

Evaluating the potential of underwater television to
contribute to marine litter assessments alongside bottom
trawling

Katja Norén¹, Filip Svensson¹, and Max Lindmark^{1,*}

¹Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Aquatic Resources, Sweden

Corresponding author: max.lindmark@slu.se

Running head: Marine litter estimation from underwater tv

¹ **Abstract**

² Marine litter presents a global threat to marine ecosystems, human health, and safety. Therefore,
³ it is important to increase our knowledge about spatiotemporal trends of litter in the environment.
⁴ Bottom trawl surveys provide a practical method for monitoring seafloor litter on the continental
⁵ shelf, but can have severe negative impacts on the environment. Here we evaluate the potential of
⁶ an underwater television survey (UWTV) to collect litter density data, and develop model-based
⁷ indices of litter densities integrating coastal and offshore trawl survey data using geostatistical
⁸ models. We find that UWTV in its current format may be limited as an alternative to trawling in
⁹ areas with relatively low densities. There are also clear spatial trends in litter, with the highest
¹⁰ densities in near-shores areas currently only included in the national monitoring program. This
¹¹ illustrate the potential of combining data, but also the importance of careful sampling designing
¹² for marine litter monitoring.

¹³ **Keywords:** Geostatistical models, Gaussian Markov random fields, marine litter, trawl survey, sim-
¹⁴ ulation

15 **Introduction**

16 In the Manila declaration from 2012, it was recognized that marine litter poses a worldwide threat
17 not only to marine habitats and species but also to human health and safety ([UNEP/GPA 2012](#)).
18 Marine litter, especially plastic litter, has been documented around the world ([Barnes et al. 2009](#)).
19 In European seas, marine litter has been documented from a variety of physiographic settings, with
20 the highest density recorded in submarine canyons [Pham et al. \(2014\)](#). Throughout the years of
21 marine litter research, several pathways have been suggested through which marine macro litter
22 could affect marine organisms such as ingestion, entanglement, toxicity and entrapment ([Le et al.](#)
23 [2024](#)). Studies demonstrating ingestion of plastic litter by seabirds were already published in the
24 late 1960s ([Ryan 2015](#)), and marine litter has been observed to interact with more than 900 species
25 around the world through ingestion or entanglement ([Kühn and Van Franeker 2020](#)). Hence, there
26 is an urgent need to monitor trends and identifying spatial hotspots of marine litter ([Sandra et al.](#)
27 [2023a](#)).

28 In the Marine Strategic Framework Directive (MSFD), which was established to achieve or
29 maintain Good Environmental Status in EU marine waters, marine litter constitutes number ten
30 out of eleven descriptors and thus mandates that marine litter on sea floor should be monitored
31 ([European Union 2008](#)). The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) coordi-
32 nates several scientific trawl surveys gathering data on commercial fish and invertebrate species.
33 In 2011, it was decided to also record litter on a selection of internationally coordinated scientific
34 trawl surveys. Over time, this procedure has been introduced into several different types of trawl
35 surveys. In Sweden, recording of litter on the sea floor is conducted in two internationally coor-
36 dinated trawl surveys: International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) in Skagerrak and Kattegat and
37 Baltic International Trawl Survey (BITS) in the Baltic Sea. In addition, litter is also registered dur-
38 ing the Swedish national Coastal Trawl Survey (CTS), which is conducted along the Swedish west
39 coast and its fjords.

40 The practice of recording marine litter in trawl surveys has raised concerns due to methodolog-
41 ical limitations. For one, the true catchability of marine litter using different fishing gears is not

known and recorded litter is most probably an underestimation of the true amounts (O'Donoghue and van Hal 2018). Litter amounts may also be underestimated given that 1) these surveys are primarily conducted far from land, 2) are only performed in areas where it is possible to trawl e.g., on soft bottoms, and 3) do not provide sufficient resolution of spatial information to allow mapping of litter (Madricardo *et al.* 2020). To overcome some of these problems, acoustic and electromagnetic methods have been suggested as alternatives, and are beneficial as they are less destructive or non-destructive and may be conducted in non-trawlable areas (Sandra *et al.* 2023b, Galgani *et al.* 2024).

In Skagerrak and Kattegat, Sweden (Fig 1) monitors the density of Nephrops (*Nephrops norvegicus*) burrows in muddy sediment on a yearly basis to provide fisheries independent data for the ICES stock assessment of Nephrops in the area. Burrows are counted by filming using an underwater television survey system (UWTV) mounted on a benthic sledge that is dragged along the sea floor and video analysis is conducted on land (Dobby *et al.* 2021). If the bottom substrate is rugged, i.e., contains large boulders or coral reefs, the sledge may also be used as a drop-camera positioned above the sea floor. An example of a photo using the UWTV is shown in Figure 1. Large parts of the Skagerrak and Kattegat are covered with the UWTV and some areas are partially overlapping with the IBTS and CTS trawl surveys. This overlap enables a direct comparison of the different methods for detecting litter on the sea floor.

The main aim of this study is to evaluate the capacity of the UWTV to detect and quantify litter, as video-based methods are considered more efficient for estimating true litter densities, and have a smaller environmental footprint. The performance of UWTV is assessed through statistical simulation and with data analysis. We also for the first time integrate offshore trawl data with Swedish coastal trawl survey data to acquire model-based indices of relative density, and to quantify spatiotemporal trends in marine litter.

