = 3)]$$

$$133 \quad \pi = [1 - p_A - p_B + p_A p_B, p_A(1 - p_B), p_B(1 - p_A), p_A p_B]$$

134 We modeled monitoring-specific detection probabilities as functions of the sampling effort of
 135 each monitoring program:

$$136 \quad \text{logit}(p_A) = \alpha_{0A} + \alpha_{1A} \log(\text{Seff}_A)$$

$$137 \quad \text{logit}(p_B) = \alpha_{0B} + \alpha_{1B} \log(\text{Seff}_B).$$

138 where the parameters α_{0A} , α_{1A} , α_{0B} , and α_{1B} are to be estimated. For example, if we assume
 139 that the detection history at site i is $y_i = \{2, 0, 1, 2\}$ over $J = 4$ sampling occasions, i.e. the species
 140 was detected by monitoring program B only at sampling occasions $j = 1$ and $j = 4$, then went
 141 undetected at $j = 2$, and was detected by monitoring program A only at $j = 3$, then for single-
 142 visit integrated occupancy we consider $y_i = \{3\}$ because both monitoring programs detected the
 143 species at site i . We ran a simulation study comparing the performance of single- vs. repeated-

144 visit occupancy over different scenarios affecting occupancy, and detection probabilities
145 (Appendix S1).

146 BOTTLENOSE DOLPHINS CASE STUDY

147 We aimed at estimating bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) distribution in an area
148 of 255,000 km² covering the North-Western Mediterranean. The protected status of this species
149 within the French seas led to the development of specific programs to monitor Mediterranean
150 bottlenose dolphins within the implementation of the European Marine Strategy Framework
151 Directive (2008/56/EC; MSFD), which involve estimating common bottlenose dolphin
152 distribution. We considered two large-scale monitoring programs about bottlenose dolphins.
153 We divided the study area in 4,356 contiguous pixel/grid-cells creating a 5'x5' Madsen grid
154 (WGS 84) that we used for all the occupancy models we considered. We used data from at-sea
155 surveys over 21,464 km of the French continental shelf (456 grid-cells sampled, 10.46% of the
156 total number of grid-cells). Observers performed monitoring aboard small sailing and motor
157 boats to locate and photo-identify bottlenose dolphins all year long between 2013 and 2015
158 (Labach et al. 2019). At-sea surveys detected 129 distinct bottlenose dolphin groups located in
159 89 different grid-cells. At-sea surveys did not include planned repeated visits, some grid-cells
160 have been visited once, and others have been visited 50 times. Then, using repeated-visits
161 occupancy models to analyze the at-sea monitoring requires considering only the grid-cells
162 sampled multiple times and hence to drop the data collected in grid-cells sampled only once.
163 Single-visit models enable us to include all data, even data collected in grid-cells that were
164 surveyed only once, which make at-sea a relevant candidate for single-visit model
165 implementation. Besides, we considered data collected during aerial line-transects covering
166 24,624 km of the French Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), targeting marine megafauna, and
167 following a distance sampling protocol. The survey sampled 1336 grid-cells (i.e. 30.67% of the
168 total number of grid-cells). Aerial surveys produced 130 distinct bottlenose dolphin detections

