

Density Model for Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) for the U.S. Gulf of Mexico: Supplementary Report

Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab*

Model Version 1.3 - 2015-09-26

Citation

When referencing our methodology or results generally, please cite our open-access article:

Roberts JJ, Best BD, Mannocci L, Fujioka E, Halpin PN, Palka DL, Garrison LP, Mullin KD, Cole TVN, Khan CB, McLellan WM, Pabst DA, Lockhart GG (2016) Habitat-based cetacean density models for the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Scientific Reports 6: 22615. doi: [10.1038/srep22615](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep22615)

To reference this specific model or Supplementary Report, please cite:

Roberts JJ, Best BD, Mannocci L, Fujioka E, Halpin PN, Palka DL, Garrison LP, Mullin KD, Cole TVN, Khan CB, McLellan WM, Pabst DA, Lockhart GG (2015) Density Model for Fraser's Dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) for the U.S. Gulf of Mexico Version 1.3, 2015-09-26, and Supplementary Report. Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Copyright and License



This document and the accompanying results are © 2015 by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory and are licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Revision History

Version	Date	Description of changes
1	2015-01-23	Initial version.
1.1	2015-02-02	Updated the documentation. No changes to the model.
1.2	2015-05-14	Updated calculation of CVs. Switched density rasters to logarithmic breaks. No changes to the model.
1.3	2015-09-26	Updated the documentation. No changes to the model.

*For questions, or to offer feedback about this model or report, please contact Jason Roberts (jason.roberts@duke.edu)

Survey Data

Survey	Period	Length (1000 km)	Hours	Sightings
SEFSC GOMEX92-96 Aerial Surveys	1992-1996	27	152	0
SEFSC Gulf of Mexico Shipboard Surveys, 2003-2009	2003-2009	19	1156	0
SEFSC GulfCet I Aerial Surveys	1992-1994	50	257	2
SEFSC GulfCet II Aerial Surveys	1996-1998	22	124	0
SEFSC GulfSCAT 2007 Aerial Surveys	2007-2007	18	95	0
SEFSC Oceanic CetShip Surveys	1992-2001	49	3102	3
SEFSC Shelf CetShip Surveys	1994-2001	10	707	0
Total		195	5593	5

Table 2: Survey effort and sightings used in this model. Effort is tallied as the cumulative length of on-effort transects and hours the survey team was on effort. Sightings are the number of on-effort encounters of the modeled species for which a perpendicular sighting distance (PSD) was available. Off effort sightings and those without PSDs were omitted from the analysis.

Period	Length (1000 km)	Hours	Sightings
1992-2009	195	5592	5
1998-2009	62	2679	1
% Lost	68	52	80

Table 3: Survey effort and on-effort sightings having perpendicular sighting distances. % Lost shows the percentage of effort or sightings lost by restricting the analysis to surveys performed in 1998 and later, the era in which remotely-sensed chlorophyll and derived productivity estimates are available. See Figure 1 for more information.




Figure 1: Fraser's dolphin sightings and survey tracklines. The top map shows all surveys. The bottom map shows surveys performed in 1998 or later, the era in which remotely-sensed chlorophyll and derived productivity estimates are available. Models fitted to contemporaneous (day-of-sighting) estimates of those predictors only utilize these surveys. These maps illustrate the survey data lost in order to utilize those predictors. Models fitted to climatological estimates of those predictors do not suffer this data loss.




Figure 2: Aerial linear survey effort per unit area.




Figure 3: Fraser's dolphin sightings per unit aerial linear survey effort.




Figure 4: Shipboard linear survey effort per unit area.




Figure 5: Fraser's dolphin sightings per unit shipboard linear survey effort.




Figure 6: Effective survey effort per unit area, for all surveys combined. Here, effort is corrected by the species- and survey-program-specific detection functions used in fitting the density models.




Figure 7: Fraser's dolphin sightings per unit of effective survey effort, for all surveys combined. Here, effort is corrected by the species- and survey-program-specific detection functions used in fitting the density models.

Detection Functions

The detection hierarchy figures below show how sightings from multiple surveys were pooled to try to achieve Buckland et. al's (2001) recommendation that at least 60-80 sightings be used to fit a detection function. Leaf nodes, on the right, usually represent individual surveys, while the hierarchy to the left shows how they have been grouped according to how similar we believed the surveys were to each other in their detection performance.

