# Overview of Unmarked:

# An R Package for the Analysis of Data from Unmarked Animals

### Ian Fiske and Richard Chandler

April 16, 2013

### Abstract

Unmarked aims to be a complete environment for the statistical analysis of data from surveys of unmarked animals. Currently, the focus is on hierarchical models that separately model a latent state (or states) and an observation process. This vignette provides a brief overview of the package — for a more thorough treatment see [2]

## 1 Overview of unmarked

Unmarked provides methods to estimate site occupancy, abundance, and density of animals (or possibly other organisms/objects) that cannot be detected with certainty. Numerous models are available that correspond to specialized survey methods such as temporally replicated surveys, distance sampling, removal sampling, and double observer sampling. These data are often associated with metadata related to the design of the study. For example, in distance sampling, the study design (line- or point-transect), distance class break points, transect lengths, and units of measurement need to be accounted for in the analysis. Unmarked uses S4 classes to store data and metadata in a way that allows for easy data manipulation, summarization, and model specification. Table 1 lists the currently implemented models and their associated fitting functions and data classes.

Model	Fitting Function	Data	Citation
Occupancy	occu	unmarkedFrameOccu	[4]
Royle-Nichols	occuRN	${\bf unmarked Frame Occu}$	[8]
Point Count	pcount	unmarked Frame PC ount	[6]
Distance-sampling	distsamp	${\bf unmarked Frame DS}$	[7]
Generalized distance-sampling	gdistsamp	${\bf unmarkedFrameGDS}$	[1]
Arbitrary multinomial-Poisson	multinomPois	${\bf unmarked Frame MPois}$	[5]
Colonization-extinction	colext	${\bf unmarked Mult Frame}$	[3]
Generalized multinomial-mixture	$\operatorname{gmultmix}$	${\bf unmarked Frame GMM}$	[5]

Table 1: Models handled by unmarked.

Each data class can be created with a call to the constructor function of the same name as described in the examples below.

# 2 Typical unmarked session

The first step is to import the data into R, which we do below using the **read.csv** function. Next, the data need to be formatted for use with a specific model fitting function. This can be accomplished with a call to the appropriate type of **unmarkedFrame**. For example, to prepare the data for a single-season site-occupancy analysis, the function **unmarkedFrameOccu** is used.

### 2.1 Importing and formatting data

- > library(unmarked)
- > wt <- read.csv(system.file("csv","widewt.csv", package="unmarked"))

```
> y <- wt[,2:4]
> siteCovs <- wt[,c("elev", "forest", "length")]</pre>
> obsCovs <- list(date=wt[,c("date.1", "date.2", "date.3")],</pre>
     ivel=wt[,c("ivel.1", "ivel.2", "ivel.3")])
> wt <- unmarkedFrameOccu(y = y, siteCovs = siteCovs, obsCovs = obsCovs)
> summary(wt)
unmarkedFrame Object
237 sites
Maximum number of observations per site: 3
Mean number of observations per site: 2.81
Sites with at least one detection: 79
Tabulation of y observations:
   0 1 <NA>
 483 182 46
Site-level covariates:
                                            length
     elev
                        forest
 Min. :-1.436125 Min. :-1.265352 Min. :0.1823
 1st Qu.:-0.940726 1st Qu.:-0.974355 1st Qu.:1.4351
 Median :-0.166666 Median :-0.064987 Median :1.6094
 Mean : 0.007612 Mean : 0.000088 Mean :1.5924
 3rd Qu.: 0.994425 3rd Qu.: 0.808005 3rd Qu.:1.7750
 Max. : 2.434177 Max. : 2.299367 Max. :2.2407
Observation-level covariates:
      date
                        ivel
 Min. :-2.90434 Min. :-1.7533
                  1st Qu.:-0.6660
 1st Qu.:-1.11862
 Median :-0.11862
                   Median :-0.1395
 Mean :-0.00022
                   Mean : 0.0000
 3rd Qu.: 1.30995
                   3rd Qu.: 0.5493
 Max. : 3.80995 Max. : 5.9795
       :42
 NA's
                   NA's
                          :46
Alternatively, the convenience function \mathbf{csvToUMF} can be used
> wt <- csvToUMF(system.file("csv", "widewt.csv", package="unmarked"),
```

```
long = FALSE, type = "unmarkedFrameOccu")
```