169 located in 87 grid-cells. Sampling effort for aerial surveys was homogeneous over the study
170 area with three or four replicates per line-transect between November 2011 and August 2012
171 (Laran et al., 2017). Because we used occupancy models, we only considered detection/no-
172 detection data, which lead to a binary 0/1 dataset. Hence, multiple sightings detected in the
173 same groups were coded as 1. Thus, we obtain the two aerial and at-sea detection/no-detection
174 datasets that we analyzed with occupancy models. An important assumption of single-season
175 occupancy models is that the latent ecological state of a grid-cell (the z_i 's) remains unchanged
176 between the repeated visits (MacKenzie 2006). When monitoring highly mobile species, such
177 as cetaceans, the closure assumption is likely to be violated because individuals can move into
178 and out of the sampling grid-cell. The size of the grid-cells is much lower than dolphins' range
179 of activity. If individuals' movement in and out of the sampling units is random, then the
180 occupancy estimator is unbiased (Kendall et al. 2013). However, it is unlikely the case for
181 bottlenose dolphins because their use of space is driven by ecological and environmental
182 factors, and occupied locations are used only temporarily by individuals (MacKenzie 2006;
183 Neilson et al. 2018). Closure assumption is crucial to the interpretation of occupancy model's
184 parameters. In cases where this assumption is known to be violated, the parameter is usually
185 interpreted as the probability that a location is used by the species as opposed to probability of
186 species presence. In this situation, the occupancy estimator Ψ_i represents the probability that
187 grid-cell i is *used* by the target species (Kendall et al. 2013), being interpreted as *space-use* by
188 bottlenose dolphins. Occupancy and *space-use* refer to distinct ecological concepts. Occupancy
189 describes the species home range that can be defined as the geographic range of occurrence,
190 while *space-use* refers to the usage made by individuals of the different components of the home
191 range (e.g. feeding locations, migratory routes, Johnson 1980). Then, both single-visit and
192 repeated-visits occupancy models infer the probability that a particular grid-cell is used by the
193 species. The detection probability now accounts for both the probability of detecting the species

194 given that the species is available for sampling, and the probability that the species is using the
195 grid-cell during the sampling, reflecting that the species might occupy the grid-cell but not
196 during the sampling occasion (MacKenzie 2006). As stated above, single-visit occupancy
197 relaxed the closure assumption because the inference of the detection probability does not
198 require site closure between the repeated visits. However, the interpretation of the occupancy
199 parameter is still space-use in the case of bottlenose dolphins because our single-visit data is
200 collected during multiple years and dolphin are expected to move in and out the sampling unit
201 area during the sampling period.

202 Because at-sea and aerial surveys were performed during different years, we considered them
203 as independent. In 2018, recent Mediterranean scale aerial monitoring program sampled French
204 Mediterranean following the same line-transect protocol as the aerial dataset we analyzed
205 (ACCOBAMS Survey Initiative, 2018). Preliminary and unpublished results from the 2018
206 program estimated similar common bottlenose dolphin distribution to that of 2011-2012. Then,
207 we assumed that space-use remained unchanged during the monitoring period (i.e. 2011 to
208 2015). Besides, we neglected the seasonal variation in the bottlenose dolphin space-use in this
209 case study. Concerning the ecological process, we used two environmental covariates to
210 estimate the space-use of bottlenose dolphins: i) bathymetry, which is expected to have a
211 positive effect on bottlenose dolphins' occurrence (Bearzi et al. 2009, Labach et al. 2019), and
212 ii) sea surface temperature (SST, AQUA MODIS | NASA 2019, <https://neo.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/>),
213 which is locally related to dolphins' prey abundance and hence expected to affect local
214 distribution of bottlenose dolphins (Bearzi et al. 2009). We extracted average SST between
215 2011 and 2015 value in each grid-cell, making SST a cell-specific covariate. Similarly,
216 bathymetry had a single value per grid-cell. We checked for correlation between the two
217 covariates and the Pearson coefficient was < 0.3 . Then, we modelled Ψ as a function of
218 bathymetry, SST, and the interaction between bathymetry and SST on a logit scale:

219
$$\text{logit}(\Psi_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ bathymetry}_i + \beta_2 \text{ SST}_i + \beta_3 \text{ bathymetry}_i \text{ SST}_i$$

220 Regarding the observation process, we calculated the transect length (in km) prospected by each
 221 monitoring protocol within each grid-cell during a time period. Sampling effort was therefore
 222 a grid-cell-specific and time-specific covariate; Seff_A refers to the sampling effort of the aerial
 223 monitoring program while Seff_S refers to the sampling effort of the at-sea monitoring program.
 224 We modeled monitoring-specific detection probabilities as functions of the relevant sampling
 225 effort:

