



Visual and acoustic sensors for early detection of biological invasions: Current uses and future potential

Francis Juanes

Department of Biology, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, V8W 3N5, Canada



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Visual and acoustic sensors
Automatic identification
Image acquisition

ABSTRACT

Development of tools for early detection of invasive species is critically important as the threat of global invasions increase. Early detection as applied to invasive species is a system of active and passive surveillance to find and verify the identity of new invaders as quickly and efficiently as possible. The earlier such species can be detected the more feasible their control and potential eradication will be. A sensor is a device that detects or measures a physical or biological property (here an invasive species), and records, indicates or responds to it. Here, I summarize what features of visual and acoustic sensors make effective tools for early detection of invasives, and suggest future potential for their use. Visual sensors are by far the dominant mode of detection, particularly in terrestrial habitats. At small scales they include photography and video technology along with the advent of advanced image acquisition and automatic identification. At larger scales remote sensing by use of drones, satellites and video technology are being developed to map invasive species habitats in both terrestrial and aquatic environments. Future use will depend in part on further development of automatic detection methodology. There is also large potential in the use of acoustic methods for early detection of invasives, especially cryptic ones, but such technology is still in its infancy due to technological and analytic limitations. In conclusion, the use of visual and acoustic sensors holds much promise for detecting and monitoring invasive species, particularly in remote settings.

1. Introduction

As the threat of global invasions continues to increase (Early et al., 2016) it is critically important to develop tools for early detection of invasive species (Holcombe & Stohlgren, 2009). The earlier such species can be detected the more feasible their control and potential eradication will be (Wittenberg, 2001; Waugh, 2009). Unfortunately most new invasive species are detected by accident when making general surveys often when it is too late for rapid response or in a location where capacity for response is limited (Lui, Cudmore, & Bouvier, 2007). Standard visual surveys provide longterm systematic and regular documentation of species present in a given habitat; species are identified and vouchered to provide inventories for future research (Wittenberg, 2001). Surveys involve the use of sensors to find, and then verify the identity of new invaders as quickly and efficiently as possible. A sensor is a device that detects or measures a physical or biological property (here an invasive species), permitting subsequent responses such as recording, alerts or control. Desirable characteristics of sensors may include dependability, accuracy, flexibility, target-specificity, automation and being 'low cost'. Clearly all of these traits will not be possible or desirable in every sensor; their importance will be context-specific.

A variety of tools can provide early detection of invasive species, via active or passive means. Traditional methods for invasive-species detection include human-conducted visual and acoustic surveys to identify and voucher the species present in a given habitat, simultaneously providing reference inventories for the future (Wittenberg, 2001). However, camera traps, passive acoustic devices and other remote sensing technologies have expanded the utility of simple surveys at different scales so that data can be recorded, digitized, saved, scanned, compared to known libraries and then easily mapped.

In this paper, I summarize the primary methods used for early detection of invasive species and highlight challenges for future sensor development and use. I do not include chemical methods, such as the use of environmental DNA (e-DNA), as they are covered elsewhere in this issue.

2. Camera traps

Camera traps have long been used to detect and count wildlife species, particularly terrestrial vertebrates. The use of camera traps has recently experienced a dramatic increase (Burton et al., 2015; O'Connell, Nichols, & Karanth, 2011). In addition to surveying and

E-mail address: juanes@uvic.ca.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2018.01.003>

Received 9 June 2017; Received in revised form 12 January 2018; Accepted 12 January 2018
1617-1381/ © 2018 Elsevier GmbH. All rights reserved.

monitoring wildlife (Saito & Koike, 2013), camera trap networks may be an efficient method with which to monitor biodiversity at landscape (McShea, Forrester, Costello, He, & Kays, 2016) and global scales (Steenweg et al., 2017). Their strength lies in the ability to capture images of often elusive wildlife in remote environments. They provide a relatively inexpensive and minimally invasive approach to assess wildlife distribution, abundance, behaviour and community structure. As camera traps are static, their weaknesses include relatively small detection areas, a bias towards mobile target species, and limited ability to provide accurate population estimates especially given large species ranges, low densities or inaccessible habitat. These challenges can be addressed with improved statistical modeling, remote access and automated image identification (Burton et al., 2015; González et al., 2016).

However, to date camera traps are rarely used for early detection of invasives. Their effectiveness as early detection sensors will increase as remote access and automated identification improve (Yu et al., 2013). For example, invasive rodents are remotely monitored using traps (Engeman et al., 2006), and more recently monitoring has been automated using images of their footprints. Rodent ‘motels’ attract invasive ship rats (Russell, Towns, & Clout, 2008). Once in the trap their footprints are captured on ink tracking cards. These images can then be scanned and species identified using image analysis methodologies with high recognition rates (Yuan, Russell, Klette, Rosenhahn, & Stones-Havas, 2006). A similar methodology is being developed to automate standard camera trap images (He et al., 2016) by developing automatic identification algorithms (Yu et al., 2013). Perhaps the best recent example of the use of such technology are web-based traps for early detection of alien wood-boring beetles. The baited traps attract the insects, images are taken, transmitted by a cellular phone network and automatically identified by image analysis (Rassati et al., 2016). Camera traps for larger invasive wildlife are now beginning to develop with the advent of remote access to and automated identification of collected images. For example, invasive wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) presence and activity levels have recently been documented using camera traps in western Canada (Stolle, van Beest, Wall, & Brook, 2015).