66 **Methods**

67 **Sampling programs**

68 **Underwater Television Survey System (UWTV)**

69 Underwater television Survey System (UWTV) is used to gather data for estimation of the abun-
70 dance of Nephrops (*Nephrops norvegicus*) ([Dobby et al. 2021](#)). The film from these surveys can also
71 be used to register benthic macrofauna on the sea floor ([Sköld 2021](#)). In 2024, during the survey of
72 Nephrops grounds in the Skagerrak and Kattegat, the potential of UWTV to evaluate the presence
73 of litter was tested. In total, 87 UWTV hauls were conducted (Fig 1) during eight days and nights
74 using the Swedish research vessel Svea to evaluate the possibility to register litter in combination
75 with the identification of megafauna. A typical UWTV-haul runs for 10 minutes at 0.8 knots per
76 hour, thus the area covered in one transect is approximately 148 m². During the analysis, each litter
77 object within a known field of view (0.80–0.85 meters, indicated by laser dots) was registered and
78 the amount of litter per filmed transect is transformed to litter per km² (Fig 2). The registration
79 of litter objects follows the manual produced by the ICES working group for marine litter, WGML
80 ([ICES 2022](#)).

81 **International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS)**

82 The International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) has been conducted by Sweden in the Skagerrak
83 and Kattegat in the first quarter since the 1980s, and in quarter three since 1991. These surveys
84 are primarily conducted to estimate the number of 0- and 1-year old fish of different commercial
85 species. Surveys and sampling of catch follows the IBTS manual ([ICES 2020](#)). The fish are caught
86 using a GOV-trawl (Chalut à Grande Ouverture Verticale), which was originally designed to catch
87 herring *Clupea harengus*. The codend of the GOV-trawl features a 20 mm mesh and the width of
88 the trawl (wing spread) varies somewhat with water depth but is generally between 20 and 25 m
89 ([ICES 2020](#)). Each haul is 30 minutes with a speed of 4 knots, and between 40–50 hauls are made
90 each quarter in the Skagerrak, Kattegat and eastern North Sea combined. In addition to measuring
91 and recording different fish and invertebrate species, litter is also recorded since 2012 following

92 the ICES trawling litter manual (ICES 2022). The number of IBTS hauls coinciding with the area
93 covered by UWTV in 2024 varies by year (Fig 1). Only IBTS stations within the area covered by
94 the UWTV in 2024 are included in this analysis. Swedish IBTS data was downloaded from DA-
95 TRAS (<https://www.ices.dk/data/data-portals/Pages/DATRAS.aspx>) (International Coun-
96 cil for the Exploration of the Sea 2024).

97 Coastal Trawl Survey (CTS)

98 The coastal trawl survey (CTS) is performed once a year with the purpose of monitoring species
99 composition and recruitment in the benthic fish community in the fjords and along the Swedish
100 west coast (Svensson *et al.* 2023). Since 2013, the survey is completed in quarter three using a fish-
101 ing trawl called “FiskeTrål Norden” with a 16 mm mesh in the codend and a width of the trawl (wing
102 spread) between 9–14 m depending on depth. Each haul is 30 minutes long and conducted with a
103 speed of 2.5 knots and around 30 hauls are made each year (Fig 1). In addition to measuring and
104 recording different fish and invertebrate species, litter is also recorded since 2015 following IBTS
105 and BITS manuals and more recently the ICES manual from 2022 specifically regarding marine
106 litter (ICES 2015, 2017, 2022).

107 Data analysis

108 Simulation

109 We used simulation testing to evaluate the performance of the UWTV to sample marine litter. The
110 approach consists of the following steps:

- 111 1. Generate a 1000×1000 m spatial grid.
- 112 2. For each litter density scenario, randomly distribute litter objects over the grid to get values
113 for presence or absence of litter for each m². Only one litter object is allowed per m². A
114 hypothetical smaller grid is shown as an example in Fig 3.
- 115 3. For each replicate and litter density scenario, apply a random sample representing the UWTV-
116 method. A single random sample is made up of 148 consecutive cells distributed horizontally

117 or vertically over the grid (start location determined randomly), each cell is 1 m² and this is
118 intended to mimic a UWTV transect which on average is 148 m².

119 4. Repeat step 3 for each sample size scenario (we chose 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000 transects, each
120 with a size of 148m²). These sample size scenarios are intended to both include relevant
121 sample sizes (in this study 87 transects were filmed) and also more unrealistic examples
122 such as 1000 transects. For each litter density and each sample size scenario transects were
123 distributed 1000 times.

124 From the simulation experiment, we calculated: 1) the proportion of replicates (across the 1000
125 replicates) with empty 0 litter recorded during UWTV transects, for each litter density scenario
126 and each sample size, 2) the mean average litter density across replicates, by litter density and
127 sample size. R functions for the simulation experiment were developed partly using the large
128 language model Claude ([Anthropic 2024](#)).