At each node, the red or green number indicates the total number of sightings below that node in the hierarchy, and is colored green if 70 or more sightings were available, and red otherwise. If a grouping node has zero sightings—i.e. all of the surveys within it had zero sightings—it may be collapsed and shown as a leaf to save space.

Each histogram in the figure indicates a node where a detection function was fitted. The actual detection functions do not appear in this figure; they are presented in subsequent sections. The histogram shows the frequency of sightings by perpendicular sighting distance for all surveys contained by that node. Each survey (leaf node) receives the detection function that is closest to it up the hierarchy. Thus, for common species, sufficient sightings may be available to fit detection functions deep in the hierarchy, with each function applying to only a few surveys, thereby allowing variability in detection performance between surveys to be addressed relatively finely. For rare species, so few sightings may be available that we have to pool many surveys together to try to meet Buckland's recommendation, and fit only a few coarse detection functions high in the hierarchy.

A blue Proxy Species tag indicates that so few sightings were available that, rather than ascend higher in the hierarchy to a point that we would pool grossly-incompatible surveys together, (e.g. shipboard surveys that used big-eye binoculars with those that used only naked eyes) we pooled sightings of similar species together instead. The list of species pooled is given in following sections.

Shipboard Surveys




Figure 8: Detection hierarchy for shipboard surveys

SEFSC Oregon II

Because this taxon was sighted too infrequently to fit a detection function to its sightings alone, we fit a detection function to the pooled sightings of several other species that we believed would exhibit similar detectability. These “proxy species” are listed below.

Reported By Observer	Common Name	n
Delphinus capensis	Long-beaked common dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis	Short-beaked common dolphin	2
Delphinus delphis/Lagenorhynchus acutus	Short-beaked common or Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella	Short-beaked common dolphin or Stenella spp.	0

Delphinus delphis/Stenella coeruleoalba	Short-beaked common or striped dolphin	0
Grampus griseus	Risso’s dolphin	156
Grampus griseus/Tursiops truncatus	Risso’s or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Lagenodelphis hosei	Fraser’s dolphin	3
Lagenorhynchus acutus	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris	White-beaked dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris/Lagenorhynchus acutus	White-beaked or white-sided dolphin	0
Stenella	Unidentified Stenella	17
Stenella attenuata	Pantropical spotted dolphin	347
Stenella attenuata/frontalis	Pantropical or Atlantic spotted dolphin	0
Stenella clymene	Clymene dolphin	44
Stenella coeruleoalba	Striped dolphin	48
Stenella frontalis	Atlantic spotted dolphin	242
Stenella frontalis/Tursiops truncatus	Atlantic spotted or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Stenella longirostris	Spinner dolphin	38
Steno bredanensis	Rough-toothed dolphin	22
Steno bredanensis/Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose or rough-toothed dolphin	0
Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose dolphin	490
Total		1409

Table 4: Proxy species used to fit detection functions for SEFSC Oregon II. The number of sightings, n , is before truncation.

The sightings were right truncated at 5000m.

Covariate	Description
beaufort	Beaufort sea state.
quality	Survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions, utilizing relevant factors other than Beaufort sea state (see methods).
size	Estimated size (number of individuals) of the sighted group.

Table 5: Covariates tested in candidate “multi-covariate distance sampling” (MCDS) detection functions.

Key	Adjustment	Order	Covariates	Succeeded	Δ AIC	Mean ESHW (m)
hr			beaufort, size	Yes	0.00	838
hr			quality, size	Yes	4.04	781
hr			size	Yes	40.93	721
hr			beaufort, quality	Yes	51.85	584
hr			quality	Yes	77.10	542
hr			beaufort	Yes	90.39	516

hr	poly	4	Yes	98.67	504
hr	poly	2	Yes	105.42	527
hr			Yes	122.09	464
hn	cos	3	Yes	347.50	1358
hn	cos	2	Yes	347.64	1513
hn		beaufort, quality, size	Yes	395.08	1960
hn		quality, size	Yes	418.20	1955
hn		beaufort, size	Yes	445.74	1988
hn		beaufort, quality	Yes	457.12	1938
hn		quality	Yes	467.60	1940
hn		size	Yes	468.82	1979
hn		beaufort	Yes	525.20	1950
hn			Yes	534.41	1952
hn	herm	4	No		
hr		beaufort, quality, size	No		

Table 6: Candidate detection functions for SEFSC Oregon II. The first one listed was selected for the density model.




