

Geographical Data and Computational Tools for Determining Restoration Priorities in Mangrove Ecosystems: A Scoping Review

Yan-Yu Lin, Pablo Ramos-Henao, Saif Ur Rehman
Laura Valentina Sierra, Ainur Smailova

* Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool

Abstract

Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.

Introduction

Mangrove forests are among the most productive and valuable coastal ecosystems, performing ecological functions such as shoreline stabilisation, storm surge attenuation, carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling, and biodiversity support [1].

Also, mangroves serve as natural coastal defence barriers, providing protection against tidal erosion and storm surges, while functioning as habitats for numerous species of fish and birds; thus supporting coastal communities worldwide and fishing enterprise globally [1].

Despite the former, as shown in the The State of the World's Mangroves 2024, these ecosystems continue to experience widespread degradation driven by aquaculture expansion, coastal development, altered hydrological regimes, pollution, and climate induced stressors including sea level rise and increasing temperature extremes [1].

Over the past two decades, substantial progress has been made in monitoring mangrove ecosystems through advances in Earth observation technologies and computational analysis [2]. Global and regional datasets derived from optical satellite imagery, synthetic aperture radar (SAR), LiDAR, hyperspectral sensors, and unmanned aerial vehicles have enabled increasingly detailed assessments of mangrove extent, structure, and temporal dynamics.

In parallel, machine learning and deep learning methods have been widely adopted to improve classification accuracy, detect change, and estimate biophysical properties such as canopy height and biomass [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [2], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16] [17], [18], [19].

Collectively, this body of work has significantly advanced the ability to observe mangrove forests at multiple spatial and temporal scales.

However, these advances have largely evolved in isolation. Existing studies typically focus on specific sensing modalities, geographic regions, or analytical tasks, with limited integration across data sources or modelling approaches. As a result, much of the literature remains oriented toward mapping and monitoring, rather than toward decision relevant assessment of restoration needs. In particular, the growing diversity of datasets and computational tools has not been systematically synthesised to evaluate how effectively current approaches support restoration prioritisation.

To address these challenges, this scoping review systematically synthesises existing research on mangrove ecosystem monitoring and the computational analysis of the resulting data. Specifically, the objectives of this review are to:

- Examine the completeness and robustness of existing geospatial datasets used for mangrove analysis.
- Identify the sensing technologies employed to acquire mangrove data, including optical, SAR, LiDAR, hyperspectral, and thermal modalities.
- Review the computational and machine learning techniques applied to these datasets, along with their reported performance metrics.
- Outline current limitations associated with data acquisition and computational analysis approaches.
- Identify key research gaps related to regional bias, data availability, and methodological limitations in current mangrove research.

A scoping review approach is appropriate for this study because the literature on mangrove restoration spans diverse datasets, sensing technologies, and

computational methods, with heterogeneous objectives, study designs, and evaluation metrics that preclude narrow systematic synthesis. Thus, this paper aims identify methodological trends and detect research gaps in the current ecological framework used in mangrove ecosystems.

This review does not propose or evaluate a specific computational model: it synthesises existing evidence to identify limitations in current practice and to outline future research directions for mangrove ecosystem analysis.

As will become evident later, strong regional bias limits model generalisation across diverse ecological contexts, and the absence of unified multimodal forest frameworks capable of integrating complementary geospatial data into holistic and decision relevant representations are the main hindrances to streamlining the process. This leads to many events such as floods, fires, and human intervention not being addressed in time by local NGOs or local authorities. It also make the implementation of this techniques in new enviroments costly in time and resources.

Methodology

This study adopts a scoping review methodology following the PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses - Scoping Reviews) guidelines [20]. A scoping review approach was selected due to the interdisciplinary nature of the research topic, which spans geospatial data acquisition, remote sensing technologies, and computational analysis techniques applied to mangrove ecosystems. This approach enables comprehensive mapping of existing research, identification of methodological trends, and systematic detection of research gaps without restricting inclusion to narrowly defined outcome measures.

Literature Search Strategy

A structured literature search was conducted across five academic databases: *SpringerLink*, *IEEE Xplore*, *EBSCO*, *Scopus*, and *Nature*. These databases were selected to ensure broad coverage of environmental science, Earth observation, and machine learning literature.

Search queries were designed to capture studies related to mangrove ecosystems, geospatial data acquisition, and computational modelling. Keywords included combinations of terms such as *mangrove*, *remote sensing*, *satellite*, *SAR*, *LiDAR*, *hyperspectral*, *thermal*, *machine learning*, *deep learning*, and *convolutional neural networks*. The search strategy was intentionally

broad to maximise recall, consistent with scoping review best practices.

Study Selection and Screening

All records retrieved from the database searches were aggregated and screened in multiple stages. Duplicate records were removed prior to screening. Non-English publications were excluded at this stage to ensure consistency in analysis.

The remaining records underwent title and abstract screening. Because the authors's institution provides full-text access to all searched databases, no studies were excluded due to retrieval limitations. The screened studies were then divided among members of the research team, and each reviewer independently assessed titles and abstracts for relevance to the research objectives.

Studies were excluded during screening if they:

- Did not involve geospatial or remotely sensed data.
- Relied solely on descriptive or basic statistical analyses without computational modelling.
- Did not employ modelling approaches central to this review, such as machine learning or deep learning methods (E.G., Random Forest, convolutional neural networks).

Disagreements between reviewers were resolved through discussion to ensure consistency in study selection.