129 Statistical modelling

130 To estimate annual trends in relative litter abundance, we used geostatistical generalized linear
131 mixed models (GLMMs), similar to those used in species distribution modelling. Since litter density
132 data contain zeroes and positive continuous observations, we used a delta (hurdle) model, with a
133 binomial and a Gamma component. This was fit as a so called “Poisson-link” delta model, which
134 has the flexibility of a classic delta model ([Aitchison 1955](#)), but avoids the assumption that the two
135 components are statistically independent ([Thorson 2018](#)). To account for spatial structure in the
136 data, we included spatial random effects in the form of Gaussian Markov random fields (GMRFs)
137 using the SPDE approach ([Lindgren et al. 2011](#)). The full model for a given component can be

138 written as:

$$\mathbb{E}[y_{s,t}] = \mu_{s,t}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_{s,t} = f^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{s,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (2)$$

$$\omega_s \sim \text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_\omega), \quad (3)$$

$$\delta_{t=1} \sim \text{MVNormal}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (4)$$

$$\delta_{t>1} = \rho\delta_{t-1} + \sqrt{1-\rho^2}\epsilon_t, \epsilon_t \sim \text{MVNormal}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (5)$$

139 where $y_{s,t}$ is the response variable (number of litter items per km²) in location s at time t , μ is
140 the mean, f^{-1} is the inverse link function, \mathbf{X} is the design matrix for fixed effects with corre-
141 sponding coefficients β . We included only a categorical effect of survey to account for different
142 catchability of the gear used in the two surveys CTS and IBTS as fixed effects. This because there
143 is a difference in the average densities between the surveys, and we want to test if this is due to
144 gear or sampling area (Fig S3 and S4). We also added independent intercepts for each year, follow-
145 ing common practices in fish stock index standardization ([Thorson 2019](#), [Anderson et al. 2024a](#)).
146 This corresponds to the assumption that marine litter is being replaced and added every year. Our
147 initial aim was to include also the UWTV data in this model, however that was not possible since
148 no litter was detected in 2024 (see section *Results*). Since we do not know which processes and
149 variables give rise to spatial patterns in litter data, we rely on latent variables to model spatial
150 patterns in the data. These are included as spatial and spatiotemporal random effects (ω_s and
151 ϵ_s , respectively), assumed drawn from a Gaussian Markov random field (GMRFs) with covariance
152 matrices Σ_ω and Σ_ϵ constrained by anisotropic Matérn covariances function ([Rue et al. 2009](#)). Spa-
153 tial random effects correspond to spatially structured variables that are constant over time (e.g.,
154 currents, depth, bathymetric slope), and spatiotemporal random effects are allowed to vary each
155 year (e.g., weather). Anisotropy means the spatial correlations can depend on direction, which
156 is fitting in this case since we are modelling coastal data and spatial patterns likely change more
157 going from near shore to offshore than up and down the coast (Fig S1). Initial exploration revealed
158 strong correlation between subsequent spatiotemporal random fields. Hence we opted to model

159 these fields as AR₁ (first-order autoregressive), where ρ is the correlation coefficient between sub-
160 subsequent random fields. This also helps informing predictions in years when samples were scarce
161 in place (e.g., 2012 in Fig 1), compared to if we had modelled them as independent each year. The
162 Stochastic Partial Differential Equation (SPDE) approach ([Lindgren et al. 2011](#)) requires piece-wise
163 linear basis functions defined by a triangulated mesh. We defined this mesh using triangles with a
164 cutoff distance (minimum distance between vertices) of 3 km and kept all other arguments in the
165 R-function `fm_rcdt_2d_inla()` in the package `fmesher` ([Lindgren 2023](#)) at their defaults (Fig S1).

166 Based on exploratory data analysis, we consider three alternative models: 1) only spatial ran-
167 dom effects 2) only spatiotemporal random effects, and 3) spatial random effects for the binomial
168 model and spatiotemporal random effects for the Gamma model. We use marginal AIC to select
169 the more parsimonious model.

170 To evaluate trends in average litter densities, we made conditional predictions for each inde-
171 pendent year. Next, fit a model to the annual estimates, using the inverse of the CV for each year
172 as weights to incorporate the varying uncertainty in the annual estimates.

173 We fit the models using the R (version 4.3.2) ([R Core Team 2024](#)) package `sdmTMB` ([Ander-](#)
174 [son et al. 2024b](#)) (version 0.6.0.9015). The `sdmTMB` package uses automatic differentiation and the
175 Laplace approximation from the R package `TMB` ([Kristensen et al. 2016](#)), along with sparse matrix
176 structures constructed with the SPDE method ([Lindgren et al. 2011](#)) using the R package `fmesher`
177 ([Lindgren 2023](#)). Parameter estimation was performed via maximum marginal likelihood using the
178 `nlinmb` ([R Core Team 2024](#)) non-linear minimizer. We ensured the models converged by verifying
179 that the Hessian matrix was positive definite, that the maximum absolute log-likelihood gradient
180 for the fixed effects was less than 0.001, and that no random field marginal standard deviation
181 was larger than 0.01. To ensure that the model was consistent with the observed data we visually
182 inspected simulated quantile residuals ([Dunn and Smyth 1996](#), [Gelman and Hill 2006](#)), calculated
183 using the R package `DHARMA` ([Hartig 2022](#)) (Fig S2).