Figure 9: Detection function for SEFSC Oregon II that was selected for the density model

Statistical output for this detection function:

Summary for ds object

Number of observations : 1388
Distance range : 0 - 5000
AIC : 21867.99

Detection function:
Hazard-rate key function

Detection function parameters

Scale Coefficients:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	5.2092869	0.2114307
beaufort	-0.5693537	0.0681569
size	2.2404429	0.2188851

Shape parameters:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	0	0.03463474

	Estimate	SE	CV
Average p	6.316950e-02	6.550362e-03	0.103695
N in covered region	2.197263e+04	2.356588e+03	0.107251

Additional diagnostic plots:




Figure 10: Scatterplots showing the relationship between Beaufort sea state and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). The line is a simple linear regression.




Figure 11: Scatterplots showing the relationship between the survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). Low values of the quality index correspond to better observation conditions. The line is a simple linear regression.




Figure 12: Histograms showing group size frequency and scatterplots showing the relationship between group size and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (top row) and only those not right truncated (bottom row). In the scatterplot, the line is a simple linear regression.

SEFSC Gordon Gunter

Because this taxon was sighted too infrequently to fit a detection function to its sightings alone, we fit a detection function to the pooled sightings of several other species that we believed would exhibit similar detectability. These “proxy species” are listed below.

Reported By Observer	Common Name	n
Delphinus capensis	Long-beaked common dolphin	9
Delphinus delphis	Short-beaked common dolphin	35

Delphinus delphis/Lagenorhynchus acutus	Short-beaked common or Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella	Short-beaked common dolphin or Stenella spp.	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella coeruleoalba	Short-beaked common or striped dolphin	0
Grampus griseus	Risso’s dolphin	129
Grampus griseus/Tursiops truncatus	Risso’s or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Lagenodelphis hosei	Fraser’s dolphin	1
Lagenorhynchus acutus	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris	White-beaked dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris/Lagenorhynchus acutus	White-beaked or white-sided dolphin	0
Stenella	Unidentified Stenella	30
Stenella attenuata	Pantropical spotted dolphin	303
Stenella attenuata/frontalis	Pantropical or Atlantic spotted dolphin	0
Stenella clymene	Clymene dolphin	29
Stenella coeruleoalba	Striped dolphin	78
Stenella frontalis	Atlantic spotted dolphin	376
Stenella frontalis/Tursiops truncatus	Atlantic spotted or Bottlenose dolphin	1
Stenella longirostris	Spinner dolphin	24
Steno bredanensis	Rough-toothed dolphin	24
Steno bredanensis/Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose or rough-toothed dolphin	0
Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose dolphin	606
Total		1645

Table 7: Proxy species used to fit detection functions for SEFSC Gordon Gunter. The number of sightings, n , is before truncation.

The sightings were right truncated at 6000m.

Covariate	Description
beaufort	Beaufort sea state.
size	Estimated size (number of individuals) of the sighted group.

Table 8: Covariates tested in candidate “multi-covariate distance sampling” (MCDS) detection functions.

Key	Adjustment	Order	Covariates	Succeeded	Δ AIC	Mean ESHW (m)
hr			beaufort	Yes	0.00	845
hr			size	Yes	56.50	827
hr	poly	4		Yes	109.59	672
hr	poly	2		Yes	120.70	708
hr				Yes	146.78	605
hn			beaufort, size	Yes	363.66	2358

hn	cos	3		Yes	368.33	1658
hn	cos	2		Yes	369.53	1845
hn			beaufort	Yes	445.88	2329
hn			size	Yes	494.38	2392
hn				Yes	562.91	2351
hn	herm	4		No		
hr			beaufort, size	No		

Table 9: Candidate detection functions for SEFSC Gordon Gunter. The first one listed was selected for the density model.




Figure 13: Detection function for SEFSC Gordon Gunter that was selected for the density model

Statistical output for this detection function:

```
Summary for ds object
Number of observations : 1629
Distance range       : 0 - 6000
AIC                  : 26333.8
```

```
Detection function:
Hazard-rate key function
```

```
Detection function parameters
Scale Coefficients:
      estimate      se
(Intercept) 7.4292786 0.19090384
beaufort    -0.9782277 0.07236275
```

Shape parameters:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	0	0.03349464

	Estimate	SE	CV
Average p	6.437877e-02	6.755469e-03	0.1049332
N in covered region	2.530337e+04	2.729041e+03	0.1078529

Additional diagnostic plots:






Figure 14: Scatterplots showing the relationship between Beaufort sea state and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). The line is a simple linear regression.


