

Integrating Resource Selection Information with Spatial Capture-Recapture

J. Andrew Royle, U.S. Geological Survey, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland, 20708, *email*: aroyle@usgs.gov

Richard B. Chandler, U.S. Geological Survey, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland, 20708, *email*: rchandler@usgs.gov

Running title. Resource Selection and Spatial Capture-Recapture

Word count. 5670

Summary.

1. Understanding space usage and resource selection is a primary focus of many studies of animal populations. Usually, such studies are based on location data obtained from telemetry, and resource selection functions (RSF) are used for inference. Another important focus of wildlife research is estimation and modeling population size and density. Recently developed spatial capture-recapture (SCR) models accomplish this objective using individual encounter history data with auxiliary spatial information on location of capture. SCR models include encounter probability functions that are intuitively related to RSFs, but to date, no one has extended SCR models to allow for explicit inference about space usage and resource selection.

2. In this paper we develop the first statistical framework for jointly modeling space usage,

22 resource selection, and population density by integrating SCR data, such as from camera
23 traps, mist-nets, or conventional catch-traps, with resource selection data from telemetered
24 individuals. We provide a framework for estimation based on marginal likelihood, wherein
25 we estimate simultaneously the parameters of the SCR and RSF models.

26 3. Our method leads to increases in precision for estimating population density and
27 parameters of ordinary SCR models. Importantly, we also find that SCR models *alone* can
28 estimate parameters of resource selection functions and, as such, SCR methods can be used
29 as the sole source for studying space-usage; however, precision will be higher when telemetry
30 data are available.

31 4. Finally, we find that SCR models using standard symmetric and stationary encounter
32 probability models produce biased estimates of density when animal space usage is related to
33 a landscape covariate. Therefore, it is important that space usage be taken into consideration,
34 if possible, in studies focused on estimating density using capture-recapture methods.

35 **Key-words.** animal movement, animal sampling, encounter probability, hierarchical
36 modeling, landscape connectivity, marginal likelihood, resource selection, space usage, spa-
37 tial capture-recapture.

38

39 1 Introduction

40 Spatial capture-recapture (SCR) models are relatively new methods for inference about
41 population density from capture-recapture data using auxiliary information about individual
42 capture locations (Efford, 2004; Borchers and Efford, 2008; Royle and Young, 2008). SCR

43 models posit that N individuals are located within a region denoted \mathcal{S} . Each individual
44 has a home range or activity area within which movement occurs during some well-defined
45 time interval, and the center of the animal’s activity has Cartesian coordinates \mathbf{s}_i for in-
46 dividuals $i = 1, \dots, N$. The population is sampled using J traps with coordinates \mathbf{x}_j for
47 $j = 1, \dots, J$, and encounter probability is expressed as a function of the distance between
48 trap location (\mathbf{x}_j), and individual activity center (\mathbf{s}_i). While SCR models are a relatively re-
49 cent innovation, their use is already becoming widespread (Efford et al., 2009; Gardner et al.,
50 2010b,a; Kéry et al., 2010; Gopalaswamy et al., 2012; Foster and Harmsen, 2012) because
51 they resolve critical problems with ordinary non-spatial capture-recapture methods such as
52 ill-defined area sampled and heterogeneity in encounter probability due to the juxtaposition
53 of individuals with traps (Borchers, 2011). Furthermore, unlike traditional capture-recapture
54 methods, SCR models allow for inference about the processes determining spatial variation
55 in population density.

56 Despite the increasing popularity of SCR models, every application of them has been
57 based on encounter probability models, such as the bivariate normal distribution, that imply
58 symmetric and stationary (invariant to translation) models for home range. While such
59 simple models might be necessitated in practice by sparse data, home range size and shape
60 are often not well represented by stationary distributions because animals select resources
61 that are unevenly distributed in space. Therefore more complex models are needed to relate
62 the capture process with the way in which individuals utilize space.