If not all sites have the same numbers of observations, then manual importation of data in long format can be tricky. csvToUMF seamlessly handles this situation.

```
> pcru <- csvToUMF(system.file("csv","frog2001pcru.csv", package="unmarked"),</pre>
                   long = TRUE, type = "unmarkedFrameOccu")
```

To help stabilize the numerical optimization algorithm, we recommend standardizing the covariates.

```
> obsCovs(pcru) <- scale(obsCovs(pcru))
```

#### 2.2Fitting models

Occupancy models can then be fit with the occu() function:

```
> fm1 <- occu(~1 ~1, pcru)
> fm2 <- occu(~ MinAfterSunset + Temperature ~ 1, pcru)</pre>
> fm2
Call:
occu(formula = "MinAfterSunset + Temperature " 1, data = pcru)
Occupancy:
```

```
Estimate SE z P(>|z|)
1.54 0.292 5.26 1.42e-07
```

### Detection:

```
Estimate SE z P(>|z|)
(Intercept) 0.2098 0.206 1.017 3.09e-01
MinAfterSunset -0.0855 0.160 -0.536 5.92e-01
Temperature -1.8936 0.291 -6.508 7.60e-11
```

AIC: 356.7591

Here, we have specified that the detection process is modeled with the MinAfterSunset and Temperature covariates. No covariates are specified for occupancy here. See ?occu for more details.

### 2.3 Back-transforming parameter estimates

Unmarked fitting functions return unmarkedFit objects which can be queried to investigate the model fit. Variables can be back-transformed to the unconstrained scale using backTransform. Standard errors are computed using the delta method.

The expected probability that a site was occupied is 0.823. This estimate applies to the hypothetical population of all possible sites, not the sites found in our sample. For a good discussion of population-level vs finite-sample inference, see Royle and Dorazio [9] page 117. Note also that finite-sample quantities can be computed in unmarked using empirical Bayes methods as demonstrated at the end of this document.

Back-transforming the estimate of  $\psi$  was easy because there were no covariates. Because the detection component was modeled with covariates, p is a function, not just a scalar quantity, and so we need to be provide values of our covariates to obtain an estimate of p. Here, we request the probability of detection given a site is occupied and all covariates are set to 0.

Transformation: logistic

Transformation: logistic

Thus, we can say that the expected probability of detection was 0.552 when time of day and temperature are fixed at their mean value. A predict method also exists, which can be used to obtain estimates of parameters at specific covariate values.

```
> newData <- data.frame(MinAfterSunset = 0, Temperature = -2:2)</pre>
> round(predict(fm2, type = 'det', newdata = newData, appendData=TRUE), 2)
 Predicted
             SE lower upper MinAfterSunset Temperature
1
      0.98 0.01 0.93 1.00
                                          0
2
      0.89 0.04 0.78 0.95
                                          0
                                                      -1
3
      0.55 0.05
                  0.45 0.65
                                          0
                                                      0
      0.16 0.03 0.10 0.23
                                          0
                                                      1
      0.03 0.01 0.01 0.07
```

Confidence intervals are requested with confint, using either the asymptotic normal approximation or profiling.

```
> confint(fm2, type='det')
```

```
0.025
                                 0.975
p(Int)
                 -0.1946871 0.6142292
p(MinAfterSunset) -0.3985642 0.2274722
                  -2.4638797 -1.3233511
p(Temperature)
> confint(fm2, type='det', method = "profile")
Profiling parameter 1 of 3 ... done.
Profiling parameter 2 of 3 ... done.
Profiling parameter 3 of 3 ... done.
                       0.025
                 -0.1929210 0.6208837
p(MinAfterSunset) -0.4044794 0.2244221
                 -2.5189984 -1.3789261
p(Temperature)
```

### 2.4 Model selection and model fit

Model selection and multi-model inference can be implemented after organizing models using the fitList function.

```
> fms <- fitList('psi(.)p(.)' = fm1, 'psi(.)p(Time+Temp)' = fm2)</pre>
> modSel(fms)
                            AIC delta AICwt cumltvWt
                   nPars
                      4 356.76 0.00 1.0e+00
psi(.)p(Time+Temp)
                                                   1.00
                       2 461.00 104.25 2.3e-23
                                                   1 00
psi(.)p(.)
> predict(fms, type='det', newdata = newData)
                     SE
                            lower
1 0.98196076 0.01266193 0.9306044 0.99549474
2 0.89123189 0.04248804 0.7763166 0.95084836
3 0.55225129 0.05102660 0.4514814 0.64890493
4 0.15658708 0.03298276 0.1021713 0.23248007
5 0.02718682 0.01326263 0.0103505 0.06948653
```