Group Size Frequency, without right trunc.



Group Size vs. Distance, without right trunc.



Group Size Frequency, right trunc. at 6000 m



Group Size vs. Distance, right trunc. at 6000 m




Figure 15: Histograms showing group size frequency and scatterplots showing the relationship between group size and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (top row) and only those not right truncated (bottom row). In the scatterplot, the line is a simple linear regression.

Aerial Surveys




Figure 16: Detection hierarchy for aerial surveys

GulfSCAT Aerial Survey

Because this taxon was sighted too infrequently to fit a detection function to its sightings alone, we fit a detection function to the pooled sightings of several other species that we believed would exhibit similar detectability. These “proxy species” are listed below.

Reported By Observer	Common Name	n
Delphinus capensis	Long-beaked common dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis	Short-beaked common dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Lagenorhynchus acutus	Short-beaked common or Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella	Short-beaked common dolphin or Stenella spp.	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella coeruleoalba	Short-beaked common or striped dolphin	0
Grampus griseus	Risso’s dolphin	0
Grampus griseus/Tursiops truncatus	Risso’s or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Lagenodelphis hosei	Fraser’s dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus acutus	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris	White-beaked dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris/Lagenorhynchus acutus	White-beaked or white-sided dolphin	0
Stenella	Unidentified Stenella	0
Stenella attenuata	Pantropical spotted dolphin	0
Stenella attenuata/frontalis	Pantropical or Atlantic spotted dolphin	0
Stenella clymene	Clymene dolphin	0
Stenella coeruleoalba	Striped dolphin	0
Stenella frontalis	Atlantic spotted dolphin	15
Stenella frontalis/Tursiops truncatus	Atlantic spotted or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Stenella longirostris	Spinner dolphin	0
Steno bredanensis	Rough-toothed dolphin	0

Steno bredanensis/Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose or rough-toothed dolphin	0
Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose dolphin	381
Total		396

Table 10: Proxy species used to fit detection functions for GulfSCAT Aerial Survey. The number of sightings, n, is before truncation.

The sightings were right truncated at 400m.

Covariate	Description
beaufort	Beaufort sea state.
quality	Survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions, utilizing relevant factors other than Beaufort sea state (see methods).
size	Estimated size (number of individuals) of the sighted group.

Table 11: Covariates tested in candidate “multi-covariate distance sampling” (MCDS) detection functions.

Key	Adjustment	Order	Covariates	Succeeded	Δ AIC	Mean ESHW (m)
hn	cos	2		Yes	0.00	221
hn	herm	4		Yes	0.79	206
hn				Yes	0.82	199
hn			size	Yes	2.13	199
hn	cos	3		Yes	2.29	209
hr	poly	2		Yes	2.30	218
hr	poly	4		Yes	2.38	223
hr				Yes	4.37	230
hr			size	Yes	4.95	232
hn			beaufort	No		
hr			beaufort	No		
hn			quality	No		
hr			quality	No		
hn			beaufort, quality	No		
hr			beaufort, quality	No		
hn			beaufort, size	No		
hr			beaufort, size	No		
hn			quality, size	No		
hr			quality, size	No		
hn			beaufort, quality, size	No		
hr			beaufort, quality, size	No		

Table 12: Candidate detection functions for GulfSCAT Aerial Survey. The first one listed was selected for the density model.




Figure 17: Detection function for GulfSCAT Aerial Survey that was selected for the density model

Statistical output for this detection function:

Summary for ds object

Number of observations : 392
 Distance range : 0 - 400
 AIC : 4506.004

Detection function:

Half-normal key function with cosine adjustment term of order 2

Detection function parameters

Scale Coefficients:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	5.046007	0.04810071

Adjustment term parameter(s):

	estimate	se
cos, order 2	-0.1327288	0.07936255

Monotonicity constraints were enforced.

	Estimate	SE	CV
Average p	0.5524659	0.04409945	0.07982294
N in covered region	709.5460595	61.50324053	0.08667970

Monotonicity constraints were enforced.