Eligibility Assessment and Inclusion

Following the screening stage, the remaining studies were assessed at the full-text level for eligibility. Studies were excluded if they lacked a clear spatial component, did not contribute substantively to understanding mangrove ecosystem monitoring or restoration, or fell outside the scope of computational and geospatial analysis considered in this review.

After applying the eligibility criteria, a final set of studies was retained for inclusion in the scoping review. These studies form the basis for the qualitative synthesis and quantitative analysis presented in subsequent sections.

Article Selection Process

The overall study selection process is summarised in the PRISMA flow diagram shown in Figure 1. The diagram illustrates the identification of records across databases, removal of duplicates, screening of titles and abstracts, assessment of full-text eligibility, and final inclusion of studies in the review.




Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram illustrating the identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion of studies in this scoping review.

Current Data Availability and Dataset Robustness

Evolution of Global Mangrove Datasets

Global mangrove datasets underpin large scale conservation assessments and policy initiatives. Early global products, such as the World Mangrove Atlas and the Landsat-based map [21], provided the first consistent estimates of global mangrove extent. While these datasets established critical baselines, they were static snapshots and did not capture temporal dynamics.

The introduction of time-series datasets marked a significant methodological shift. The Continuous Global Mangrove Forest Cover for the 21st Century (CGMFC-21) provided annual mangrove extent maps from 2000 to 2014 at 30 m resolution, enabling year-by-year analysis of loss and gain [8]. However, CGMFC-21 employed conservative mangrove definitions, resulting in substantially lower area estimates than other products and potentially under-representing sparse or degraded stands.

The Global Mangrove Watch (GMW) initiative represents the most comprehensive effort at the present time. It integrates optical and SAR data to produce multi-epoch and near-global time-series products. The latest release, GMW v4.0, established a 10 m resolution global baseline for 2020 with reported overall accuracy exceeding 95% [22]. This improvement significantly enhances the detection of narrow, fragmented, and small mangrove patches. Table 1 provides a comparative overview of major global

mangrove datasets, summarising their release timelines, spatial resolution, temporal coverage, primary data sources, and the ecosystem attributes they capture. As per the latest report issued by the Global Mangrove Watch, this dataset retains its standing among the conservation community [1].

Dataset Robustness and Uncertainty

Despite methodological advances, global mangrove datasets remain subject to several limitations. Differences in sensor selection, classification algorithms, training data, and mangrove definitions lead to discrepancies in mapped extent. This is seen particularly near latitudinal range limits and in transitional ecosystems [1]. Temporal gaps between dataset updates may obscure short-term disturbances or rapid regeneration events, while most global products prioritise extent over structural or functional attributes. This last point is an important observation, as it is often times that functional attributes that translate into ecological services (fishing grounds, water filtration, resources, etc.) are what truly moves communities and authorities to act pro or against conservation efforts. Assessing these attributes is thus of great relevance.

Lastly, validation data is unevenly distributed geographically. Regions with limited field data often exhibit higher uncertainty, which can propagate into downstream analyses. This can only be addressed with field work and completion of datasets. As stated by the Mangrove Global Watch, in locations where data fails, it is crucial to rely on local communities and traditional knowledge [1]. This provides validation (or points out inaccuracies in the models), and makes the scientific efforts tangible to society.

Geological Survey Tools and Data Acquisition Technologies

Mangrove ecosystems are monitored using a diverse suite of geospatial sensing technologies, each capturing distinct and complementary attributes of forest condition (physiological stress, drought, etc.) or structure (plant height and density, topological features, etc.) [3], [1]. No single sensing modality among the retrieved papers provides a complete description of mangrove ecosystems, making multimodal integration a notable hole in the field, and a milestone for conservation science.

Thus, a holistic representation would refer to a joint latent encoding that simultaneously captures forest extent, vertical structure, physiological condition, hydrological dynamics, and temporal change,

Table 1: Major global mangrove datasets and their key characteristics

Dataset	First Re-lease	Spatial Res-olution	Temporal Cover-age	Primary Sources	Data	Mangrove Attributes Captured
Global Mangrove Forests Distribution CGMFC-21 [8]	2000 2014	~30 m ~30 m	Circa 2000 2000–2012	Landsat Landsat-derived products		Extent Annual extent and change
Global Mangrove Watch v2.0 [23]	2019	20–25 m	1996–2016	ALOS PALSAR, Landsat		Extent and loss
Global Mangrove Watch v3.0 [22]	2022	~25 m	1996–2020	Multi-mission SAR and optical		Extent and temporal dynamics
Global Mangrove Canopy Height Maps [24]	2020+	~30 m	Multi-year	DEM and optical in-tegration		Canopy height and structure
Global Mangrove Soil Carbon Stocks [25]	2023	~30 m	2020	Remote sensing and modelling		Soil organic carbon

enabling restoration prioritisation based on both current state and predicted developments.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the major sensing modalities used in mangrove studies and the ecological attributes they capture. The matrix highlights that individual sensing modalities provide partial and complementary views of mangroves.