63 In this paper, we extend SCR capture probability models to accommodate models of space
64 usage or resource selection, by extending them to include one or more explicit landscape
65 covariates, which the investigator believes might affect how individual animals use space

66 within their home range (this is what (Johnson, 1980) called *third-order* selection). We do
67 this in a way that is entirely consistent with the manner in which parameters of classical
68 resource selection functions (RSF) (Manly et al., 2002) or utilization distributions (UD)
69 (Worton, 1989; Fieberg and Kochanny, 2005; Fieberg, 2007) are estimated from animal
70 telemetry data. In fact, we argue that SCR models and RSF/UD models estimated from
71 telemetry are based on the same basic underlying model of space usage. The important
72 distinctions between SCR and RSF studies are that (1) resource selection studies do not
73 result in estimates of population density and (2) in SCR studies, encounter of individuals is
74 imperfect (i.e., “ $p < 1$ ”) whereas, with RSF data obtained by telemetry, encounter is perfect.
75 With respect to the latter point, we can think of the RSF and SCR studies as being exactly
76 equivalent either if we have a dense array of trapping devices, or if our telemetry apparatus
77 samples time or space imperfectly. A key concept that we must confront in order to unify and
78 integrate SCR and RSF data is that we need to formulate both models in terms of a common
79 latent variable so that we can make them consistent with respect to some underlying space
80 utilization process. As we will explain, this latent variable is the number of times that an
81 individual uses a particular region of the landscape over some period of time.

82 The modeling framework we develop here simultaneously resolves three important prob-
83 lems: (1) it generalizes all existing capture probability models for SCR data to accommodate
84 realistic patterns of space usage that result in asymmetric and irregular home ranges; (2) it
85 allows estimation of RSF parameters directly from SCR data, i.e., *absent* telemetry data; and
86 (3) it provides the basis for integrating telemetry data directly into SCR models to improve
87 estimates of model parameters, including density. Our model greatly expands the applied
88 relevance of SCR methods for conservation and management, and for addressing applied and

89 theoretical questions related to animal space usage and resource selection.

90 **2 Spatial Capture-Recapture**

91 A number of distinct observation models have been proposed for spatial capture-recapture
92 studies (Borchers and Efford, 2008; Royle et al., 2009; Efford et al., 2009), including Poisson,
93 multinomial, and binomial observation models. Here we focus on the binomial model in which
94 we suppose that the J traps are operated for K periods (e.g., nights), and the observations are
95 individual- and trap-specific counts y_{ij} , which are binomial with sample size K and capture
96 probabilities p_{ij} which depend on trap locations \mathbf{x}_j and individual activity centers \mathbf{s}_i as
97 described subsequently. The vector of trap-specific counts for individual i , $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iJ})$
98 is its *encounter history*. A standard encounter probability model (Borchers and Efford, 2008)
99 is the Gaussian model in which

$$\log(p_{ij}) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 d_{ij}^2 \tag{1}$$

100 or, equivalently, $p_{ij} = \lambda_0 \exp(-d_{ij}^2/(2\sigma^2))$, where d_{ij} is the Euclidean distance between points
101 \mathbf{s}_i and \mathbf{x}_j , $d_{ij} = \|\mathbf{s}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\| = \sqrt{(s_{i1} - x_{j1})^2 + (s_{i2} - x_{j2})^2}$, and $\alpha_0 = \log(\lambda_0)$ and $\alpha_1 =$
102 $-1/(2\sigma^2)$. Alternative detection models are used, but all are functions of Euclidean distance
103 and so we do not consider them further here.

104 The primary motivation behind our work is that, in all previous applications of SCR
105 models, simple encounter probability models based only on Euclidean distance have been
106 used, with estimation based on standard likelihood or Bayesian methods. These methods
107 regard the activity center for each individual i , \mathbf{s}_i , as latent variables and remove them

108 from the likelihood either under a model of “uniformity” in which $\mathbf{s} \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S})$ where \mathcal{S} is
109 a spatial region (the “state-space” of \mathbf{s}), or a model in which covariates might affect the
110 spatial distribution of individuals (Borchers and Efford, 2008). The state-space \mathcal{S} defines
111 the potential values for any activity center \mathbf{s} , e.g., a polygon defining available habitat or
112 range of the species under study.