226
$$\text{logit}(p_a) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log(\text{Seff}_A)$$

227
$$\text{logit}(p_s) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log(\text{Seff}_S).$$

228 Regarding the repeated-visit occupancy models, we divided the detection/non-detection
 229 datasets into four sampling occasions ($J = 4$): winter (January, February, March), spring (April,
 230 May, June), summer (July, August, September), autumn (October, November, December). For
 231 the single-visit occupancy models, we considered the entire monitoring program in a single
 232 occasion. For example, let us assume that the detection history at site i is $y_i = \{0,1,1,0\}$ in
 233 repeated-visit occupancy, i.e. the species was detected at sampling occasions $j = 2$ and $j = 3$,
 234 and went undetected at $j = 1$, and $j = 4$, then for single-visit occupancy we have $y_i = \{1\}$. In
 235 addition, the single-visit sampling effort in a grid-cell was equal to the sum of the sampling
 236 effort over the 4 sampling occasions of the repeated-visit occupancy model.

237 **Performances of integrated models**

238 To assess the added value of combining aerial and at-sea datasets into integrated single-visit
 239 occupancy models, we analyzed 3 datasets: i) the aerial dataset, ii) the at-sea dataset, and iii)
 240 the two datasets together into an integrated occupancy model. For each of these datasets, we
 241 applied repeated-visit and single-visit occupancy models. Besides the case study, we also
 242 carried out a simulation study to test for the performances of integrated occupancy models
 243 (Appendix S2). In Appendix S5, we go through a worked example of the likelihood functions

244 for single-visit, repeated-visit, integrated repeated-visit, and integrated single-visit occupancy
245 models. In Appendix S4, we listed the modeling assumptions required to run the different
246 occupancy models.

247 **Bayesian implementation**

248 We ran all models with three Markov Chain Monte Carlo chains with 100,000 iterations
249 each in JAGS (Plummer and others 2003) called from R (R Core Team, v 3.2.5 2019) using the
250 *r2jags* package (Su and Yajima 2015). We checked for convergence calculating the *R-hat*
251 parameter (Gelman et al. 2013) and reported posterior means and 95% credible intervals (CI)
252 for each regression coefficient of covariates affecting space-use probability (Fig. 1). Hereafter,
253 we considered *effect size* of a covariate as the estimate of its regression coefficient. We
254 discussed the effect of a covariate whenever the 95% CI of its associated parameter did not
255 include 0. From covariates' effect size, we calculated the predicted space-use by bottlenose
256 dolphins (i.e. Ψ , Fig. 2). We reported maps of standard deviation of Ψ (Fig. 2B). On the maps,
257 we displayed mean and standard deviation of Ψ for coastal and pelagic seas according to a 500m
258 deep boundary that corresponds to the separation of continental shelf from the abysses. Data
259 and codes are available on Data S1, and on GitHub at
260 <https://github.com/valentinlauret/IntegratedSingleVisitOccupancy>.

261 **Results**

262 All models produced similar predictions of space used by bottlenose dolphins (Fig. 2).
263 The 95% CI of SST, and of the interaction between SST and bathymetry included 0 in all
264 models (Fig. 1). The probability of space-use increased with decreasing bathymetry for all
265 models (Fig. 1). Bathymetry ranges from altitude of 0 m to -3,488 m deep, hence a positive
266 influence of bathymetry referred to a preference for a high seafloor (e.g. 0-200m depth).
267 Overall, maps showed greater probabilities of space-use on the continental shelf (mean $\Psi =$
268 $0.76 \text{ SD} \pm 0.17$) than on the high seas (mean $\Psi = 0.40 \text{ SD} \pm 0.15$), although magnitudes of Ψ

269 were different between models (Fig. 2). Bathymetry posterior means were highest for at-sea
270 occupancy (although the 95% CI of effect size included 0), which resulted in models using only
271 at-sea survey data predicting the highest contrast between the continental shelf and the high-
272 seas. Bathymetry effect size was the lowest for aerial occupancy while maps from integrated
273 occupancy models displayed moderate contrast of space-use between shelf and pelagic waters
274 (Fig. 2). Single-visit occupancy models exhibited similar covariates estimates to those of
275 repeated-visit occupancy models (Fig. 1). For aerial occupancy, we noticed similar space-use
276 prediction between single- and repeated-visit (Fig. 2A). For at-sea, predicted space-use
277 probabilities were different between single-visit and repeated-visit occupancy models (Fig. 2).