184 **Results**

185 In the simulation experiment we find that across 1000 replicates for each combination of litter
186 density (6 levels of known densities, ranging from 10–20000 items per km²) and sample sizes
187 (6 levels of sample sizes where one sample is one transect), it is evident that the UWTV with its
188 current sampling size and area swept is inadequate to sample litter at these *relatively* low densities.
189 For example, when the density is 10 items per km², the percentage of replicates of the experiment
190 where the survey did not catch a single litter item is as high as 91% when the sample size is 50,
191 and 84% when the sample size is 100 (the number of hauls in the 2024 UWTV survey was 87)
192 (Fig 4A). Moreover, while the overall mean across all 1000 replicates was close to the true mean
193 (pink points in Fig 4A), individual replicates either estimate 0 litter density or severely overestimate
194 the true mean by a factor of >10 in some cases. That is because if a litter item is recorded (a 10%
195 probability), the density will be very high given the small area sampled. Similarly, when the true
196 litter density is 50 (Fig 4B) and the sample size is 100, single replicates estimate litter densities
197 range from 0 to ≈250 per km², where the higher value is an overestimation by a factor 5. The
198 simulation experiment shows that with litter densities of 50 (comparable to the trawl surveys), it
199 would require a minimum of 500 hauls to have a 97% probability of observing a minimum of a
200 single litter item across 1000 iterations (Fig 4C). At higher litter densities, the number of hauls
201 needed to have similar values is lower. At litter densities of 1000 per km², all replicates find litter.

202 From the spatiotemporal models fitted to trawl survey data, we find that the marginal AIC
203 supported the model where both components had the same random effect structure (spatiotem-
204 poral random effects for both the binomial and Gamma components), although the model with a
205 spatial random field for the binomial model and a spatiotemporal field for the Gamma model are
206 nearly indistinguishable in terms of marginal AIC (Table S1). This is also evident in that the spa-
207 tiotemporal random fields are more similar from year to year in the binomial model than for the
208 Gamma model (Fig 5). The correlation between consecutive spatiotemporal random fields (ρ) was
209 very high (0.99) in the binomial model, and relatively high in the Gamma model (0.75) (Fig 5). The
210 random effects in addition show a clear directionality in the spatial correlation, meaning the range

where correlation effectively disappears is longer going along the coast (northwest to southeast) than from coastal to offshore (Figs 5 and S1). This distance is larger for the binomial model, further illustrating that the presence of litter largely depends on the distance to the coast. There is no clear statistical difference between the survey intercepts, meaning the differences in mean catch is due to the coastal trawl survey (CTS) sampling in higher density areas (Figs S3 and S4).

The same spatial pattern is also evident in the combined model predictions (Fig 6), and here it is also clear there are some fluctuations over time with the highest densities in the first year of the time series (Fig 7). Predictions from the model shows that average litter densities ranged between 5 [95% CI: 0.86–30.3]–78 [95% CI: 20.4–300] items per km², with a mean of 34 across all years (conditional predictions for year omitting the random effects). The linear effect of year from the weighted regression on annual litter densities is negative (decline in density by -2.09 per year), but the confidence interval of the slope overlaps 0 [95% CI: -4.17–0.0039] (Fig 7).

The UWTV survey did not record a single litter item in the 87 UWTV transects that were made in 2024. While we do not know the true litter density in the area sampled by the UWTV, and that the simulation study is a simplification of reality, the simulation does indicate that under probably densities (approximately 100 items per km²), there is a 22% chance of that no litter are observed in 100 transects (Fig 4C). When no successes (litter presences) are observed in a series of binomial trials, one can estimate the upper confidence interval of probabilities of occurrence using the “rule of three” (Jovanovic and Levy 1997, McCracken and Looney 2017). The rule of three is a simple method for sample sizes larger than 30 that can be used to estimate the upper confidence interval for the probability of presence by $3/n$ (99% confidence interval is given by $4.61/n$) (Jovanovic and Levy 1997), where n is the number of trials (transects in this case). With $n = 87$, we find that the upper 95% confidence interval for probability of presence of litter in a given transect is between 0 and 0.034 (or 0 and 0.053 for the 99% confidence interval) (Fig 8A). Moreover, when a litter object is recorded by the UWTV, the estimated density will be extremely high in that specific transect (as we showed also in the simulation study), because the “swept area” is small. In 87 transects, the expectation for the upper 95% confidence interval for the number of transects with litter is $0.034 \times 87 \approx 3$. The average upper 95% confidence interval of litter density

239 across those 87 transects is 233 items per km² (84 transects recording 0 density and three a density
240 of 6757 items per km² [$1/(6757/1000000)$]) (Fig 8B). However, this is a simplification, because the
241 UWTV could in reality record more than one litter item per transect. To further provide insight
242 into how the confidence interval behaves under different scenarios where few transects contain
243 litter, we calculated confidence intervals for varying number of transects with litter and varying
244 sampling sizes using the Agresti-Coull method (Brown *et al.* 2001), implemented in the R package
245 DescTools ([Signorell 2024](#)) (Fig S5).

246 Discussion

247 In this study, we used data and simulation experiments to determine the ability of Underwater TV
248 (UWTV) to replace the more destructive trawl survey methodology for collecting data. We then
249 applied geostatistical models to the trawl data to determine levels, trends, and spatiotemporal
250 patterns in marine litter. We conclude that the UWTV sampling is not suitable for contributing to
251 monitoring of marine litter in its current form. This is because it did not record any litter, likely
252 due to the UWTV's relatively small "swept area" compared to a trawl, combined with its use in
253 offshore areas where our spatiotemporal models showed lower litter densities compared to coastal
254 regions. While we can still calculate upper confidence intervals for probability of occurrence, we
255 cannot provide any expected values of litter densities, which is the aim of the survey and needed for
256 monitoring trends in estimated litter densities. Current trawl surveys also provide large amounts of
257 data on different categories of litter found on the seafloor. With zero or few findings in the current
258 UWTV setup this information is lost. Important to emphasize is also that the current UWTV setup
259 has a lower geographical coverage of Skagerrak, Kattegat and the North Sea compared to the IBTS
260 trawl survey.