Sensing modalities	Ecological attributes						
	Areal extent and spatial distribution	Canopy structure and height	Biomass and carbon stocks	Species composition and biochemical traits	Hydrology and inundation dynamics	Physiological stress and temperature anomalies	Temporal change and disturbance recovery
Optical multispectral imagery	●●	●	●	●	○	○	●●
Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR)	●	●●	●	○	●●	○	●●
LiDAR	●	●●●	●●	○	○	○	●
Hyperspectral imagery	●	●	●	●●●	○	●	●
Thermal infrared	○	○	○	○	●	●●●	●
UAV-based sensing	●●	●●	●●	●	●	●	●●

Legend: ●●● = strong information ●● = moderate information ● = limited information ○ = minimal or indirect information

Figure 2: Conceptual modality attribute matrix illustrating the relative strength of ecological information captured by different sensing modalities in mangrove ecosystem studies[21][26][27].[28][29][30]

Geospatial and Remote Sensing Tools Used in Mangrove Research

Table 2 summarises the aggregated frequency of major geospatial and sensing tools used in mangrove studies across the surveyed databases.

Several clear trends emerge from Table 2. First, satellite-based and airborne optical and radar systems dominate mangrove research. High-resolution aerial imagery and SAR-based platforms (particularly ALOS-PALSAR) appear most frequently. This is likely due to the need to assess large geographical spaces and relying on inundation dynamics to classify mangrove ecosystems.

Tool / Data Source	Number of Studies
High-Resolution Aerial Imagery	2431
ALOS-PALSAR (SAR)	2205
Thermal SAR (T-SAR)	1799
Thermal Infrared Sensors (TIRS)	1120
Hyperspectral Imaging (HSI)	812
SAR (general)	449
Satellite Platforms (general)	266
CubeSats	174
LiDAR	123
Landsat	28

Table 2: Summary of tools and data sources used in mangrove studies

Noticeably, advanced sensing modalities such as LiDAR and hyperspectral imaging remain comparatively underrepresented, despite their demonstrated ability to capture three-dimensional structure, species composition, and biochemical traits [11], [31]. This suggests that while high-fidelity structural and functional data are recognised as valuable, their integration into mainstream mangrove monitoring workflows remains limited, likely due to cost, availability, and analytical complexity.

Third, the relatively low representation of Landsat compared to SAR-based and aerial platforms reflects a gradual shift away from coarse optical imagery toward sensors better suited to cloud-prone, hydrologically dynamic coastal environments. Overall, these patterns indicate a strong dependence on a narrow subset of sensing technologies, reinforcing the need for multimodal integration to capture the full complexity of mangrove ecosystems.

Optical Multispectral Remote Sensing

Optical multispectral imagery from platforms such as Landsat and Sentinel-2 remains the most widely used data source for mangrove monitoring. These sensors support vegetation indices, phenological analysis, and land-cover classification (Bunting et al., 2022). Sentinel-2's red-edge bands enhance discrimination between mangrove vegetation and adjacent land covers but remain susceptible to cloud cover and atmospheric interference (Zhang et al., 2025).

Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR)

Satellite Aperture Radar (SAR) consists of satellite imagery obtained by using sensors capable of utilising other bands of the electromagnetic spectrum. Depending on the bandwidths used by said sensors the images may be classified as multispectral (about 3 to 10 wide bands within the range of 0.43 μm to 12.51 μm) or hyperspectral (a couple hundred narrow bands in the range of 0.4 to 2.5 μm) [8]. The usage of these tools was evaluated by Kwon and collaborators, and yielded promising results. SAR sensors provide cloud-independent observations and sensitivity to vegetation structure, moisture, and inundation dynamics. Sentinel-1 and ALOS PALSAR have proven effective for mangrove delineation in persistently cloudy regions and for detecting fragmented or narrow forest stands (Ghorbanian et al., 2025). SAR's ability to capture tidal and hydrological dynamics makes it particularly valuable for restoration suitability assessments.

LiDAR

LiDAR remote sensing is performed by low altitude aircraft equipped with light lasers; as the aircraft flies at constant speed, the sensor emits light and measures the time it takes to rebound, creating a 3D model of the scanned surface. It may struggle to get accurate plant resolution with multilayered, dense, tall forests.

Hyperspectral and Thermal Infrared Sensors

Hyperspectral data support species-level discrimination and biochemical trait estimation, while thermal infrared data reveal physiological stress and hydrological anomalies (Farella et al., 2022; Fu et al., 2025). These modalities are underutilised in large-scale mangrove studies but offer significant potential for early stress detection and restoration monitoring.

UAV-Based Observations

UAV platforms provide ultra-high spatial resolution imagery for local-scale assessment and validation. While invaluable for monitoring restoration sites, UAV data lack scalability and require integration with satellite-based observations.

Computational Analysis Techniques

Machine learning and deep learning methods are increasingly used to analyse mangrove-related geospatial datasets for both regression and classification tasks, driven by the growing availability of multi-source remote sensing data and the need to infer biophysical properties at scale (Adam et al., 2010; Giri et al., 2011; Hamilton & Casey, 2016). Regression tasks typically aim to estimate continuous variables such as above-ground biomass, carbon stocks, or canopy height, whereas classification tasks focus on mangrove extent delineation, species discrimination, and change detection (Lucas et al., 2007; Bunting et al., 2018). Across these applications, ensemble-based methods, kernel-based learners, and deep neural networks have emerged as dominant computational approaches.

Regression-based modelling

Regression-based machine learning models are widely applied to estimate mangrove biomass and structural attributes from remotely sensed inputs. Commonly used algorithms include Random Forest (RF), Support Vector Machine (SVM), and gradient boosting methods such as Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost), owing to their ability to model non-linear relationships between spectral, textural, and structural features (Breiman, 2001; Cortes & Vapnik, 1995; Friedman, 2001). Model performance is most often evaluated using the coefficient of determination (R^2) and root mean square error (RMSE), which together capture explanatory power and absolute prediction error (Li et al., 2021; Maung et al., 2025).