Additional diagnostic plots:




Figure 18: Scatterplots showing the relationship between Beaufort sea state and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). The line is a simple linear regression.






Figure 19: Scatterplots showing the relationship between the survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). Low values of the quality index correspond to better observation conditions. The line is a simple linear regression.


Group Size Frequency, without right trunc.



Group Size vs. Distance, without right trunc.



Group Size Frequency, right trunc. at 400 m



Group Size vs. Distance, right trunc. at 400 m




Figure 20: Histograms showing group size frequency and scatterplots showing the relationship between group size and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (top row) and only those not right truncated (bottom row). In the scatterplot, the line is a simple linear regression.

GulfCet Aerial Surveys

Because this taxon was sighted too infrequently to fit a detection function to its sightings alone, we fit a detection function to the pooled sightings of several other species that we believed would exhibit similar detectability. These “proxy species” are listed below.

Reported By Observer	Common Name	n
<i>Delphinus capensis</i>	Long-beaked common dolphin	0
<i>Delphinus delphis</i>	Short-beaked common dolphin	0

Delphinus delphis/Lagenorhynchus acutus	Short-beaked common or Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella	Short-beaked common dolphin or Stenella spp.	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella coeruleoalba	Short-beaked common or striped dolphin	0
Grampus griseus	Risso’s dolphin	71
Grampus griseus/Tursiops truncatus	Risso’s or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Lagenodelphis hosei	Fraser’s dolphin	2
Lagenorhynchus acutus	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris	White-beaked dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris/Lagenorhynchus acutus	White-beaked or white-sided dolphin	0
Stenella	Unidentified Stenella	10
Stenella attenuata	Pantropical spotted dolphin	94
Stenella attenuata/frontalis	Pantropical or Atlantic spotted dolphin	0
Stenella clymene	Clymene dolphin	12
Stenella coeruleoalba	Striped dolphin	16
Stenella frontalis	Atlantic spotted dolphin	36
Stenella frontalis/Tursiops truncatus	Atlantic spotted or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Stenella longirostris	Spinner dolphin	11
Steno bredanensis	Rough-toothed dolphin	9
Steno bredanensis/Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose or rough-toothed dolphin	0
Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose dolphin	237
Total		498

Table 13: Proxy species used to fit detection functions for GulfCet Aerial Surveys. The number of sightings, n , is before truncation.

The sightings were right truncated at 1296m. The vertical sighting angles were heaped at 10 degree increments, so the candidate detection functions were fitted using linear bins scaled accordingly.

Covariate	Description
beaufort	Beaufort sea state.
quality	Survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions, utilizing relevant factors other than Beaufort sea state (see methods).
size	Estimated size (number of individuals) of the sighted group.

Table 14: Covariates tested in candidate “multi-covariate distance sampling” (MCDS) detection functions.

Key	Adjustment	Order	Covariates	Succeeded	Δ AIC	Mean ESHW (m)
hr			size	Yes	0.00	402
hr				Yes	1.41	394
hr	poly	2		Yes	3.41	394

hr	poly	4		Yes	3.41	394
hn	cos	2		Yes	4.97	368
hn	cos	3		Yes	10.69	340
hn			size	Yes	31.42	441
hn				Yes	34.80	439
hn	herm	4		Yes	36.57	439
hn			beaufort	No		
hr			beaufort	No		
hn			quality	No		
hr			quality	No		
hn			beaufort, quality	No		
hr			beaufort, quality	No		
hn			beaufort, size	No		
hr			beaufort, size	No		
hn			quality, size	No		
hr			quality, size	No		
hn			beaufort, quality, size	No		
hr			beaufort, quality, size	No		

Table 15: Candidate detection functions for GulfCet Aerial Surveys. The first one listed was selected for the density model.




Figure 21: Detection function for GulfCet Aerial Surveys that was selected for the density model

Statistical output for this detection function:

Summary for ds object

Number of observations : 492
 Distance range : 0 - 1296
 AIC : 2031.84

Detection function:

Hazard-rate key function

Detection function parameters

Scale Coefficients:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	5.535347	0.09109734
size	0.139986	0.06272901

Shape parameters:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	0.866934	0.08296851

	Estimate	SE	CV
Average p	0.3057269	0.0166754	0.05454346
N in covered region	1609.2795060	106.6843878	0.06629326

Additional diagnostic plots:




Figure 22: Scatterplots showing the relationship between Beaufort sea state and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). The line is a simple linear regression.