261 For the UWTV monitoring to contribute to estimates of litter densities and potentially replace
262 some or all of the trawling, some modifications to the design could be made. For instance, the
263 transect length could be increased to cover larger areas in a given tow. However, this would also

264 increase costs as more material needs to be processed. Probably the geographical coverage of the
265 UWTV survey would need to be expanded too in order to replace the IBTS data.

266 Our model based on two surveys, showing similar results in the overlapping area, provides
267 strong evidence that litter densities are higher closer to shore. This calls for an expansion of the
268 UWTV survey towards coastal areas if one believes that filming the seafloor is better to get a true
269 estimate of amounts of litter (recall it does not have the same issues with catchability as a trawl
270 haul). Preferably the UWTV should be conducted in regions that have not been previously sampled
271 in the CTS as there is a risk that yearly trawling along the same transects have removed litter. In
272 the future, trends in marine litter may stem from multiple data sources, and in that case a model
273 similar to the one used here could be used to integrate those different datasets and is one of the
274 strengths of model-based trends ([Yalcin et al. 2023](#)). Using multiple data sources that complement
275 each other (e.g., in terms of location of sampling) can increase accuracy and reduce uncertainty in
276 annual indices ([Thompson et al. 2023](#)).

277 The spatiotemporal model used here is largely inspired by species distribution models and
278 models used to create model-based indices of abundance in fisheries science ([Thorson et al. 2015](#)).
279 However, there are some interesting differences. The spatial distribution of species results from
280 the interplay between environmental and ecological processes (competition, predation) ([Elith and](#)
281 [Leathwick 2009](#), [Ward et al. 2024](#)). For instance, the strong association species may have to certain
282 environmental variables (e.g., depth or temperatures) can be used to improve the underlying spa-
283 tiotemporal model and thereby indices ([Thorson et al. 2015](#), [Yalcin et al. 2023](#)). In contrast, unlike
284 biological organisms, the distribution of litter is likely more stochastic. The processes determining
285 the dynamics of litter movements are many and which are most influential are largely unknown
286 and likely depend on the material of the litter, where plastics may be more easily transported
287 with currents while more dense litter or larger object are not removed easily ([Van Sebille et al.](#)
288 [2020](#), [Canals et al. 2021](#)). There could also be areas acting as sinks, e.g., shelves and deep sea areas
289 ([Harris et al. 2021](#)). Hence, it is difficult to *a priori* know which covariates to include in a model,
290 and more research on this is needed to improve models. In this study, we instead of covariates
291 used an approach based on Gaussian Markow random fields. In similar applications ([Barry et al.](#)

292 2022, HELCOM 2023), researchers have used similar models with smoothers of latitude and longi-
293 tude, and different options for modelling the temporal trends (linear, smooth, independent means).
294 Overall these are similar models, but a benefit of using our approach is that it can determine the
295 range at which spatial correlation disappears (and the directionality of it). While we have only
296 applied this to a case study on the Swedish west coast, we believe it could be applied in general
297 for estimating marine litter levels.

298 The clear spatial trends in marine litter highlight the important question for managers about
299 which areas to consider for monitoring and which litter density thresholds to use for status classifi-
300 cation. For instance, currently the offshore (IBTS) survey is used for status determination and with
301 that relatively low densities are measured. However, as we show, the densities are much higher
302 near shore, and near shore areas may be more sensitive to litter than offshore habitats. The results
303 in this study indicate that near shore monitoring should be included in the status classification
304 and also that near shore monitoring data might benefit from the addition of UWTV stations.

305 Acknowledgements:

306 We would like to extend thanks to the crew of RV Svea, Anders Wernbo, Emmelie Hammenstig-
307 Åström, and Erika Norlinder for their direct work in analyzing video footage from the UWTV-
308 survey, developing the registration of marine litter, their valuable input regarding various issues
309 related to litter on the seabed, including the challenges of categorizing marine litter. We also thank
310 Patrik Jonsson for providing data and information on UWTV sampling. Additionally, a big thank
311 to all the staff who diligently register marine litter from our various trawl sampling surveys. We
312 would also like to thank the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (HaV) and the
313 European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund for their roles in funding the UWTV-survey,
314 IBTS as well as for their support of the megafauna inventory. In addition, we appreciate HaV for
315 funding the coastal trawl survey and litter registration. We are also grateful for valuable input on
316 earlier versions of this manuscript from Christopher C. Griffiths and Massimiliano Cardinale at
317 SLU.

318 **Funding**

319 This work was funded by the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (contract no
320 2024-0000962).

321 **Author contributions:**

322 Katja Norén: Conceptualization-Equal, Data curation-Lead, Formal analysis-Equal, Investigation-
323 Equal, Methodology-Equal, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Lead, Writing – review &
324 editing-Supporting; Filip Svensson: Formal analysis-Supporting, Investigation-Supporting, Methodology-
325 Supporting, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting; Max
326 Lindmark: Conceptualization-Equal, Formal analysis-Equal, Investigation-Equal, Methodology-
327 Lead, Visualization-Equal, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Lead;

328 **Data Availability Statement:**

329 Code and data to reproduce the results are available on GitHub (<https://github.com/maxlindmark/uwtw>) and will be deposited on Zenodo upon publication.