113 A critical problem with standard SCR models is that the encounter probability model
114 based on Euclidean distance metric is unaffected by habitat or landscape structure, and
115 it implies that the space used by individuals is stationary and symmetric, which may be
116 unreasonable in many applications. For example, if the common detection model based on a
117 bivariate normal probability distribution function is used, then the implied space usage by *all*
118 individuals, no matter their location in space or local habitat conditions, is symmetric with
119 circular contours of usage intensity. Subsequently we provide an extension of this class of
120 SCR models that accommodates asymmetric, irregular and spatially heterogeneous models
121 of space usage. Thus, “where” an individual lives on the landscape, and the state of the
122 surrounding landscape, will determine the character of its usage of space. In particular, we
123 suggest encounter probability models that imply irregular, asymmetric and non-stationary
124 home ranges of individuals and that are sensitive to the local landscape being used by an
125 individual.

126 **3 Basic Model of Space Usage**

127 We develop the model here in terms of a discrete landscape purely for computational
128 expediency. This formulation will accommodate the vast majority of actual data sets, as
129 almost all habitat or landscape structure data comes to us in the form of raster data. Let

130 $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{nG}$ identify the center coordinates of a set of nG pixels that define a landscape. In
131 SCR studies, a *subset* of the coordinates \mathbf{x} will correspond to trap locations where we might
132 observe individuals whereas, in telemetry studies, animals are observable (by telemetry fixes)
133 at potentially *all* coordinates.

134 Let $z(\mathbf{x})$ denote a covariate measured (or defined) for every pixel \mathbf{x} . For clarity, we
135 develop the basic ideas here in terms of a single covariate but, in practice, investigators
136 typically have more than 1 covariate, which poses no additional problems. We suppose that
137 a population of individuals wanders around space in some manner related to the covariate
138 $z(\mathbf{x})$, and their locations accumulate in pixels by some omnipotent accounting mechanism.
139 We will define “use of \mathbf{x} ” to be the event that an individual animal appeared in some pixel
140 \mathbf{x} . This is equivalently stated in the literature in terms of individual having *selected* \mathbf{x} . As a
141 biological matter, use is the outcome of individuals moving around their home range (Hooten
142 et al., 2010), i.e., where an individual is at any point in time is the result of some movement
143 process. However, to understand space usage, it is not necessary to entertain explicit models
144 of movement, just to observe the outcomes, and so we don’t elaborate further on what could
145 be sensible or useful models of movement.

146 Suppose that an individual is monitored over some period of time and a fixed number,
147 say R , of use observations are recorded. Let $n(\mathbf{x})$ be the use frequency of pixel \mathbf{x} for that
148 individual. i.e., the number of times that individual used pixel \mathbf{x} during some period of time.
149 We assume the following probability distribution for the $nG \times 1$ vector of use frequencies:

$$\mathbf{n} \sim \text{Multinom}(R, \boldsymbol{\pi})$$

150 where $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is the $nG \times 1$ vector of use probabilities with elements (for each pixel):

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))}{\sum_x \exp(\alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))}$$

151 This is the standard RSF model (Manly et al., 2002) used to model telemetry data. The
 152 parameter α_2 is the effect of the landscape covariate $z(\mathbf{x})$ on the relative probability of use.
 153 Thus, if α_2 is positive, the relative probability of use increases as the value of the covariate
 154 increases. In practice, we don't get to observe $\{n(\mathbf{x})\}$ for all individuals but, instead, only
 155 for a small subset say $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{tel}$, which we capture and install telemetry devices on.
 156 For the telemetered individuals, we assume they behave according to the same RSF model
 157 as the population as a whole, which might be justified if individuals are randomly sampled
 158 from the population.

159 We extend this model slightly to make it more realistic spatially and also consistent
 160 with standard SCR models. Let \mathbf{s} denote the centroid of an individual's home range and let
 161 $d(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}\|$ be the distance from the home range center \mathbf{s} of some individual to pixel
 162 \mathbf{x} , and let $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ denote the use frequency of pixel \mathbf{x} for an individual with activity center
 163 \mathbf{s} . We modify the space usage model to accommodate that space use will be concentrated
 164 around an individual's home range center (Johnson et al., 2008; Forester et al., 2009):

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\exp(-\alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))}{\sum_x \exp(-\alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))} \quad (2)$$

165 where $\alpha_1 = 1/(2\sigma^2)$ describes the rate at which encounter probability declines as a function
 166 of distance, $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$. From ordinary telemetry data, it would be possible to estimate param-
 167 eters α_1 , α_2 and also the activity centers \mathbf{s} using standard likelihood methods based on the

168 multinomial likelihood (Johnson et al., 2008).