278 When considering the covariates' effect size (Fig. 1), the widths of the 95% CI were not
279 smaller for integrated occupancy than for occupancy models using datasets in isolation.
280 However, when looking at the standard deviation of the predicted probability of space-use,
281 integrated occupancy models had a better precision than aerial or at-sea occupancy models
282 separately, (Fig. 2B). The use of integrated single-visit occupancy models also improved
283 precision in predicted space-use compared to single-visit occupancy built from aerial and at-
284 sea datasets separately (Fig.2B). Inspecting the simulation results, we found that 1) integrated
285 occupancy models produced more precise estimates of covariates effect size than occupancy
286 models fitted to a single dataset (Appendix S2), and 2) single-visit occupancy models produced
287 similar results to repeated-visit occupancy models (Appendix S1).

288 **Discussion**

289 **Integrated single-visit occupancy models provide reliable ecological inference**

290 Ecological inference from integrated occupancy models lied within the range of the
291 estimates obtained with each dataset separately (Fig. 1). Across all occupancy models, the
292 effects of environmental covariates were similar and consistent with previous studies.
293 Bottlenose dolphins were more likely to use shallower seas (Bearzi et al. 2009, Labach et al.

294 2019), and depth had a stronger effect than SST on the use of space by bottlenose dolphins
295 (Torres et al. 2008). However, we found variations among models in the estimation of the
296 probability of space-use by dolphins (Fig. 1). In particular, at-sea occupancy models predicted
297 that dolphins make little use of the pelagic seas compared to the continental shelf, while aerial
298 occupancy models predict more homogeneous space-use between coasts and pelagic seas.
299 Aerial surveys detected several dolphin groups in the high depths while at-sea surveys detected
300 none. Detecting offshore groups tempered the preference for low-depth seafloors in aerial
301 occupancy models (Appendix S6). Besides, we recommend caution in interpreting predicted
302 maps of space-use as predicted space-use was sensitive to the mean value of covariate effect
303 size. Therefore, depth being the only covariate that affect space-use probability, maps of
304 predicted space-use were mostly driven by bathymetry effect size, and did not account for
305 precision associated with space-use prediction. Because depth posterior mean was similar
306 between occupancy models, differences between predicted space-use maps do not provide a
307 relevant illustration to compare occupancy models performances, nor they reflect the
308 uncertainty associated with the occupancy models' estimates. To study the benefits of single-
309 visit and integrated occupancy models to accommodate existing ecological datasets, we
310 emphasize standard deviation maps and the credible intervals of covariates effect size (Fig. 1-
311 2B). Integrated occupancy models had a better precision in space-use than models using aerial
312 or at-sea surveys separately (Fig. 2). This result was supported by our simulation study which
313 demonstrates the better performance of integrated occupancy models at estimating covariate
314 effect size compared to occupancy models from a single dataset (Appendix S2). Single-visit
315 occupancy models gave similar estimates to those obtained with repeated-visit occupancy
316 models, although repeated-visit occupancy models exhibited better precision (Fig. 1-2B), as
317 well as in our simulations (Appendix S1). In the bottlenose dolphins case study, we considered
318 two existing monitoring programs that were not initially designed for occupancy modeling. In

