

A Lattice and Random Intermediate Point (LARI) Sampling Design for Animal Movement


Elizabeth Eisenhauer & Ephraim Hanks

Penn State University


 eisenhauer@psu.edu
 @LizStats

bit.ly

Hughes lab at Penn State collected **high resolution ant data**, but data collection was **time-consuming** (1000s of student-hours).



The resulting dataset consists of **4 hours** of movement data for **78 ants** at 1 second intervals (14,401 observations per ant).



We were approached by the researchers with the **scenario**:

- Next time, we will collect **lower resolution** data.
- How should we do this to **minimize the loss of information** about movement behavior?


This question is relevant to many researchers collecting animal movement data.

2 sampling designs:

REGULAR



LATTICE AND RANDOM INTERMEDIATE POINT (LARI)



To compare regular and LARI sampling designs,
we look at **4 subsamples** of the ant data.

Full data



Every 3s



Every 5s



Lattice and Random intermediate point (LARI) 10s



Every 5s and LARI 10s
have the same number of
data points

Stochastic differential equation (SDE) model for animal movement

Data: \mathbf{x}_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, 14401$ for each ant

SDE model framework:

$$d\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{v}_t dt$$

$$d\mathbf{v}_t = -\beta (\mathbf{v}_t - \mu(\mathbf{x}_t)) dt + c(\mathbf{x}_t) I d\mathbf{w}_t$$



Utilizing motility and potential surfaces, define:

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}_t) = m(\mathbf{x}_t) [- \nabla p(\mathbf{x}_t)] \quad (\text{mean drift})$$


$$c(\mathbf{x}_t) = \sigma m(\mathbf{x}_t) \quad (\text{magnitude of stochasticity})$$

We describe animal movement using a stochastic differential equation model with 2 parameters:

POTENTIAL SURFACE



MOTILITY SURFACE



Since we don't observe animal movement in continuous time,
we **numerically approximate derivatives**.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}_\tau}{dt} \approx \frac{\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{x}_\tau}{h_\tau}$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}_\tau}{dt} \approx \frac{\mathbf{v}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{v}_\tau}{h_\tau} \approx \frac{\mathbf{x}_{\tau+2} - \mathbf{x}_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau h_{\tau+1}} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} - \mathbf{x}_\tau}{h_\tau^2}$$



Note that this works
for data that is
irregular in time.

where

- \mathbf{x}_τ is the position of ordered observation τ
- \mathbf{v}_τ is the (unobserved) velocity of observation τ
- h_τ is the change in time from observation τ to $\tau + 1$

Resulting in the model equation


$$\mathbf{x}_{\tau+2} = \left(1 + \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau} - \beta h_{\tau+1} \right) \mathbf{x}_{\tau+1} + \left(\beta h_{\tau+1} - \frac{h_{\tau+1}}{h_\tau} \right) \mathbf{x}_\tau + \beta h_\tau h_{\tau+1} \textcolor{brown}{m}(\mathbf{x}_\tau) [- \nabla p(\mathbf{x}_\tau)] + \sigma \textcolor{brown}{m}(\mathbf{x}_\tau) h_{\tau+1} h_\tau^2 N(\mathbf{0}, I)$$

Spline expansion (degree 0, piecewise constant) of the motility and potential surfaces

$$m(\mathbf{x}_t) = \sum_{j=1}^J \textcolor{brown}{m}_j s_j(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}_t) = \sum_{j=1}^J \textcolor{blue}{p}_j s_j(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$$

$$s_j(\mathbf{x}_\tau) \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{x}_\tau \text{ in } j^{\text{th}} \text{ grid cell} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



Estimate motility surface (\mathbf{m}) and potential surface (\mathbf{p})

Penalize the roughness of \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{p}

- Maximize $\{ [\mathbf{x}_\tau | \mathbf{x}_{\tau-1}, \mathbf{x}_\tau] - \lambda_1 \mathbf{m}' Q \mathbf{m} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{p}' Q \mathbf{p} \}$

REML-style approximation

- First **estimate variance terms** to get \mathbf{m}
- Then **estimate mean drift** to get \mathbf{p}


Smoothness parameters are chosen with a holdout set

Computing time ~20 minutes (single core)


- 14,401 x 78 data points

We compare motility and potential surfaces estimated with the 4 subsamples using multiple metrics.

MOTILITY SURFACE




POTENTIAL SURFACE




We fit 50 different LARI subsamples to understand random variation.

(A) Potential Surface MSD




(B) Log Motility Surface MSE



We compared the estimates of motility and potential surfaces using several different metrics.

Result: **LARI sampling was better** than regular sampling overall for understanding movement behavior. A simulation study and additional data example support this conclusion.



Eisenhauer, Elizabeth, and Ephraim Hanks. "A lattice and random intermediate point sampling design for animal movement." *Environmetrics* (2020): e2618.