Figure 23: Scatterplots showing the relationship between the survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). Low values of the quality index correspond to better observation conditions. The line is a simple linear regression.




Figure 24: Histograms showing group size frequency and scatterplots showing the relationship between group size and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (top row) and only those not right truncated (bottom row). In the scatterplot, the line is a simple linear regression.

GOMEX92-96 Aerial Survey

Because this taxon was sighted too infrequently to fit a detection function to its sightings alone, we fit a detection function to the pooled sightings of several other species that we believed would exhibit similar detectability. These “proxy species” are listed below.

Reported By Observer	Common Name	n
<i>Delphinus capensis</i>	Long-beaked common dolphin	0
<i>Delphinus delphis</i>	Short-beaked common dolphin	0

Delphinus delphis/Lagenorhynchus acutus	Short-beaked common or Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella	Short-beaked common dolphin or Stenella spp.	0
Delphinus delphis/Stenella coeruleoalba	Short-beaked common or striped dolphin	0
Grampus griseus	Risso's dolphin	4
Grampus griseus/Tursiops truncatus	Risso's or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Lagenodelphis hosei	Fraser's dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus acutus	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris	White-beaked dolphin	0
Lagenorhynchus albirostris/Lagenorhynchus acutus	White-beaked or white-sided dolphin	0
Stenella	Unidentified Stenella	1
Stenella attenuata	Pantropical spotted dolphin	0
Stenella attenuata/frontalis	Pantropical or Atlantic spotted dolphin	0
Stenella clymene	Clymene dolphin	0
Stenella coeruleoalba	Striped dolphin	0
Stenella frontalis	Atlantic spotted dolphin	24
Stenella frontalis/Tursiops truncatus	Atlantic spotted or Bottlenose dolphin	0
Stenella longirostris	Spinner dolphin	0
Steno bredanensis	Rough-toothed dolphin	0
Steno bredanensis/Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose or rough-toothed dolphin	0
Tursiops truncatus	Bottlenose dolphin	936
Total		965

Table 16: Proxy species used to fit detection functions for GOMEX92-96 Aerial Survey. The number of sightings, n , is before truncation.

The sightings were right truncated at 1296m. Due to a reduced frequency of sightings close to the trackline that plausibly resulted from the behavior of the observers and/or the configuration of the survey platform, the sightings were left truncated as well. Sightings closer than 83 m to the trackline were omitted from the analysis, and it was assumed that the area closer to the trackline than this was not surveyed. This distance was estimated by inspecting histograms of perpendicular sighting distances. The vertical sighting angles were heaped at 10 degree increments, so the candidate detection functions were fitted using linear bins scaled accordingly.

Covariate	Description
beaufort	Beaufort sea state.
quality	Survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions, utilizing relevant factors other than Beaufort sea state (see methods).
size	Estimated size (number of individuals) of the sighted group.

Table 17: Covariates tested in candidate “multi-covariate distance sampling” (MCDS) detection functions.

Key	Adjustment	Order	Covariates	Succeeded	Δ AIC	Mean ESHW (m)
-----	------------	-------	------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

hr			size	Yes	0.00	281
hr	poly	4		Yes	4.73	273
hn	cos	3		Yes	4.85	220
hr				Yes	4.90	278
hr	poly	2		Yes	5.13	269
hn	cos	2		Yes	12.07	259
hn			size	Yes	39.53	304
hn				Yes	41.94	304
hn	herm	4		Yes	43.71	304
hn			beaufort	No		
hr			beaufort	No		
hn			quality	No		
hr			quality	No		
hn			beaufort, quality	No		
hr			beaufort, quality	No		
hn			beaufort, size	No		
hr			beaufort, size	No		
hn			quality, size	No		
hr			quality, size	No		
hn			beaufort, quality, size	No		
hr			beaufort, quality, size	No		

Table 18: Candidate detection functions for GOMEX92-96 Aerial Survey. The first one listed was selected for the density model.