Empirical results reported in the mangrove literature indicate moderate to strong predictive performance for biomass estimation, though with substantial variability across regions and forest types. For example, Maung et al. (2025) evaluated RF, SVM, and XGBoost models for above-ground biomass estimation in Myanmar mangroves using multispectral and SAR inputs and reported that RF achieved the best performance ($R^2 = 0.48$, $\text{RMSE} = 28.12 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$) after feature selection, while alternative models exhibited markedly lower explanatory power. In a contrast-

ing subtropical plantation setting, Peng et al. (2025) reported higher accuracy using XGBoost applied to Sentinel-2 data, achieving an R^2 of approximately 0.68 with an RMSE of 6.85 Mg ha^{-1} , reflecting the reduced structural complexity and biomass range of managed stands. In structurally complex old-growth mangroves, Selvaraj et al. (2023) reported an R^2 of 0.78 but a substantially higher RMSE of 38.24 Mg ha^{-1} , highlighting the influence of biomass heterogeneity and signal saturation effects.

Across studies, reported R^2 values for mangrove biomass estimation commonly fall within the range of 0.5–0.8, with RMSE values strongly dependent on forest maturity, biomass distribution, and sensor configuration (Simard et al., 2019; Xie et al., 2025). Multiple studies demonstrate that regression performance improves when complementary structural information is incorporated. In particular, the integration of canopy height metrics derived from airborne or spaceborne LiDAR with optical and SAR features has been shown to mitigate saturation effects and improve predictive accuracy (Asner et al., 2012; Simard et al., 2019; Xie et al., 2025). These findings consistently support the value of multimodal data fusion for robust estimation of mangrove biophysical properties.

Classification-based modelling

Classification approaches are extensively used for mangrove extent mapping, species classification, and land cover change detection. Traditional machine learning models such as Random Forest and SVM remain widely adopted due to their robustness to noisy inputs and limited training data requirements (Belgiu & Drăguț, 2016; Giri et al., 2011). More recently, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and other deep learning architectures have been applied for pixel-level segmentation and fine-scale species mapping, particularly where high-resolution optical or hyperspectral imagery is available (Li et al., 2022; Lassalle et al., 2023).

Reported classification performance is typically quantified using overall accuracy, Cohen's Kappa, F1-score, or area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC), depending on task formulation (Congalton & Green, 2019). Representative studies indicate that high classification accuracy is achievable under favourable conditions. For instance, Aparicio and Viodor (2025) demonstrated strong performance of a lightweight CNN architecture (MobileNetV3) for mangrove species identification from smartphone imagery, illustrating the potential of deep learning for in situ and participatory monitoring applications. In remote sensing-based studies, Random Forest classifiers frequently achieve overall accuracies exceeding

90% when trained on high-resolution multispectral or hyperspectral data, while SVM performance is more sensitive to kernel selection and training sample composition (Adam et al., 2010; Fu et al., 2025).

Across the literature, overall classification accuracies for mangrove mapping commonly range between 80% and 95%, with higher values often reported in studies covering limited spatial extents or a small number of species classes (Lassalle et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2025). However, several studies caution that high overall accuracy can obscure systematic misclassification of rare species or fragmented mangrove patches, emphasising the importance of reporting class-level metrics and confusion matrices (Congalton & Green, 2019; Belgiu & Drăguț, 2016).

Evaluation practices and limitations

Despite advances in computational modelling, evaluation practices across mangrove studies remain heterogeneous. Most studies rely on random cross-validation or hold-out test sets drawn from the same geographic region used for model training, while cross-region or cross-site validation is rarely conducted (Maung et al., 2025; Fu et al., 2025). As a result, reported performance metrics may overestimate model generalisability, particularly in geographically heterogeneous mangrove systems where spectral, structural, and environmental conditions vary substantially (Lucas et al., 2007; Simard et al., 2019).

Differences in target variables, sensor combinations, spatial resolution, and validation protocols further limit direct comparison of reported metrics across studies (Congalton & Green, 2019). Recent work has therefore highlighted the need for standardised benchmarking datasets, spatially explicit validation strategies, and transparent reporting of uncertainty (Belgiu & Drăguț, 2016; Li et al., 2021). Ensemble approaches and multimodal learning frameworks have been proposed as promising directions to improve robustness and reduce sensitivity to site-specific biases, although their application in mangrove research remains limited and largely region-specific (Li et al., 2021; Bahaduri et al., 2024).

Research Gaps

Regional Bias

Most mangrove modelling studies train and evaluate models within a single geographic region. When such models are applied to new regions, performance degradation is expected due to domain shift arising from differences in species composition, canopy structure, sediment characteristics, tidal regimes, and an-

thropogenic pressures. These factors induce systematic variation in optical reflectance, SAR backscatter, thermal signatures, and structural metrics, resulting in both covariate and concept shift across regions (Li et al., 2021; Leal & Spalding, 2024).

Despite these known challenges, explicit cross-region evaluation remains uncommon in the mangrove literature. Only isolated studies have examined transfer learning or domain adaptation, often focusing on narrow biophysical targets such as biochemical traits rather than holistic ecosystem properties (Fu et al., 2025; Wu et al., 2025). Consequently, reported model performance metrics may overestimate generalisability and mask sensitivity to regional heterogeneity.

This imbalance has direct implications for restoration-oriented applications. Models trained predominantly on data-rich regions, particularly in Asia, risk encoding region-specific correlations rather than ecologically invariant representations. Addressing regional bias is therefore essential for both scientific validity and operational scalability, requiring systematic cross-region benchmarking, transfer learning strategies, and domain-aware evaluation protocols.