The parametric bootstrap can be used to check the adequacy of model fit. Here we use a  $\chi^2$  statistic appropriate for binary data.

```
> chisq <- function(fm) {</pre>
     umf <- getData(fm)
     y <- getY(umf)
    y[y>1] <- 1
     sr <- fm@sitesRemoved</pre>
     if(length(sr)>0)
         y <- y[-sr,,drop=FALSE]
     fv <- fitted(fm, na.rm=TRUE)</pre>
     y[is.na(fv)] \leftarrow NA
     sum((y-fv)^2/(fv*(1-fv)), na.rm=TRUE)
> (pb <- parboot(fm2, statistic=chisq, nsim=100))</pre>
Call: parboot(object = fm2, statistic = chisq, nsim = 100)
Parametric Bootstrap Statistics:
   t0 mean(t0 - t_B) StdDev(t0 - t_B) Pr(t_B > t_D)
1 356
                20.2
                                   15.6
                                             0.0792
t_B quantiles:
     0% 2.5% 25% 50% 75% 97.5% 100%
t*1 299 306 326 334 346 371 385
t0 = Original statistic compuated from data
t_B = Vector of bootstrap samples
```

We fail to reject the null hypothesis, and conclude that the model fit is adequate.

### 2.5 Derived parameters and empirical Bayes methods

The parboot function can be also be used to compute confidence intervals for estimates of derived parameters, such as the proportion of sites occupied PAO =  $\sum_i z_i$  where  $z_i$  is the true occurrence state at site i, which is unknown at sites where no individuals were detected. The "colext" vignette shows examples of using parboot to obtain confidence intervals for such derived quantities. An alternative way achieving this goal is to use empirical Bayes methods, which were introduced in unmarked version 0.9-5. These methods estimate the posterior distribution of the latent variable given the data and the estimates of the fixed effects (the MLEs). The mean or the mode of the estimated posterior distribution is referred to as the empirical best unbiased predictor (EBUP), which in unmarked can be obtained by applying the bup function to the estimates of the posterior distributions returned by the ranef function. The following code returns the estimate of PAO and a 90% confidence interval.

Note that this is similar, but slightly lower than the population-level estimate of  $\psi$  obtained above. A plot method also exists for objects returned by ranef, but distributions of binary variables are not so pretty. Try it out on a fitted abundance model instead.

## References

- [1] R. B. Chandler, J. A. Royle, and D. I. King. Inference about density and temporary emigration in unmarked populations. *Ecology*, 92(7):1429–1435, July 2011.
- [2] Ian Fiske and Richard Chandler. **unmarked**: An **R** package for fitting hierarchical models of wildlife occurrence and abundance. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 43(10):1–23, 2011.
- [3] Darryl I. MacKenzie, James D. Nichols, James E. Hines, Melinda G. Knutson, and Alan B. Franklin. Estimating site occupancy, colonization, and local extinction when a species is detected imperfectly. *Ecology*, 84(8):2200–2207, 2003.
- [4] Darryl I. MacKenzie, James D. Nichols, G. B. Lachman, S. Droege, J. A. Royle, and C. A. Lang-timm. Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one. *Ecology*, 83(8):2248–2255, 2002.
- [5] J. A. Royle. Generalized estimators of avian abundance from count survey data. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation*, 27(1):375–386, 2004.
- [6] J. A Royle. N-mixture models for estimating population size from spatially replicated counts. Biometrics, 60(1):108-115, 2004.
- [7] J. A. Royle, D. K. Dawson, and S. Bates. Modeling abundance effects in distance sampling. *Ecology*, 85(6):1591–1597, 2004.
- [8] J. A. Royle and J. D. Nichols. Estimating abundance from repeated presence-absence data or point counts. *Ecology*, 84(3):777-790, 2003.
- [9] J.A. Royle and R.M. Dorazio. Hierarchical modeling and inference in ecology: the analysis of data from populations, metapopulations and communities. Academic Press, 2008.