319 the at-sea monitoring, repeated line-transects were not implemented, nor the high depths were
320 sampled, which made at-sea occupancy unlikely to exhibit precise estimates at our spatial
321 extent. The two datasets exhibit complementary characteristics. While aerial surveys covered a
322 larger spatial scale than at-sea surveys, at-sea surveys exhibited a better detection rate.
323 Detection probability was greater for at-sea surveys ($p = 0.18 \text{ SD} \pm 0.04$) than for aerial surveys
324 ($p = 0.10 \text{ SD} \pm 0.03$). Regarding the aerial dataset, the number of occurrences was low despite
325 the important coverage of the monitoring design (i.e. bottlenose dolphins were detected in 6.5%
326 of sampled grid-cells), which might hinder the implementation of single-visit occupancy when
327 the number of occurrences is less than 10% of the sampling units (Peach et al. 2017). However,
328 the at-sea dataset had occurrences in 19.5% of sampled units. Using integrated occupancy
329 models enables to combine low-frequency occurrence data like the aerial dataset with another
330 dataset to increase the amount of information about the ecological state process and helps
331 mitigating the issue of low number of occurrences.

332 **Ecological implications and perspectives**

333 Overall, we illustrate that: i) Integrating datasets into occupancy models improves the
334 precision of space-use estimates, and ii) Single-visit occupancy models can reliably
335 accommodate the lack of repeated visits that occurs frequently. Integrated occupancy models
336 produced more reliable estimates than occupancy models using datasets in isolation in both the
337 bottlenose dolphin data analyzes and the simulations. Our finding on the bottlenose dolphins
338 case study is a good illustration of the well-known benefit of combining datasets into integrated
339 species distribution models to increase precision in ecological inference (Fletcher et al. 2019).
340 Some advanced developments of occupancy models allow combining datasets to estimate
341 occupancy parameters at multiple spatial scales (Nichols et al. 2008, Pavlacky et al. 2012).
342 Besides, integrated occupancy modeling has also been used to evaluate ecological monitoring
343 programs prior to their implementation (e.g., comparing capabilities of different detection

344 devices, Otto & Roloff 2011; Haynes et al. 2013). Here, we emphasize the benefit of
345 considering integrated methods combined with single-visit occupancy modeling after data
346 collection. When the species of interest either occurs over a large spatial scale or is a highly
347 mobile species (such as bottlenose dolphins), considering multiple sampling methods is
348 effective to monitor the entire population making the most of each device (Zipkin and Saunders
349 2018). In particular, integrating a large volume of data, such as those that can be leveraged
350 through citizen-science programs or with dedicated NGOs over the years can make the most of
351 ecological monitoring programs for the furthering of many applied situations (Zipkin et al.
352 2019). However, caution should be taken as integrating data is not always beneficial and
353 requires additional modelling assumptions according to the particularity of each dataset or
354 include (Dupont et al., 2019; Farr et al., 2020; Fletcher et al., 2019; Simmonds et al., 2020).
355 Although repeated-visit occupancy models remain statistically more precise, there are benefits
356 in using single-visit occupancy models. The ability of single-visit occupancy to relax the
357 closure assumption is appealing, because this assumption is often incompatible with the
358 behavior of mobile species and for numerous monitoring programs of animal populations (Rota
359 et al. 2009, Issaris et al. 2012, Sólymos and Lele 2016, Lele et al. 2012, Kendall et al. 2013).
360 In this study, the closure assumption is unlikely to be valid for bottlenose dolphins over the
361 time span of the two monitoring programs, because dolphins obviously would not remain into
362 the same grid-cell. Besides, when financial or logistical costs are limited, implementing a
363 single-visit monitoring design could provide robust ecological inference while explicitly
364 accounting for imperfect species detection (Lele et al. 2012, Dénes et al. 2017). Overall,
365 increasing quantity and types of biodiversity data are becoming available (Isaac et al. 2019).
366 Numerous monitoring programs do not rely on protocols implementing repeated visits like, e.g.,
367 historical monitoring programs, or citizen science programs (Tingley and Beissinger 2009,
368 Zipkin and Saunders 2018). Then, using single-visit occupancy models helps making efficient