[Figure 4 placeholder: Global distribution of mangrove studies and regional data availability]

Lack of a Unified Multimodal Forest Framework

A second major research gap is the absence of a unified multimodal forest framework capable of integrating complementary geospatial data sources into a coherent and ecologically meaningful representation of mangrove ecosystems.

Each sensing modality captures a distinct and non-redundant component of forest condition:

- Optical multispectral imagery encodes extent, canopy cover, and phenology (Bunting et al., 2022).
- SAR captures structure, moisture, and inundation dynamics under all-weather conditions (Ghorbanian et al., 2025).
- LiDAR provides direct measurements of three-dimensional canopy architecture and biomass (Li et al., 2021).
- Thermal infrared data reveal physiological stress and hydrological anomalies (Farella et al., 2022).
- Hyperspectral data support biochemical and species-level trait estimation (Fu et al., 2025).

Single-modality analyses can therefore produce misleading restoration assessments. Intact canopy cover inferred from optical imagery may obscure physiological stress detectable in thermal data, while

LiDAR-derived height alone does not capture hydrological constraints or salinity stress. Restoration decisions based on incomplete representations risk misidentifying resilient forests or prioritising unsuitable restoration sites.

Recent advances in multimodal representation learning offer a pathway toward addressing this limitation. Li et al. (2021) demonstrated that integrating multispectral, hyperspectral, and LiDAR data improves multilayer structural mapping, while Bahaduri et al. (2024) showed that channel-level cross-attention enables dynamic alignment between heterogeneous modalities. Channel-level fusion is particularly advantageous in mangrove ecosystems, where data relevance varies spatially and temporally due to cloud cover, tidal state, and sensor availability.

Figure 5 illustrates a conceptual unified multimodal framework for integrating spatiotemporal optical, SAR, LiDAR, thermal infrared, and multispectral data into a shared latent forest representation, informed by the multimodal integration strategy proposed by Li et al. (2021).




Figure 3: Draft of what a unified multimodal framework for mangrove ecosystem surveying would look like [11].

Importantly, this review does not advocate a single architectural solution. Rather, it highlights that a holistic representation of mangrove ecosystem condition cannot be obtained from any single sensing modality, as key attributes such as extent, structure, hydrology, physiological stress, and biochemical composition are captured across complementary optical, SAR, LiDAR, thermal infrared, and multispectral or hyperspectral data sources. Cross-attention transformers, multimodal convolutional networks, graph-based models, hybrid ConvLSTM–Transformer pipelines, and ensemble approaches all represent viable computational pathways depending on data availability and restoration objectives. The central gap lies not in the absence of individual techniques, but in the lack of end-to-end, restoration-oriented multimodal frameworks explic-

itly designed to fuse these complementary modalities into generalisable and decision-relevant mangrove ecosystem representations.

Limitations of CNN-Centric Approaches in Fragmented Mangrove Landscapes

Convolutional neural networks underpin most deep learning-based mangrove classification and segmentation pipelines. While effective for large, contiguous forest stands, CNN-based approaches often struggle to detect small, fragmented, or linear mangrove patches embedded within complex coastal environments. This limitation is particularly pronounced in regions experiencing urbanisation, aquaculture expansion, or partial degradation.

Fragmentation-related challenges arise from three interconnected factors: reduced spatial context at fixed receptive field sizes, spectral confusion with surrounding vegetation or built environments, and heavy reliance on dense manual annotations. These issues contribute to reduced robustness when models are transferred to regions with differing fragmentation patterns. Addressing this gap will require exploration of multi-scale architectures, weakly supervised or semi-supervised learning strategies, and alternative spatial representations that better capture fine-grained ecological structure.

Inadequate Observation of Submerged and Underwater Mangrove Components

Most satellite-based mangrove monitoring relies on visible and near-infrared wavelengths, which are strongly attenuated by water, limiting detection of submerged root structures and early-stage regeneration in intertidal and subtidal zones. As a result, below-water components critical to ecosystem stability and recovery are often poorly characterised or entirely omitted from restoration assessments.

This sensing limitation constrains evaluation of mangrove health and restoration potential in tidally dynamic and turbid environments. Addressing this gap will require integration of alternative observation strategies, including UAV-based surveys, bathymetric and acoustic data, and improved fusion of radar and optical observations across tidal states.

Limited Integration of Field Validation and Local Knowledge

Despite advances in geospatial modelling, field validation and local ecological knowledge remain insufficiently integrated into many mangrove restoration studies. In situ observations are essential for

validating remotely sensed classifications, contextualising model outputs, and identifying site-specific constraints that may not be captured by remote sensing alone.

The absence of systematic field validation can result in restoration suitability maps that are technically accurate yet ecologically or socially misaligned. Future frameworks should therefore emphasise participatory validation, integration of field measurements, and collaboration with local stakeholders to ensure that computational outputs translate into context-aware and implementable restoration decisions.

Future Work: Toward Unified Multimodal Frameworks for Mangrove Restoration Prioritisation

Building on the research gaps identified in this review, future work should prioritise a shift from isolated, region-specific modelling pipelines toward unified, multimodal, and generalisable computational frameworks for mangrove ecosystem assessment. Addressing these gaps requires coordinated advances in data integration, model design, evaluation methodology, and translational practice.