169 Note that Eq. 2 resembles standard encounter models used in spatial capture-recapture
170 but with an additional covariate $z(\mathbf{x})$. The main difference between this observation model
171 and the standard SCR model is that the model here includes the normalizing constant
172 $\sum_x \exp(-\alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))$, which ensures that the use distribution is a proper probability
173 density function. Thus we are able to characterize the probability of encounter in terms of
174 both distance from activity center and space use. Note that, under this model for space
175 usage or resource selection, if there are *no* covariates, or if $\alpha_2 = 0$, then the probabilities
176 $\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})$ are directly proportional to the SCR model for encounter probability. For example,
177 setting $\alpha_2 = 0$, then this implies probability of use for pixel \mathbf{x} is:

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}) \propto \exp(-\alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})^2).$$

178 Therefore, for whatever model we choose for $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})$ in an ordinary SCR model, we can
179 modify the distance component in the RSF function in Eq. 2 accordingly to be consistent
180 with that model, by choosing $\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})$ according to

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}) \propto \exp(\log(p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})) + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}))$$

181 As an illustration of space usage patterns under this model, we simulated a covariate
182 that represents variation in habitat structure (Fig. 1) such as might correspond to habitat
183 quality. This was simulated by using a simple kriging interpolator of spatial noise. Space
184 usage patterns for 8 individuals in this landscape are shown in Fig. 2, simulated with
185 $\alpha_1 = 1/(2\sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 2$ and the coefficient on $z(\mathbf{x})$ set to $\alpha_2 = 1$. These space usage

186 densities – “home ranges” – exhibit clear non-stationarity in response to the structure of the
 187 underlying covariate, and they are distinctly asymmetrical. We note that if α_2 were set to 0,
 188 the 8 home ranges shown here would resemble bivariate normal kernels with $\sigma = 2$. Another
 189 interesting thing to note is that the activity centers are not typically located in the pixel of
 190 highest use or even the centroid of usage. That is, the observed “average” location is not an
 191 unbiased estimator of \mathbf{s} under the model in Eq. 2.

192 3.1 Poisson use model

193 A natural way to motivate this specific model of space usage is to assume that individuals
 194 make a sequence of random resource selection decisions so that the outcomes $n(\mathbf{x})$ (for all
 195 \mathbf{x}) are marginally *independent* Poisson random variables:

$$n(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{s} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}))$$

196 where

$$\log(\lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})) = a_0 - \alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s})^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x})$$

197 In this case, the number of visits to any particular cell is affected by the covariate $z(\mathbf{x})$
 198 but has a baseline rate ($\exp(a_0)$) related to the amount of movement occurring over some
 199 time interval. This is an equivalent model to the multinomial model given previously in the
 200 sense that, if we condition on the total sample size $R = \sum_x n(\mathbf{x})$, then the vector of use
 201 frequencies $\{n(\mathbf{x})\}$ for individual with activity center \mathbf{s} , has a multinomial distribution with
 202 probabilities

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})}{\sum_x \lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})}$$

203 which is the same as Eq. 2 because a_0 cancels from the numerator and denominator of the
 204 multinomial cell probabilities and thus this parameter is not relevant to understanding space
 205 usage. Note that if use frequencies are summarized over $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{tel}$ individuals for
 206 each pixel, then a standard Poisson regression model for the resulting “quadrat counts” is
 207 reasonable. This corresponds to “Design 1” in Manly et al. (2002).