369 use of available data, which is of great interest in many ecological applications (Nichols and
370 Williams 2006, Sólymos and Lele 2016). In this context, Miller et al. (2019) encouraged further
371 developments of methods mixing standardized and non-standardized datasets. To illustrate, we
372 built an integrated occupancy model mixing repeated-visit occupancy models for aerial surveys
373 and single-visit occupancy models for at-sea surveys (Appendix S3). One could also extend
374 integrated occupancy models to more than two datasets. However, caution should be taken
375 when integrating datasets, as combining different sources of information does not always
376 outperform the analysis of single datasets in isolation (Lele and Allen 2006, Simmonds et al.
377 2020). The flexibility of occupancy models provided a relevant framework to combine
378 monitoring programs and to accommodate different types of data collection. Integrated and
379 single-visit occupancy models contribute to widen the scope of possibilities. We emphasize the
380 usefulness of both integrated and single-visit approaches to deal with existing datasets. We
381 anticipate that their combination into integrated single-visit approaches will be of most interest
382 for many parties in ecological research.

383 **Acknowledgements**

384 The French Ministry in charge of the environment (Ministère de la Transition Energetique et
385 Solidaire) and the French Office for Biodiversity (OFB) funded the project SAMM. The
386 PELAGIS observatory, with the help of the OFB, designed, coordinated and conducted the
387 survey. We are grateful to all financial partners of the GDEGeM project. We warmly thank
388 technical and scientific participants of GDEGeM. We also thank three anonymous reviewers
389 for their insightful comments and suggestions.

390 **Literature cited**

391 ACCOBAMS Survey Initiative. 2018. ASI 2018 Summer Survey | Accobams.
392 <https://accobams.org/main-activites/accobams-survey-initiative-2/asi-preliminary->
393 [results/](https://accobams.org/main-activites/accobams-survey-initiative-2/asi-preliminary-).

394 Bearzi, G., C. M. Fortuna, and R. R. Reeves. 2009. Ecology and conservation of common
395 bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mammal Review* 39:92–
396 123.

397 Dénes, F. V., P. Sólymos, S. Lele, L. F. Silveira, and S. R. Beissinger. 2017. Biome-scale
398 signatures of land-use change on raptor abundance: insights from single-visit detection-
399 based models. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54:1268–1278.

400 Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008
401 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy
402 (Marine Strategy Framework Directive) (Text with EEA relevance). 2008. . Page 164.

403 Fletcher, R. J., T. J. Hefley, E. P. Robertson, B. Zuckerberg, R. A. McCleery, and R. M.
404 Dorazio. 2019. A practical guide for combining data to model species distributions.
405 *Ecology*:e02710.

406 Gelman, A., J. B. Carlin, H. S. Stern, D. B. Dunson, A. Vehtari, and D. B. Rubin. 2013.
407 *Bayesian data analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

408 Isaac, N. J. B., M. A. Jarzyna, P. Keil, L. I. Dambly, P. H. Boersch-Supan, E. Browning, S. N.
409 Freeman, N. Golding, G. Guillera-Arroita, P. A. Henrys, S. Jarvis, J. Lahoz-Monfort, J.
410 Pagel, O. L. Pescott, R. Schmucki, E. G. Simmonds, and R. B. O’Hara. 2019. Data
411 Integration for Large-Scale Models of Species Distributions. *Trends in Ecology &*
412 *Evolution*.

413 Issaris, Y., S. Katsanevakis, M. Salomidi, K. Tsiamis, N. Katsiaras, and G. Verriopoulos. 2012.
414 Occupancy estimation of marine species: dealing with imperfect detectability. *Marine*
415 *Ecology Progress Series* 453:95–106.

416 Johnson, D. H. 1980. The Comparison of Usage and Availability Measurements for Evaluating
417 Resource Preference. *Ecology* 61:65–71.

418 Kendall, W. L., J. E. Hines, J. D. Nichols, and E. H. C. Grant. 2013. Relaxing the closure

419 assumption in occupancy models: staggered arrival and departure times. *Ecology* 94:610–
420 617.