A primary direction for future work is the development of *unified multimodal forest frameworks* that integrate complementary sensing modalities, including spatiotemporal optical imagery, SAR, LiDAR, thermal infrared, and multispectral or hyperspectral data. Because each modality captures distinct ecological attributes, multimodal integration enables holistic representations that cannot be achieved using any single data source. Multimodal integration enables the construction of holistic latent representations capable of supporting restoration prioritisation based on both current ecosystem condition and long-term resilience.

Recent advances in multimodal representation learning offer promising tools for achieving such integration. Attention-based architectures, including cross-attention multimodal transformers, allow heterogeneous data streams to interact at the feature or channel level, enabling dynamic weighting of modalities based on contextual relevance and data quality. This property is particularly valuable in mangrove environments, where sensor availability and informativeness vary spatially and temporally due to cloud cover, tidal state, and acquisition constraints. However, future research should remain architecture-agnostic, systematically comparing attention-based transformers, multimodal convo-

lutional networks, graph-based models, and hybrid spatiotemporal pipelines under realistic data availability and domain shift conditions.

Addressing *regional bias and limited generalisation* represents another critical research direction. Future frameworks should explicitly incorporate cross-region validation, transfer learning, and domain adaptation strategies to assess and improve model robustness across diverse ecological contexts. Pre-training multimodal models on globally distributed datasets, followed by region-specific fine-tuning using limited local data, represents a promising pathway for reducing dependence on data-rich regions and improving scalability. Such strategies are critical for ensuring that restoration prioritisation models remain robust under domain shift and can be deployed beyond data-rich regions.

Future work must also move beyond CNN-centric pipelines that struggle in fragmented mangrove landscapes. Exploration of multi-scale representations, object-centric models, weakly supervised learning, and semi-supervised approaches may improve detection of small or degraded mangrove patches while reducing reliance on extensive manual labelling. Such approaches are particularly important in urbanised or partially restored coastal environments where fragmentation is pronounced.

The challenge of observing submerged and underwater mangrove components further motivates integration of alternative sensing strategies. Combining satellite observations with UAV-based surveys, bathymetric data, and tide-aware data fusion can improve characterisation of intertidal and subtidal zones. Developing models that explicitly account for tidal state and water-column effects will be essential for accurate assessment of early-stage regeneration and below-canopy structures.

Finally, future research should prioritise *restoration-oriented and participatory outputs*. Integrating field validation, in situ measurements, and local ecological knowledge into computational pipelines will be critical for ensuring that model outputs are actionable and context-aware. Restoration prioritisation frameworks should produce interpretable suitability indices, uncertainty estimates, and scenario-based projections that support decision-making by practitioners, policymakers, and local communities.

Conclusions

This scoping review synthesised the current state of geographical data, sensing technologies, and computational tools used to determine restoration priorities in mangrove ecosystems. By combining qualitative literature analysis with quantitative synthesis of tools

and techniques across major academic databases, the review provides a comprehensive overview of methodological trends, strengths, and limitations in contemporary mangrove research.

The findings reveal that while satellite-based optical and SAR data dominate the literature and classical machine learning approaches remain prevalent, advanced sensing modalities such as LiDAR, hyperspectral, and thermal infrared data are comparatively underutilised. Similarly, despite growing interest in deep learning, most computational pipelines remain CNN-centric and single-modality, limiting their effectiveness in fragmented landscapes and complex ecological settings.

Five critical research gaps were identified. First, strong regional bias in data availability and model development constrains generalisation and scalability. Second, the absence of unified multimodal forest frameworks restricts the integration of complementary structural, functional, and temporal information. Third, CNN-based approaches struggle with small and fragmented mangrove patches and rely heavily on costly manual labelling. Fourth, current sensing strategies inadequately capture submerged and underwater mangrove components. Finally, limited integration of field validation and local ecological knowledge reduces the translational impact of computational outputs.

Addressing these gaps requires a shift toward unified, multimodal, and generalisable computational frameworks that integrate diverse sensing modalities, explicitly account for domain shift, and align model outputs with restoration decision-making needs. By framing mangrove restoration as a multimodal representation learning and generalisation challenge, this review positions future research at the intersection of remote sensing, ecology, and machine learning. Advancing in this direction is essential for translating technological progress into robust, scalable, and socially relevant strategies for mangrove conservation and restoration.

References

- [1] Maricé Leal and Mark D. Spalding. *The State of the World's Mangroves 2024*. Global Mangrove Alliance, July 2024. DOI: 10.5479/10088/119867. URL: <https://repository.si.edu/handle/10088/119867> (visited on 11/24/2025).
- [2] Guillaume Lassalle et al. "Advances in multi- and hyperspectral remote sensing of mangrove species: A synthesis and study case on airborne and multisource spaceborne imagery". In: *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*.