Figure 25: Detection function for GOMEX92-96 Aerial Survey that was selected for the density model

Statistical output for this detection function:

Summary for ds object

Number of observations : 808
Distance range : 83.2036 - 1296
AIC : 2832.217

Detection function:

Hazard-rate key function

Detection function parameters

Scale Coefficients:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	5.49007390	0.06761203
size	0.09577309	0.04016336

Shape parameters:

	estimate	se
(Intercept)	0.9893445	0.05859387

	Estimate	SE	CV
Average p	0.2138621	0.01146898	0.05362795
N in covered region	3778.1360570	234.49525749	0.06206639

Additional diagnostic plots:




Figure 26: Density of sightings by perpendicular distance for GOMEX92-96 Aerial Survey. Black bars on the left show sightings that were left truncated.




Figure 27: Scatterplots showing the relationship between Beaufort sea state and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). The line is a simple linear regression.






Figure 28: Scatterplots showing the relationship between the survey-specific index of the quality of observation conditions and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (left) and only those not right truncated (right). Low values of the quality index correspond to better observation conditions. The line is a simple linear regression.


Group Size Frequency, without right trunc.



Group Size vs. Distance, without right trunc.



Group Size Frequency, right trunc. at 1296 m



Group Size vs. Distance, right trunc. at 1296 m




Figure 29: Histograms showing group size frequency and scatterplots showing the relationship between group size and perpendicular sighting distance, for all sightings (top row) and only those not right truncated (bottom row). In the scatterplot, the line is a simple linear regression.

$g(0)$ Estimates

Platform	Surveys	Group Size	$g(0)$	Biases Addressed	Source
Shipboard	All	1-20	0.856	Perception	Barlow and Forney (2007)
		>20	0.970	Perception	Barlow and Forney (2007)
Aerial	All	1-5	0.43	Both	Palka (2006)
		>5	0.960	Both	Carretta et al. (2000)

Table 19: Estimates of $g(0)$ used in this density model.

For shipboard surveys, we were unable to locate species-specific $g(0)$ estimates in the literature. Instead, we utilized Barlow and Forney’s (2007) estimates for delphinids, produced from several years of dual-team surveys that used bigeye binoculars and similar protocols to the surveys in our study. This study provided separate estimates for small and large groups, but pooled sightings of several species together to provide a generic estimate for all delphinids, due to sample-size limitations. The estimates accounted for perception bias but not availability bias; dive times for dolphins are short enough that availability bias is not expected to be significant for dolphins observed from shipboard surveys.

For aerial surveys, we were unable to locate species-specific $g(0)$ estimates in the literature. For small groups, defined here as 1-5 individuals, we used Palka’s (2006) estimate of $g(0)$ for groups of 1-5 small cetaceans, estimated from two years of aerial surveys using the Hiby (1999) circle-back method. This estimate accounted for both availability and perception bias, but pooled sightings of several species together to provide a generic estimate for all delphinids, due to sample-size limitations. For large groups, defined here as greater than 5 individuals, Palka (2006) assumed that $g(0)$ was 1. When we discussed this with NOAA SWFSC reviewers, they agreed that it was safe to assume that the availability bias component of $g(0)$ was 1 but insisted that perception bias should be slightly less than 1, because it was possible to miss large groups. We agreed to take a conservative approach and obtained our $g(0)$ for large groups from Carretta et al. (2000), who estimated $g(0)$ for both small and large groups of delphinids. We used Carretta et al.’s $g(0)$ estimate for groups of 1-25 individuals (0.960), rather than their larger one for more than 25 individuals (0.994), to account for the fact that we were using Palka’s definition of large groups as those with more than 5 individuals.

Density Model

Fraser’s dolphin is a tropical species that is found world-wide on the high seas (Jefferson and Schiro 1997). NOAA only reported a few sightings during the entire series of surveys from 1992-2009 utilized here. Despite this, it has been argued that the species may be more common in the Gulf than anywhere else in the North Atlantic (Dolar 2009). With insufficient sightings to model density using environmental predictors, we fitted a stratified model to off-shelf waters, defined here as those deeper than the 100m isobath.




Figure 30: Fraser's dolphin density model schematic. All sightings are shown, including those that were truncated when detection functions were fitted. The coefficient of variation (CV) underestimates the true uncertainty of our estimate, as it only incorporated the uncertainty of the GAM stage of our model. Other sources of uncertainty include the detection functions and $g(0)$ estimates. It was not possible to incorporate these into our CV without undertaking a computationally-prohibitive bootstrap; we hope to attempt that in a future version of our model.