331 **References**

332 Aitchison, J. (1955) On the distribution of a positive random variable having a discrete probability
333 mass at the origin. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **50**, 901.

334 Anderson, S.C., English, P.A., Gale, K.S.P., Haggarty, D.R., Robb, C.K., Rubidge, E.M. and Thomp-
335 son, P.L. (2024a) Impacts on population indices if scientific surveys are excluded from marine
336 protected areas. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* , fsae009URL <https://academic.oup.com/icesjms/advance-article/doi/10.1093/icesjms/fsae009/7609168>.

338 Anderson, S.C., Ward, E.J., English, P.A., Barnett, L.A.K. and Thorson, J.T. (2024b) sdmTMB: An
339 R package for fast, flexible, and user-friendly generalized linear mixed effects models with spa-

- 340 tial and spatiotemporal random fields. *bioRxiv* **2022.03.24.485545**. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.24.485545>.
- 341
- 342 Anthropic (2024) Claude 3.5 sonnet. Large language model version 20241022.
- 343 Barnes, D.K., Galgani, F., Thompson, R.C. and Barlaz, M. (2009) Accumulation and fragmentation of
344 plastic debris in global environments. *Philosophical transactions of the royal society B: biological
345 sciences* **364**, 1985–1998. Number: 1526.
- 346 Barry, J., Rusell, J., van Hal, R., van Loon, W. *et al.* (2022) Composition and Spatial
347 Distribution of Litter on the Seafloor. Technical report, OSPAR Commission, Lon-
348 don. URL <https://oap.ospar.org/en/ospar-assessments/quality-status-reports/qsr-2023/indicator-assessments/seafloor-litter/>.
- 349
- 350 Brown, L.D., Cai, T.T. and DasGupta, A. (2001) Interval estimation for a binomial proportion. *Sta-*
351 *tistical science* **16**, 101–133. Number: 2.
- 352 Canals, M., Pham, C.K., Bergmann, M., Gutow, L. *et al.* (2021) The quest for seafloor macrolitter: a
353 critical review of background knowledge, current methods and future prospects. *Environmental
354 Research Letters* **16**, 023001. Number: 2.
- 355 Dobby, H., Doyle, J., Jonasson, J., Jonsson, P. *et al.* (2021) ICES Survey Protocols – Man-
356 ual for Nephrops Underwater TV Surveys, coordinated under ICES Working Group
357 on Nephrops Surveys (WGNEPS). report, ICES Techniques in Marine Environmen-
358 tal Science (TIMES). URL https://ices-library.figshare.com/articles/report/ICES_Survey_Protocols_Manual_for_Nephrops_Underwater_TV_Surveys_coordinated_under_ICES_Working_Group_on_Nephrops_Surveys_WGNEPS_18627137/1.
- 359
- 360
- 361 Dunn, P.K. and Smyth, G.K. (1996) Randomized Quantile Residuals. *Journal of Computational and
362 Graphical Statistics* **5**, 236–244. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1390802>. Publisher:
363 [American Statistical Association, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., Institute of Mathematical Statistics,
364 Interface Foundation of America].

- 365 Elith, J. and Leathwick, J.R. (2009) Species Distribution Models: Ecological Explanation and
366 Prediction Across Space and Time. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*
367 40, 677–697. URL <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.110308.120159>. Publisher: Annual Reviews.
- 368
- 369 European Union (2008) Council directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Coun-
370 cil of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine envi-
371 ronmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive) L164, 19–40.
- 372 Galgani, F., Lusher, A.L., Strand, J., Haarr, M.L. *et al.* (2024) Revisiting the strategy for marine litter
373 monitoring within the european marine strategy framework directive (MSFD). *Ocean & Coastal
374 Management* 255, 107254.
- 375 Gelman, A. and Hill, J. (2006) Data Analysis Using Regression and Multi-
376 level/Hierarchical Models. URL <https://www.cambridge.org/highereducation/books/data-analysis-using-regression-and-multilevel-hierarchical-models/>
377 32A29531C7FD730C3A68951A17C9D983. ISBN: 9780511790942 Publisher: Cambridge University
378 Press.
379
- 380 Harris, P.T., Tamelander, J., Lyons, Y., Neo, M.L. and Maes, T. (2021) Taking a mass-balance ap-
381 proach to assess marine plastics in the South China Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 171, 112708.
382 URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X21007426>.
- 383 Hartig, F. (2022) DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression
384 Models. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA>. R package version 0.4.6.
- 385 HELCOM (2023) Amount and composition of macrolitter on the seafloor. HELCOM
386 pre-core indicator report. Technical report. URL https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://indicators.helcom.fi/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Seafloor-litter_Final_April-2023.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjlpuysImLAXVuJRAIHUP8F8oQFnoECBYQAQ&usg=A0vVaw1-JyKyUUhzICsUq0Z1ajWo.
- 387
- 388
- 389