- ing 195 (Jan. 2023), pp. 298–312. ISSN: 09242716. DOI: 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2022.12.003. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0924271622003185> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [3] Alme M. Aparicio and Ariel Christian C. Viodor. “AI-Based Advancements for Comprehensive Mangrove Analysis Suitability Mapping”. In: *2025 IEEE Open Conference of Electrical, Electronic and Information Sciences (eStream)*. 2025 IEEE Open Conference of Electrical, Electronic and Information Sciences (eStream). ISSN: 2690-8506. Apr. 2025, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/eStream66938.2025.11016872. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11016872> (visited on 11/23/2025).
- [4] Bissmella Bahaduri et al. “Multimodal Transformer Using Cross-Channel attention for Object Detection in Remote Sensing Images”. In: June 17, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/html/2310.13876v3> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [5] Liwei Deng et al. “Comparison of 2D and 3D vegetation species mapping in three natural scenarios using UAV-LiDAR point clouds and improved deep learning methods”. In: *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 125 (Dec. 2023), p. 103588. ISSN: 15698432. DOI: 10.1016/j.jag.2023.103588. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1569843223004120> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [6] Arsalan Ghorbanian et al. “Weakly Supervised Semantic Segmentation of Mangrove Ecosystem Using Sentinel-1 SAR and Deep Convolutional Neural Networks”. In: *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing* 18 (2025), pp. 17497–17512. ISSN: 2151-1535. DOI: 10.1109/JSTARS.2025.3586289. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11072052> (visited on 11/23/2025).
- [7] Chandra Giri et al. “Monitoring mangrove forest dynamics of the Sundarbans in Bangladesh and India using multi-temporal satellite data from 1973 to 2000”. In: *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 73.1 (June 1, 2007), pp. 91–100. ISSN: 0272-7714. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecss.2006.12.019. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771407000029> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [8] Stuart Hamilton and Daniel Casey. “Creation of a high spatiotemporal resolution global database of continuous mangrove forest cover for the 21st Century (CGMFC-21)”. In: *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 25.6 (June 2016), pp. 729–738. ISSN: 1466-822X, 1466-8238. DOI: 10.1111/geb.12449. arXiv: 1412.0722[physics]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.0722> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [9] Ilham Jamaluddin, Ying-Nong Chen, and Kuo-Chin Fan. “Spatial-Spectral-Temporal Deep Regression Model With Convolutional Long Short-Term Memory and Transformer for the Large-Area Mapping of Mangrove Canopy Height by Using Sentinel-1 and Sentinel-2 Data”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 62 (2024), pp. 1–17. ISSN: 0196-2892, 1558-0644. DOI: 10.1109/TGRS.2024.3362788. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10423062/> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [10] Guillaume Lassalle et al. “Deep learning-based individual tree crown delineation in mangrove forests using very-high-resolution satellite imagery”. In: *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 189 (July 2022), pp. 220–235. ISSN: 09242716. DOI: 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2022.05.002. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0924271622001411> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [11] Qiaosi Li, Frankie Kwan Kit Wong, and Tung Fung. “Mapping multi-layered mangroves from multispectral, hyperspectral, and LiDAR data”. In: *Remote Sensing of Environment* 258 (June 2021), p. 112403. ISSN: 00344257. DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2021.112403. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0034425721001218> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [12] Fillmore D. Masancay et al. “Spectro-Textural Integration in Mangrove Delineation: A Case Analysis of Aboitiz Cleanergy Park, Davao City, Philippines”. In: *2025 10th International Conference on Image, Vision and Computing (ICIVC)*. 2025 10th International Conference on Image, Vision and Computing (ICIVC). July 2025, pp. 433–438. DOI: 10.1109/ICIVC66358.2025.11200282. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11200282> (visited on 11/23/2025).
- [13] Win Sithu Maung et al. “Assessing above ground biomass of Wunbaik Mangrove Forest in Myanmar using machine learning and remote sensing data”. In: *Discover Conservation* 2.1 (Mar. 6, 2025), p. 8. ISSN: 3004-9784. DOI: 10.1007/s44353-025-00025-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44353-025-00025-3> (visited on 11/18/2025).

- [14] T. Mayamanikandan et al. "Mapping coastal green infrastructure along the Pondicherry coast using remote sensing data and machine learning algorithm". In: *Journal of Earth System Science* 133.4 (Oct. 30, 2024), p. 218. ISSN: 0973-774X. DOI: 10.1007/s12040-024-02432-x. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-024-02432-x> (visited on 11/23/2025).
- [15] Uday Pimple et al. "Enhancing monitoring of mangrove spatiotemporal tree diversity and distribution patterns". In: *Land Degradation & Development* 34.5 (Mar. 1, 2023), pp. 1265–1282. ISSN: 1085-3278. DOI: 10.1002/ldr.4537. URL: <https://research.ebsco.com/linkprocessor/plink?id=1ac97efb-b02e-32b6-8ca3-f1f271c277bc> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [16] Jun Sun et al. "Synergistic construction of an annual 2 m mangrove species dataset from 2016 to 2023 using structural features and hybrid stacked deep learning models—Beibu Gulf, Guangxi, China". In: *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 230 (Dec. 2025), pp. 754–778. ISSN: 09242716. DOI: 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2025.10.007. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0924271625003958> (visited on 11/23/2025).
- [17] Thomas A. Worthington et al. "Harnessing Big Data to Support the Conservation and Rehabilitation of Mangrove Forests Globally". In: *One Earth* 2.5 (May 22, 2020), pp. 429–443. ISSN: 2590-3322. DOI: 10.1016/j.oneear.2020.04.018. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590332220302050> (visited on 10/29/2025).
- [18] Yiheng Xie et al. "Mangrove monitoring and extraction based on multi-source remote sensing data: a deep learning method based on SAR and optical image fusion". In: *Acta Oceanologica Sinica* 43.9 (Sept. 2024), pp. 110–121. ISSN: 0253-505X, 1869-1099. DOI: 10.1007/s13131-024-2356-1. URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13131-024-2356-1> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [19] Ruoxin Zhang et al. "FragMangro: A cross-domain zero-shot model for monitoring fragmented mangrove ecosystems". In: *Journal of King Saud University Computer and Information Sciences* 37.4 (May 20, 2025), p. 46. ISSN: 2213-1248. DOI: 10.1007/s44443-025-00053-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44443-025-00053-y> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [20] Andrea C. Tricco et al. "PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation". In: *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169.7 (Oct. 2, 2018). Publisher: American College of Physicians, pp. 467–473. ISSN: 0003-4819. DOI: 10.7326/M18-0850. URL: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M18-0850> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [21] C. Giri et al. "Status and distribution of mangrove forests of the world using earth observation satellite data". In: *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 20.1 (2011). eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00584.x>, pp. 154–159. ISSN: 1466-8238. DOI: 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00584.x. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00584.x> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [22] Pete Bunting et al. *Global Mangrove Watch (1996 - 2020) Version 3.0 Dataset*. July 24, 2022. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6894273. URL: <https://zenodo.org/records/6894273> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [23] *Global Mangrove Watch (1996 - 2016) Version 2.0*. Charles Sturt University Research Output. URL: <https://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/en/datasets/global-mangrove-watch-1996-2016-version-20/> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [24] M. Simard et al. *Carbon Monitoring System (CMS) CMS: Global Mangrove Canopy Height Maps Derived from TanDEM-X, 2015*. In colab. with ORNL DAAC. Artwork Size: 0 MB Medium: COG, CSV Pages: 0 MB Version Number: 1. Jan. 1, 2024. DOI: 10.3334/ORNLDAAC/2251. URL: <https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/data/catalog/ornl-cloud-cms-global-mangrove-forest-ht-2251-1> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [25] Tania L. Maxwell et al. "Global mangrove soil organic carbon stocks dataset at 30 m resolution for the year 2020 based on spatiotemporal predictive machine learning". In: *Data in Brief* 50 (Oct. 1, 2023), p. 109621. ISSN: 2352-3409. DOI: 10.1016/j.dib.2023.109621. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352340923007060> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [26] Xudong Zhu et al. "Integrating UAV optical imagery and LiDAR data for assessing the spatial relationship between mangrove and inundation across a subtropical estuarine wetland". In: *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 149 (Mar. 1, 2019), pp. 146–156. ISSN: 0924-2716. DOI: 10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2019.01.

021. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0924271619300292> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [27] Tien-Dat Pham et al. "Mangrove Species Mapping Using Sentinel-1 and Sentinel-2 Data in North Vietnam". In: July 30, 2019. DOI: 10.1109/IGARSS.2019.8898987.
- [28] Richard M. Lucas et al. "The potential of L-band SAR for quantifying mangrove characteristics and change: case studies from the tropics". In: *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 17.3 (2007). _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/aqc.833>, pp. 245–264. ISSN: 1099-0755. DOI: 10.1002/aqc.833. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/aqc.833> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [29] Pete Bunting et al. "The Global Mangrove Watch—A New 2010 Global Baseline of Mangrove Extent". In: *Remote Sensing* 10.10 (Oct. 21, 2018). Company: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Distributor: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Institution: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Label: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Publisher: publisher. ISSN: 2072-4292. DOI: 10.3390/rs10101669. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/10/10/1669> (visited on 12/17/2025).
- [30] Marc Simard et al. "Mapping Height and Biomass of Mangrove Forests in Everglades National Park with SRTM Elevation Data". In: *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 72 (Mar. 1, 2006), pp. 299–311. DOI: 10.14358/PERS.72.3.299.
- [31] Bolin Fu et al. "Cross-scenario transfer learning for estimating mangrove nitrogen and phosphorus content from field hyperspectral data to SDGSAT-1 and Sentinel-2 images". In: *Remote Sensing of Environment* 329 (Nov. 1, 2025), p. 114923. ISSN: 0034-4257. DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2025.114923. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S003442572500327X> (visited on 11/26/2025).
- [32] Suraj Sawant et al. "Integration of machine learning and remote sensing for assessing the change detection of mangrove forests along the Mumbai coast". In: *Journal of Earth System Science* 133.4 (Sept. 16, 2024), p. 186. ISSN: 0973-774X. DOI: 10.1007/s12040-024-02378-0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-024-02378-0> (visited on 11/18/2025).
- [33] Cristina Cipriano et al. "Algorithms going wild – A review of machine learning techniques for terrestrial ecology". In: *Ecological Modelling* 506 (July 1, 2025), p. 111164. ISSN: 0304-3800. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2025.111164. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380025001498> (visited on 11/24/2025).
- [34] Soohyun Kwon, Hyeon Kwon Ahn, and Chul-Hee Lim. "Can Synthetic Aperture Radar Enhance the Quality of Satellite-Based Mangrove Detection? A Focus on the Denpasar Region of Indonesia". In: *Remote Sensing* 17.11 (Jan. 2025). Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, p. 1812. ISSN: 2072-4292. DOI: 10.3390/rs17111812. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/17/11/1812> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [35] Martha M. Farella et al. "Thermal remote sensing for plant ecology from leaf to globe". In: *Journal of Ecology* 110.9 (2022). _eprint: <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1365-13957>, pp. 1996–2014. ISSN: 1365-2745. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2745.13957. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1365-2745.13957> (visited on 11/25/2025).
- [36] GISGeography. *Multispectral vs Hyperspectral Imagery Explained*. GIS Geography. July 23, 2014. URL: <https://gisgeography.com/multispectral-vs-hyperspectral-imagery-explained/> (visited on 12/16/2025).
- [37] *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems | Aquatic Journal | Wiley Online Library*. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aqc.833> (visited on 12/17/2025).