Abundance Estimates

Dates	Model or study	Estimated abundance	CV	Assumed $g(0)=1$	In our models
1992-2009	Our model	1665	0.73	No	
2009	Oceanic waters, Jun-Aug (Waring et al. 2013)	0		Yes	Yes
2003-2004	Oceanic waters, Jun-Aug (Mullin 2007)	0		Yes	Yes
1996-2001	Oceanic waters, Apr-Jun (Mullin and Fulling 2004)	726	0.70	Yes	Yes
1991-1994	Oceanic waters, Apr-Jun (Hansen et al. 1995)	127	0.90	Yes	Yes

Table 20: Estimated mean abundance within the study area for our model and independent estimates from NOAA and/or the scientific literature. The Dates column gives the dates to which the estimates apply. For our model, these are the years for survey data were available. Our coefficient of variation (CV) estimates are probably too low, as they only incorporated the uncertainty of the GAM stage of our models. Other sources of uncertainty include the detection functions and $g(0)$ estimates. It was not possible to incorporate these into our CVs without undertaking a computationally-prohibitive bootstrap; we hope to attempt that in a future version of our models. The Assumed $g(0)=1$ column specifies whether the abundance estimate assumed that detection was certain along the survey trackline. Studies that assumed this did not correct for availability or perception bias, and therefore underestimated abundance. The In our models column specifies whether the survey data from the study was also used in our models. If not, the study provides a completely independent estimate of abundance. Note that our abundance estimates are averaged over the whole year, while the other estimates apply to specific months or seasons. Please see the Discussion section below for our evaluation of our models compared to the other estimates.

Discussion

Relative to other dolphin species that inhabit the Gulf of Mexico, Fraser's dolphin is relatively rare. No sightings have been reported by NOAA since the 1990s, at least in the surveys NOAA made available to us. Our abundance estimate is more than double NOAA's highest estimate (Mullin and Fulling 2004), which was based on one shipboard sighting. We do not believe this difference is due to $g(0)$: while NOAA's estimate assumed that $g(0)=1$ and we did not, all of the sightings were made of large groups, thus we assumed $g(0)=0.970$ or 0.960 for all of the sightings (depending on which platform sighted them). Our best guess is that the difference results from differences in detection functions. For shipboard surveys, NOAA's effective strip half width (ESHW) for small dolphins was 1555m. Our detection functions had ESHWs of 838m and 845m. Abundance scales inversely with ESHW; cutting ESHW in half doubles abundance. In any case, our estimate is within the 95% confidence interval of NOAA's estimate.

References

- Barlow J, Forney KA (2007) Abundance and density of cetaceans in the California Current ecosystem. *Fish. Bull.* 105: 509-526.
- Carretta JV, Lowry MS, Stinchcomb CE, Lynn MS, Cosgrove RE (2000) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals at San Clemente Island and surrounding offshore waters: results from aerial and ground surveys in 1998 and 1999. Administrative Report LJ-00-02, available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Box 271, La Jolla, CA USA 92038. 44 p.
- Dolor, MLL (2008) Fraser's Dolphin: *Lagenodelphis hosei*. In: *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals*, 2nd ed. (Perrin WF, Wursig B, Thewissen JGM, eds.) Academic Press, San Diego, California. pp. 469-471.
- Hansen LJ, Mullin KD, Roden CL (1995) Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami Laboratory, Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25, 9 pp.
- Hiby L (1999) The objective identification of duplicate sightings in aerial survey for porpoise. In: *Marine Mammal Survey and Assessment Methods* (Garner GW, Amstrup SC, Laake JL, Manly BFJ, McDonald LL, Robertson DG, eds.). Balkema, Rotterdam, pp. 179-189.
- Jefferson TA, Schiro AJ (1997) Distribution of cetaceans in the offshore Gulf of Mexico. *Mammal Rev.* 27(1): 27-50.
- Mullin KD (2007) Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. 26 pp.
- Mullin KD, Fulling GL (2004) Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 20(4): 787-807.
- Palka DL (2006) Summer Abundance Estimates of Cetaceans in US North Atlantic Navy Operating Areas. US Dept Commer, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 06-03: 41 p.
- Waring GT, Josephson E, Maze-Foley K, Rosel PE, eds. (2013) U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2012. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS NE 223; 419 p.