421 Knape, J., and F. Korner-Nievergelt. 2015. Estimates from non-replicated population surveys
422 rely on critical assumptions. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6:298–306.

423 Labach, H., C. Azzinari, M. Barbier, C. Cesarini, B. Daniel, L. David, F. Dhermain, N. Di-
424 Mégio, B. Guichard, J. Jourdan, N. Robert, M. Roul, N. Tomasi, and O. Gimenez. 2019.
425 Distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphin over the French Mediterranean
426 continental shelf. *bioRxiv*.

427 Laran, S., E. Pettex, M. Authier, A. Blanck, L. David, G. Dorémus, H. Falchetto, P. Monestiez,
428 O. Van Canneyt, and V. Ridoux. 2017. Seasonal distribution and abundance of cetaceans
429 within French waters- Part I: The North-Western Mediterranean, including the Pelagos
430 sanctuary. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 141:20–30.

431 Lele, S. R., and K. L. Allen. 2006. On using expert opinion in ecological analyses: a frequentist
432 approach. *Environmetrics* 17:683–704.

433 Lele, S. R., M. Moreno, and E. Bayne. 2012. Dealing with detection error in site occupancy
434 surveys: what can we do with a single survey? *Journal of Plant Ecology* 5:22–31.

435 Lindenmayer, D. B., and G. E. Likens. 2010. The science and application of ecological
436 monitoring. *Biological Conservation* 143:1317–1328.

437 MacKenzie, D. I., editor. 2006. *Occupancy estimation and modeling: inferring patterns and*
438 *dynamics of species*. Elsevier, Amsterdam ; Boston.

439 Mackenzie, D. I., J. D. Nichols, G. B. Lachman, S. Droege, J. A. Royle, and C. A. Langtimm.
440 2002. Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one 83:8.

441 Miller, D. A. W., K. Pacifici, J. S. Sanderlin, and B. J. Reich. 2019. The recent past and
442 promising future for data integration methods to estimate species' distributions. *Methods*
443 *in Ecology and Evolution* 10:22–37.

444 Neilson, E. W., T. Avgar, A. C. Burton, K. Broadley, and S. Boutin. 2018. Animal movement
445 affects interpretation of occupancy models from camera-trap surveys of unmarked animals.
446 *Ecosphere* 9:e02092.

447 Nichols, J. D., L. L. Bailey, A. F. O’Connell Jr., N. W. Talancy, E. H. Campbell Grant, A. T.
448 Gilbert, E. M. Annand, T. P. Husband, and J. E. Hines. 2008. Multi-scale occupancy
449 estimation and modelling using multiple detection methods. *Journal of Applied Ecology*
450 45:1321–1329.

451 Nichols, and Williams. 2006. Monitoring for conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*
452 21:668–673.

453 Pavlacky, D. C., J. A. Blakesley, G. C. White, D. J. Hanni, and P. M. Lukacs. 2012. Hierarchical
454 multi-scale occupancy estimation for monitoring wildlife populations. *The Journal of*
455 *Wildlife Management* 76:154–162.

456 Peach, M. A., J. B. Cohen, and J. L. Frair. 2017. Single-visit dynamic occupancy models: an
457 approach to account for imperfect detection with Atlas data. *Journal of Applied Ecology*
458 54:2033–2042.

459 Plummer, M. and others. 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models
460 using Gibbs sampling. Page 125 *Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on*
461 *distributed statistical computing*. Vienna.

462 R Core Team, v 3.2.5. 2015. R Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical
463 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL
464 <https://www.R-project.org/>. <https://www.r-project.org/>.

465 Rota, C. T., R. J. Fletcher Jr, R. M. Dorazio, and M. G. Betts. 2009. Occupancy estimation and
466 the closure assumption. *Journal of Applied Ecology*.

467 Royle, J. A., and M. Kéry. 2007. A Bayesian state-space formulation of dynamic occupancy
468 models. *Ecology* 88:1813–1823.