The lack of mobility of standard camera traps has been circumvented by developing networks of citizen scientists carrying mobile phones used to document the presence and location of invasive species. This information is rapidly transmitted and, if the web of users is extensive enough, such a method can produce accurate and wide-ranging maps. An example is the iMapInvasives effort (www.imapinvasives.org), an online GIS-based data management system to assist citizen scientists to report, document and map invasive species. The webpage contains a user manual, mobile tools, identification guides and a decisions analysis tool to help managers make decisions about invasive species control.

Similar image acquisition technology is being developed for use of early detection and identification of invasive species from aquatic samples. In aquatic habitats traditional monitoring protocols have included collection plates, SCUBA surveys, underwater video, wharf, dock and boat hull surveys to detect invasive invertebrate species (McKenzie et al., 2016). In addition, plankton tows are often taken to survey larval pelagic invertebrates, followed by detection using light microscopy, scanning electron microscopy (SEM), flow cell cytometry or genetic methods (Hosler, 2011). However much effort is needed to detect rare species with high probability using these methods (Counihan & Bollens, 2017). Dreissenid mussel species are major biofouling pests as they can quickly colonize hard surfaces (e.g., docks, buoys, boats) and clog water intake structures. In North America there are two related species, zebra (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and quagga mussels (*D. rostriformis*). Early detection of these species while they're still in their larval (veliger) stages, and not large enough to restrict water flow, is critical (Hosler, 2011). However this is challenging as they are small (80–400 µm) and it is visually difficult to distinguish them from other species. New technology, using automated image

particle analysis, has been developed to detect, identify and enumerate invasive quagga and zebra mussels (dreissenids) (Nelson et al., 2015). These methods can process more data faster, but morphologically similar species can still be distinguished more readily with light traditional microscopy (Stanislawczyk, 2016).

The use of camera traps and other visual sensors for detection of invasives will continue to increase especially as image acquisition technology improves. Further development will be facilitated by the incorporation of new technologies into existing methods, for example the recent integration of sound playback into standard wildlife camera traps (Suraci et al., 2017).

3. Remote sensing

On a broader geographic scale remote sensing by use of drones, satellites and video technology is rapidly being developed to map invasive species habitats in both terrestrial and aquatic environments. The use of remote sensing and GIS applications to map invasive species, particularly plants, has increased exponentially in the last few decades (Joshi, de Leeuw, & van Duren, 2004), but until recently has been used to map current distributions and predict their spread (Rocchini et al., 2015) rather than as early detection tools. Remote identification of plants is typically based on spectral signatures (He, Rocchini, Neteler, & Nagendra, 2011), but textural and phenological differences can also be used (Bradley, 2014).

Although remote sensing can be used for early detection and response, accurately detecting small, sometimes cryptic, populations is challenging (Bradley, 2014; Young, Schrader, Boykin, Caldwell, & Roemer, 2007). However, recent work has shown that small inconspicuous species such as bryophytes can be accurately mapped using remotely sensed data. Although its use for early detection depends on many factors, this approach would reduce searching efforts in large areas (Skowronek et al., 2017). Asner and Vitousek (2005) combined remote sensing with photon transport modeling to measure canopy cover visually, and canopy water content and leaf Nitrogen concentrations chemically. This technique allowed them to map the distribution and biogeochemical effects of the invasion of *Morella* (= *Myrica*) *faya*, a nitrogen-fixing tree from the Canary Islands that is replacing the dominant native overstorey tree species, *Metrosideros polymorpha*, at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. They also made a surprising finding in some understories that showed low foliar N but high canopy water due to the invasion of *Hedygium gardnerianum* (Kahili ginger), a herb that is invisible to conventional remote sensing because it colonizes the forest understory.

Remote sensing technology is also beginning to be used in aquatic systems for the identification and mapping of invasive plants (Meinesz, 2007) and has been especially useful for the detection of harmful algal blooms (Shen, Xu, & Guo, 2012). However, its use is limited in freshwater ecosystems because of their optical complexity and variability (Palmer et al., 2015). Recent applications have included detection of submerged aquatic vegetation (Purkis & Roelfsema, 2015), wetlands (Tiner, Lang, & Klemas, 2015), coral reefs (Goodman, Purkis, & Phinn, 2013) including mapping of coral bleaching (Hedley et al., 2016, Hedley, Roelfsema, Koetz, & Phinn, 2012), mangroves (Klemas, 2015), marsh (Bustamante et al., 2016), and seagrass (Roelfsema et al., 2013) habitats. Mangrove forests can also be mapped and threats identified using shoreline video assessments. This technique collects and analyzes georeferenced hyperlapsed imagery (camera moving through space rather than fixed images over time) which can then be combined with satellite image remote sensing of the same areas (Mackenzie, Duke, & Wood, 2016). To date remote sensing technology has been used primarily for mapping invasive plant species (Huang & Asner, 2009; Johnston, 2015); early detection is more of a challenge because the graminoid structure of many invasive species makes it difficult to distinguish them from other species using remote sensing and thus is most efficient when the invader has colonized and formed large monotypic stands (Johnston, 2015).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8849305>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8849305>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)