

Subject: RE: NESP sites
Date: Tuesday, 9 November 2021 at 1:55:14 pm Australian Central Daylight Time
From: Lizzi Oh
To: Camille Mellin
Attachments: NESP-Extract_2021-11-09.xlsx

CAUTION: External email. Only click on links or open attachments from trusted senders.

Hooray!

Attached is your extract 😊, hopefully it's all good to go.

I've highlighted important columns to use in managing the data.

Some things to note are:

- This is solely the surveys from your NESP survey list
- The field "annotation_labeller_username" has the Squidle username of who labelled the point. Note that the same survey may have 2 or three annotators, where another person has finished the non-coral annotations, and/or QA/QC'd those categories. "RLS_user" is Emre. One unfortunate thing for you is that there are some coral species annotations that Emre has labelled earlier on that have another username on them. This is because we had issues with EXIF data and image orientation in different browsers, when that was fixed some points got re-arranged clockwise or anticlockwise, so sometimes a person other than Emre has moved them back to cover the coral species it is meant to label. This point then gets their username as the last person who edited it. Fortunately it sounds like your analysing labeller bias for the benthic categories, so maybe not a big deal.
- I usually QA/QC the benthic category scores from people other than Emre, but I noticed that some surveys were finished off but not reported properly as so, so they have not been checked QA/QC'd. ☹️. But I guess your labeller bias analysis will make the final call
- Infilled data! Unfinished data!
 - Some surveys are unfinished as reported "no" in the "Is finished" column. These all have an assumed/projected "total points" count of 100.
 - Some unfinished surveys have a blank in the "Is infilled" column. These have no non-coral scores, and the percent cover will not sum to 100.
 - Some unfinished surveys have "infilled" in the the "is infilled" column. These have data from the old database to fill in the benthic caetgories. The infilled data points are marked "NRMN M13" in the "database" column, instead of "Squidle+". These do not have labeller information, so you may want to delete these scores if you're not confident about bias (these are probably the scores that caused some of the problem last time).
- ****Dataset_id. This field is the unique identifier for an analysis of a survey's photos. In our wider dataset there are plenty of cases where a survey is analysed by different people in different (but compatible) ways, so this field is important to use instead of "survey_id" because it is the field for which the percent covers should sum to 100 for finished or infilled surveys.
- Finally when coral is flagged "dead" in Squidle the column "flag_dead" is set to true. I've scripted the RLS and RLE categories to then come up as "Dead coral", but the category in the "label" filed will be the same. SO when Emre was annotating this will be a coral species – perhaps goo for looking at richness(?), but not to be used for calculating live coral covers?

Okay, let me know if I've missed explaining anything, or provided poor explanations..
Good luck, I'd love to hear how it went, esp if we can get feedback on the level of labeller bias

Cheers,
Lizzie

From: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 November 2021 3:32 PM
To: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Subject: Re: NESP sites

Thanks Lizzie, that would be awesome!
Cheers,
C

On 8 Nov 2021, at 2:47 pm, Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au> wrote:

CAUTION: External email. Only click on links or open attachments from trusted senders.

Hi Camille,

Yes I think I can provide an extract split by labeller. At the moment I've included "labeller_name" as a field, but it seems to represent the owner of the data set, as a whole, not really who labelled each field. It should be an easy tweak of the code and re-export though to include a different field which should represent who labelled the points, and then include that in the grouping of data.

Cheers,
Lizzie

From: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 November 2021 1:32 PM
To: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Subject: Re: NESP sites

Hi Lizzie,

Thanks for your message – I think we won't worry about the missing surveys, as the available ones should be plenty for this analysis.

Re the benthic categories, we will only include those for this site list, so the data for just those surveys will be fine. Would it be possible for you to provide a single combined data extract for those sites/surveys that also specifies the labeller for each category (so I can control for observer effect etc)?

Many thanks again!

Cheers,
C.

From: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Date: Friday, 5 November 2021 at 2:37 pm
To: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Subject: RE: NESP sites

CAUTION: External email. Only click on links or open attachments from trusted senders.

Hi Camille,
Sorry it has taken a lot of the week to catch up with this. I'd just like to confirm two things. The highlighted survey IDs in the attached are still not finished. 8 are unresolvable (with the PQs not available) and 6 could potentially be done, Emre has either missed them or chosen not to do them but could. Would you like him to do these 6 surveys, or any others that would fill gaps that the 8 unresolvable ones have created?

The other thing I wanted to confirm is the benthic categories. Were you only including the ones from this site list in your analysis, or is that a wider study. I've still been QA/QC'ing the labels done in our recent work, but have realised that none apply to the surveys in your NESP list, so can likely just pass the data on. Would you like the data for just the surveys in this list, or the whole dataset?

Cheers!
Lizzie

From: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Sent: Thursday, 28 October 2021 11:58 AM
To: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Subject: Re: NESP sites

Hi Lizzie,

Thanks for your message – if you could please include the non-coral scores that would be ideal as it would give more flexibility – i.e., I can determine for how many surveys the non-coral scores were done by Emre, and subsequently decide to include them or not in the analysis. Monday or anytime next week will be fine, thanks heaps for this!

Cheers,
Camille

From: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Date: Thursday, 28 October 2021 at 10:47 am
To: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Subject: RE: NESP sites

CAUTION: External email. Only click on links or open attachments from trusted senders.

Hi Camille,

I'm just wanting to confirm whether you'd like the updated non-coral scores or not? Our little "blitz" on scoring is almost to an end, so on Monday I could provide an extract where perhaps 700 of the "unfinished" surveys are finished now. Some will be "infilled" currently, but the new data should be more consistent. Others will be finished when they previously had only coral or kelp % scores. I will say though, a lot of these are not Emre's – many wither kelp or from Ningaloo and the Solitary Islands. If not useful, I'll just add what Emre has finished with the NESP sites now, and pass it on to you,

Cheers,
Lizzie

From: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 October 2021 4:37 PM
To: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>; Emre Turak <emreturak@wanadoo.fr>
Subject: Re: NESP sites

Fantastic news, thanks both!

Cheers,
Camille

From: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Date: Wednesday, 27 October 2021 at 12:12 pm
To: Emre Turak <emreturak@wanadoo.fr>
Cc: Camille Mellin <camille.mellin@adelaide.edu.au>
Subject: RE: NESP sites

CAUTION: External email. Only click on links or open attachments from trusted senders.

Awesome, Thanks Emre!

I'll get onto the data exports and pass on to Camille.

Cheers,
Lizzie

-----Original Message-----

From: Emre Turak <emreturak@wanadoo.fr>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 October 2021 1:16 PM
To: Lizzi Oh <elizabeth.oh@utas.edu.au>
Subject: NESP sites

Hi Lizzie,

I've finished scoring the NESP sites. Just working on a few reviews, but ready to use as is.

You'll see in my notes:

- Survey 912340566 had two transects with same name details except ending in RSS or GER. I've scored both and I presume you can separate them.
- Survey 912349682 appears to be a bit messy, incorporating some images from 912349621 and another transect.

Here is the list of NESP sites I scored and accompanying notes.

Emre

This email is confidential, and is for the intended recipient only. Access, disclosure, copying, distribution, or reliance on any of it by anyone outside the intended recipient organisation is prohibited and may be a criminal offence. Please delete if obtained in error and email confirmation to the sender. The views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of the University of Tasmania, unless clearly intended otherwise.