469 Simmonds, E. G., S. G. Jarvis, P. A. Henrys, N. J. B. Isaac, and R. B. O’Hara. 2020. Is more
470 data always better? A simulation study of benefits and limitations of integrated distribution
471 models. *Ecography*:ecog.05146.

472 Sólymos, P., and S. R. Lele. 2016. Revisiting resource selection probability functions and
473 single-visit methods: clarification and extensions. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*
474 7:196–205.

475 Su, Y.-S., and M. Yajima. 2015. R2jags: Using R to Run “JAGS.”

476 Tingley, M. W., and S. R. Beissinger. 2009. Detecting range shifts from historical species
477 occurrences: new perspectives on old data. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 24:625–633.

478 Torres, L. G., A. J. Read, and P. Halpin. 2008. Fine-scale habitat modeling of a top marine
479 predator: do prey data improve predictive capacity. *Ecological Applications* 18:1702–
480 1717.

481 Zipkin, E. F., B. D. Inouye, and S. R. Beissinger. 2019. Innovations in data integration for
482 modeling populations. *Ecology*:e02713.

483 Zipkin, E. F., and S. P. Saunders. 2018. Synthesizing multiple data types for biological
484 conservation using integrated population models. *Biological Conservation* 217:240–250.

485 Zipkin, E. F., E. R. Zylstra, A. D. Wright, S. P. Saunders, A. O. Finley, M. C. Dietze, S. Itter,
486 and M. W. Tingley. 2021. Addressing data integration challenges to link ecological
487 processes across scales. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*:9.

488

489

Figure captions

490 **Figure 1:** Effect size of bathymetry, sea surface temperature (SST), and interaction between
491 SST and bathymetry on the probability Ψ that a site is used by Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops*
492 *truncatus*). The posterior mean is provided with the associated 95% credible interval. “SV”
493 refers to *single-visit* occupancy models, “RV” to *repeated visit* occupancy models, and “IOM”
494 stands for *integrated* occupancy models, in which aerial surveys and at-sea surveys are
495 combined. Estimates are given on the logit scale.


496

497 **Figure 2: A. Probability of predicted space-use by Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops***
498 ***truncatus*) over the NW Mediterranean Sea.** Using the posterior mean of covariates effect
499 size, we estimated the probability that a grid-cell was used by bottlenose dolphins. For each
500 occupancy model, we added the mean space-use probability (Ψ) for coasts (bathymetry < 500
501 m) and pelagic seas (bathymetry > 500 m)

502 **B. Standard deviation of predicted space-use.** Using the posterior standard deviation of
503 covariates effect size, we estimated the standard deviation associated with the space-use
504 probability. For each occupancy model, we added the mean standard-deviation (sd) associated
505 with Ψ for coasts (bathymetry < 500 m) and pelagic seas (bathymetry > 500 m).

506 “IOM” stands for *integrated* occupancy models, in which aerial surveys and at-sea surveys are
507 combined. Repeated-visit occupancy maps refer to occupancy models with 4 sampling
508 occasions. Single-visit maps refer to occupancy models considering 1 sampling occasion.

509



510


511 **Figure 1**

512

A. Predicted space-use probability


IOM - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.36$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.71$




IOM - Single Visit

Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.55$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.9$




At-sea - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.26$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.57$




At-sea - Single Visit

Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.44$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.91$






Aerial - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.45$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.82$



Aerial - Single Visit


Pelagic seas: $\Psi \approx 0.45$
Coasts: $\Psi \approx 0.81$



B. Predicted space-use standard deviation


IOM - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.57
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.65




IOM - Single Visit

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.62
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.75




At-sea - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.62
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.73



At-sea - Single Visit

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.64
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.74




Aerial - Repeated-visits

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.63
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.71



Aerial - Single Visit

Pelagic seas: sd ≈ 0.71
Coasts: sd ≈ 0.82



513

514 **Figure 2**