- 390 ICES (2015) Manual for the International Bottom Trawl Surveys. *Series of ICES Survey Protocols*
391 *SISP 10 - IBTS IX* .
- 392 ICES (2017) Manual for the Baltic International Trawl Surveys (BITS). *Series of ICES Survey Protocols*
393 *SISP 7 - BITS version 2.0* .
- 394 ICES (2020) SISP 10-Manual for the International Bottom Trawl Surveys. Revision 11 .
- 395 ICES (2022) ICES manual for seafloor litter data collection and reporting from demersal trawl
396 samples. *ICES Techniques in Marine Environmental Sciences* 67, 16.
- 397 International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (2024) Ices database on trawl surveys (datras).
398 ICES, Copenhagen, Denmark. URL <https://datras.ices.dk>. Accessed: 2024-11-22.
- 399 Jovanovic, B.D. and Levy, P.S. (1997) A look at the rule of three. *The American Statistician* 51,
400 137–139. Number: 2.
- 401 Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C.W., Skaug, H. and Bell, B.M. (2016) TMB: Automatic Differ-
402 entiation and Laplace Approximation. *Journal of Statistical Software* 70, 1–21. URL <https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v070i05>. Number: 1.
- 404 Kühn, S. and Van Franeker, J.A. (2020) Quantitative overview of marine debris ingested by marine
405 megafauna. *Marine pollution bulletin* 151, 110858.
- 406 Le, V.G., Nguyen, H.L., Nguyen, M.K., Lin, C. et al. (2024) Marine macro-litter sources and ecolog-
407 ical impact: a review. *Environmental Chemistry Letters* 22, 1257–1273. Number: 3.
- 408 Lindgren, F. (2023) *fmesher: Triangle Meshes and Related Geometry Tools*. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fmesher>. R package version 0.1.5.
- 410 Lindgren, F., Rue, H. and Lindström, J. (2011) An explicit link between Gaussian fields and Gaussian
411 Markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach. *Journal of the Royal
412 Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 73, 423–498. URL <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.00777.x/abstract>.

- 414 Madricardo, F., Ghezzo, M., Nesto, N., Mc Kiver, W.J. *et al.* (2020) How to Deal With Seafloor
415 Marine Litter: An Overview of the State-of-the-Art and Future Perspectives. *Frontiers in Marine*
416 *Science* 7. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/marine-science/articles/10.3389/fmars.2020.505134/full>. Publisher: Frontiers.
- 417
- 418 McCracken, C.E. and Looney, S.W. (2017) On finding the upper confidence limit for a binomial
419 proportion when zero successes are observed. *J Biom Biostat* 8, 338. Number: 2.
- 420 O'Donoghue, A.M. and van Hal, R. (2018) Seafloor litter monitoring: International Bottom Trawl
421 Survey 2018. Technical report, Wageningen Marine Research.
- 422 Pham, C.K., Ramirez-Llodra, E., Alt, C.H., Amaro, T. *et al.* (2014) Marine litter distribution and
423 density in European seas, from the shelves to deep basins. *PLoS one* 9, e95839. Number: 4.
- 424 R Core Team (2024) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for
425 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 426 Rue, H., Martino, S. and Chopin, N. (2009) Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian
427 models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Soci-
428 ety: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 71, 319–392. URL <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x>.
- 429
- 430 Ryan, P.G. (2015) A brief history of marine litter research. *Marine anthropogenic litter* , 1–25.
- 431 Sandra, M., Devriese, L.I., Booth, A.M., De Witte, B. *et al.* (2023a) A systematic review of state-of-
432 the-art technologies for monitoring plastic seafloor litter. *Journal of Ocean Engineering and Sci-
433 ence* URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468013323000372>.
- 434 Sandra, M., Devriese, L.I., Booth, A.M., De Witte, B. *et al.* (2023b) A systematic review of state-
435 of-the-art technologies for monitoring plastic seafloor litter. *Journal of Ocean Engineering and
436 Science* .
- 437 Signorell, A. (2024) *DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics*. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DescTools>. R package version 0.99.58.
- 438

- 439 Sköld, M. (2021) Täthet av sjöpennor i skyddade bottentrålade områden i Skagerrak och Kattegatt
440 – Förslag till övervakningsprogram för epifaunans status. *Aqua reports* **14**.
- 441 Svensson, F., Andersson, L. and Holmes, A. (2023) Kusttrålundersökning 2022 – Övervakning av
442 bottenlevande fisk längs svenska västkusten. *Aqua notes* URL <https://res.slu.se/id/publ/121673>.
- 443 Thompson, P.L., Anderson, S.C., Nephin, J., Robb, C.K. *et al.* (2023) Integrating trawl and longline
444 surveys across British Columbia improves groundfish distribution predictions. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **80**, 195–210. URL <https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/10.1139/cjfas-2022-0108>. Publisher: NRC Research Press.
- 445 Thorson, J.T. (2018) Three problems with the conventional delta-model for biomass sampling data,
446 and a computationally efficient alternative. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **75**,
447 1369–1382. URL <https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/10.1139/cjfas-2017-0266>. Publisher:
448 NRC Research Press.
- 450 Thorson, J.T. (2019) Guidance for decisions using the Vector Autoregressive Spatio-Temporal
451 (VAST) package in stock, ecosystem, habitat and climate assessments. *Fisheries Research* **210**,
452 143–161. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0165783618302820>.
- 454 Thorson, J.T., Shelton, A.O., Ward, E.J. and Skaug, H.J. (2015) Geostatistical delta-generalized linear
455 mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices for West Coast groundfishes.
456 *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **72**, 1297–1310. URL <https://academic.oup.com/icesjms/article/72/5/1297/767661>. Publisher: Oxford Academic.
- 458 UNEP/GPA (2012) Manila declaration on furthering the implementation of the global programme
459 of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities.
- 460 Van Sebille, E. *et al.* (2020) The physical oceanography of the transport of floating marine debris.
461 *Environmental Research Letters* **15**, 023003.