208 3.2 Random Thinning

209 Suppose our sampling is imperfect so that we only observe a smaller number of telemetry
 210 fixes than actual use frequency, $n(\mathbf{x})$. We express this “thinning” (or sampling) by assuming
 211 the observed number of uses is a binomial random variable based on a sample of size $n(\mathbf{x})$:

$$m(\mathbf{x}) \sim \text{Bin}(n(\mathbf{x}), \phi_0).$$

212 Then, the marginal distribution of the new random variable m is also Poisson but with
 213 mean

$$\log(\lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})) = \log(\phi_0) + a_0 - \alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}).$$

214 Thus, the space-usage model (RSF) for the thinned counts m is the same as the space-usage
 215 model for the original variables n . This is because if we remove n from the conditional model
 216 by summing over its possible values, then the vector of thinned use frequencies \mathbf{m} (i.e., for
 217 all pixels) is *also* multinomial with cell probabilities

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})}{\sum_x \lambda(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{s})}$$

218 and so the constants a_0 and ϕ_0 cancel from both the numerator and denominator. Thus,
219 the underlying RSF model applies to the true unobserved count frequencies \mathbf{n} and also those
220 produced by a random thinning or sampling process, \mathbf{m} .

221 In summary, if we conduct a telemetry study of $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{tel}$ individuals, the observed
222 data are the $nG \times 1$ vectors of use frequencies \mathbf{m}_i for each individual. We declare these data to
223 be “resource-selection data” which are typical of the type used to estimate resource-selection
224 functions (RSFs) (Manly et al., 2002). In fact, the situation we have described here in which
225 we obtain a random sample of use locations and a complete census of available locations is
226 referred to as “Design 2” by (Manly et al., 2002).

227 **3.3 Resource Selection in SCR Models**

228 The key to combing RSF data with SCR data is to work with this underlying resource
229 utilization process and formulate SCR models in terms of that process. Imagine that we have
230 a sampling device, such as a camera trap, in *every* pixel. If the device operates continually
231 then it is no different from a telemetry instrument. If it operates intermittently *or* does not
232 expose the entire area of each pixel then a reasonable model for this imperfect observation is
233 the “thinned” binomial model given above, where ϕ_0 represents the sampling effectiveness of
234 the device. For data that arise from SCR studies, the frequency of use for each pixel *where*
235 a trap is located serves as an intermediate latent variable that we don’t observe. From a
236 design standpoint, the main difference between SCR studies and telemetry is that, for SCR
237 data, we do not have sampling devices in all locations (pixels) in the landscape. Rather, the
238 data are only recorded at a subsample of them, the trap locations, which we identify by the
239 specific coordinates $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_J$.

240 So we imagine that the hypothetical perfect data from a camera trapping study are the
 241 counts $m(\mathbf{x})$ only at the specific trap locations \mathbf{x}_j , and for all individuals in the population
 242 $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ where $N > N_{tel}$. We denote the individual- and trap-specific counts by m_{ij}
 243 for individual with activity center \mathbf{s}_i and trap location \mathbf{x}_j . In practice, many (perhaps most)
 244 of the $m_{ij} \equiv m(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{s}_i)$ frequencies will be 0, corresponding to individuals not captured in
 245 certain traps. We then construct our SCR encounter probability model based on the view
 246 that these frequencies m_{ij} are *latent* variables. In particular, under the SCR model with
 247 binary observations, we observe a random variable $y_{ij} = 1$ if the individual i visited the pixel
 248 containing trap j and was detected. We imagine that y_{ij} is related to the latent variable m_{ij}
 249 being the event $m_{ij} > 0$, as follows:

$$y_{ij} \sim \text{Bern}(p_{ij})$$

250 where

$$p_{ij} = \Pr(m_{ij} > 0) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda(\mathbf{x}_j|\mathbf{s}_i))$$

251 This is the complementary log-log link relating p_{ij} to $\log(\lambda_{ij})$, setting $\lambda_{ij} \equiv \lambda(\mathbf{x}_j|\mathbf{s}_i)$:

$$\text{cloglog}(p_{ij}) = \log(\lambda_{ij})$$

252 where

$$\log(\lambda_{ij}) = \log(\phi_0) + a_0 - \alpha_1 d(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{s}_i)^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}_j).$$

253 and we collect the constants so that $\alpha_0 = \log(\phi_0) + a_0$ is the baseline encounter rate which
 254 includes the constant intensity of use by the individual and also the baseline rate of detection,

255 conditional on use.