- 463 Ward, E.J., Anderson, S.C., Barnett, L.A.K., English, P.A. *et al.* (2024) Win, lose, or draw: Evaluating
464 dynamic thermal niches of northeast Pacific groundfish. *PLOS Climate* 3, e0000454. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000454>. Publisher:
465 Public Library of Science.
- 466
- 467 Yalcin, S., Anderson, S.C., Regular, P.M. and English, P.A. (2023) Exploring the limits of spatiotem-
468 poral and design-based index standardization under reduced survey coverage. *ICES Journal of*
469 *Marine Science*, fsad155URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsad155>.

470 **Figures**




Figure 1: Sampling locations over time. The Coastal Trawl Survey (CTS) is depicted in green, the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) in orange, and the Underwater TV survey (UWTV) in purple. The IBTS is conducted in Kattegat, Skagerrak and parts of the North Sea but in this study only stations within the area covered by the UWTV survey in 2024 are included (see Fig S3). The dotted line in the topleft panel depicts the Skagerrak/Kattegat border.



Figure 2: Image of the sea floor with a litter object taken from a transect filmed with an UWTV in 2023 in ICES subarea 4 (Kattegat). The distance between red laser dots is approximately 80 cm. Due to turbidity, it is difficult to say if the object is A2=plastic sheet or A3=plastic bag according to the Ices manual ([ICES 2022](#)). Foto SLU-Aqua, P. Jonsson.




Figure 3: Example of a single replicate of a randomly filled spatial grid with known litter densities (100, 500, 1000, 5000 items per km^2 in this case). Black grid cells indicate presence of litter. The pink line corresponds to a randomly placed straight UWTV transect. For visualization purposes, we have used relatively high litter densities, zoomed in on a 50×50 m portion of the full grid, and divided the transect by 4 (hence, in the simulation experiment, the UWTV transect would be 4 times as long).




Figure 4: Results from the simulation experiment. Each panel (A–F) corresponds to a litter density scenario, and each blue point represents the estimated mean density for that sample size (number of hauls) (x-axis) and iteration. To avoid overplotting, we randomly sample 30 of the 1000 blue points and a small jitter has been added horizontally and vertically. The pink circles correspond to the mean litter density across all 1000 replicates. The horizontal pink line depicts the true litter density in the simulation (also indicated in the panel title). The number on the top corresponds to the proportion of the 1000 simulations that did not catch a single litter item in that sample size scenario.




Figure 5: Spatiotemporal random effects for the binomial model (top row) and the Gamma model (bottom row) for selected years (2012, 2016, 2020, 2024).




Figure 6: Predicted litter densities from the spatiotemporal model for the years 2012–2024. To better visualize the spatial patterns, values greater than the 99% quantile (479 items per km^2) are set to the highest color.




Figure 7: Conditional predictions of litter density for the IBTS level (points) and 95% confidence interval (vertical lines) without random effects. The purple line illustrates trends in annual estimates of mean litter densities and is the prediction from a GAM year modelled as a penalized spline and the inverse of the CV for annual predictions as weights.




Figure 8: Illustration of how the upper confidence interval (95% in green and 99% in orange) for the probability of litter being present in a given haul (A) and the estimated density that corresponds to (B) change as a function of sample size if no hauls record any litter, using the “rule of three” and a sampled area of 148 m². The lower confidence interval is always zero.

Supporting Information S1




Figure S1: Panel A depicts the SPDE mesh for the litter model, and in panel B, the ellipses depict the spatiotemporal range (the distance at which correlation is effectively independent) for the two model components (green = binomial, orange = Gamma).

Table S1: AIC and Δ AIC (AIC for the model relative to the model with the lowest AIC) for all spatial and spatiotemporal GLLMs fitted to litter density data. In model 1, we use a spatial random field for the binomial and Gamma components of the delta-model, in model 2, we replace the spatial random field with a spatiotemporal AR1 random field, and in model 3 we use a spatial random field for the binomial model and a spatiotemporal AR1 random field for the Gamma model.

Model	binomial	Gamma	AIC	ΔAIC
1	Spatial	Spatial	4287	8
2	Spatiotemporal	Spatiotemporal	4279	0
3	Spatial	Spatiotemporal	4281	2




Figure S2: QQ-plots based on simulated quantile residuals for the combined predictions of the litter density models where fixed effects are held at their maximum likelihood estimate and random effects taken from a single approximate posterior sample.




Figure S3: Mean litter densities (A) by survey (green = CTS, orange = IBTS), over time, and location of samples (B) with polygons depicting concave hulls of the survey extent. Note the CTS is split in two, where CTS in the UW/IBTS polygon is denoted CTS offshore (triangles) and coastal data are denoted CTS coastal (points), to illustrate that the differences in mean litter between CTS and IBTS is due to spatial differences in litter density and sampling area (see also Fig S4 and Fig 5).




Figure S4: Effect of survey on litter density from the spatiotemporal model.




Figure S5: Litter density estimates and 95% CI for varying sample sizes (number of hauls) and number of hauls with litter per sample size using the Agresti-Coull method (note a haul with litter can only contain one litter object in this hypothetical example). Haul area: 0.000148 km². The solid line depicts the mean and the ribbon covers the 95% confidence interval.