256 4 The Joint RSF/SCR Likelihood

257 To construct the likelihood for SCR data when we have auxiliary covariates on space
258 usage *or* direct information on space usage from telemetry data, we regard the two samples
259 (SCR and RSF) as independent of one another. In practice, this might not always be the
260 case but (1) the telemetry data often come from a previous study; (2) Or, the individuals
261 are not the same, or cannot be reconciled, even if telemetry study occurs simultaneously;
262 (3) In cases where we *can* match some individuals between the two samples, regarding them
263 as independent should only entail a minor loss of efficiency because we are disregarding
264 more precise information on a small number of activity centers. Moreover, we believe, it is
265 unlikely in practice to expect the two samples to be completely reconcilable and that the
266 independence formulation is the most generally realistic.

267 Regarding the two data sets as being independent, our approach here is to form the
268 likelihood for each set of observations as a function of the same underlying parameters
269 and then combine them. In particular, let $\mathcal{L}_{scr}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, N; \mathbf{y}_{scr})$ be the likelihood for the
270 SCR data in terms of the basic encounter probability parameters and the total (unknown)
271 population size N , and let $\mathcal{L}_{rsf}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2; \mathbf{m}_{rsf})$ be the likelihood for the RSF data based on
272 telemetry which, because the sample size of such individuals is fixed, does not depend on N .
273 Assuming independence of the two datasets, the joint likelihood is the product of these two
274 pieces:

$$\mathcal{L}_{rsf+scr}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, N; \mathbf{y}_{scr}, \mathbf{m}_{rsf}) = \mathcal{L}_{scr} \times \mathcal{L}_{rsf}$$

275 In what follows, we provide a formulation of each likelihood component. An \mathbf{R} function for
 276 obtaining the MLEs of model parameters is given in Appendix 1.

277 We adopt the notation $f(\cdot)$ to indicate the probability distribution of whatever observ-
 278 able quantity is in question. e.g., $f(u)$ is the marginal distribution of u and $f(u|v)$ is the
 279 conditional distribution of u given v , etc. We use $g(\cdot)$ to represent the probability distribu-
 280 tion of latent variables. The observation model for the SCR data for individual i and trap
 281 j , from sampling over K encounter periods, is:

$$f(y_{ij}|\mathbf{s}_i) = \text{Bin}(K, p_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \quad (3)$$

282 where

$$p_{ij} \equiv p(d(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{s}_i), z(\mathbf{x}_j); \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda_{ij})$$

283 and

$$\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_0 \exp(-\alpha_1 d_{ij}^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}_j))$$

284 We emphasize that this is conditional on the latent variables \mathbf{s}_i (which appear in the distances
 285 d_{ij}). For these latent variables we adopt the standard assumption of uniformity, $\mathbf{s}_i \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{S})$
 286 for each individual $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ (Royle and Young, 2008) where \mathcal{S} is the state-space of
 287 the random variable \mathbf{s} .

288 The joint distribution of the data for individual i , conditional on \mathbf{s}_i , is the product of J
 289 binomial terms (i.e., the contributions from each of J traps):

$$f(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{s}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{j=1}^J \text{Bin}(K, p_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})).$$

290 The marginal likelihood (Borchers and Efford, 2008) is computed by removing \mathbf{s}_i , by inte-
 291 gration, from the conditional-on- \mathbf{s} likelihood and regarding the *marginal* distribution of the
 292 data as the likelihood. That is, we compute:

$$f(\mathbf{y}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{s}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha})g(\mathbf{s}_i)d\mathbf{s}_i$$

293 where, under the uniformity assumption, we have $g(\mathbf{s}) = 1/|\mathcal{S}|$. The joint likelihood for all
 294 N individuals, is the product of N such terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{scr}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}|\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N) = \prod_{i=1}^N f(\mathbf{y}_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

295 In practice, we don't know N and so we can't just compute the SCR likelihood in this manner.
 296 Instead, we compute the contributions of the n observed individuals directly as given above,
 297 but then we have to compute the likelihood contribution for the “all 0” encounter history,
 298 i.e., that corresponding to unobserved individuals. The mechanics of computing that are the
 299 same as for an ordinary observed encounter history, requiring that we integrate a binomial
 300 probability of $\mathbf{0}$ over the state-space \mathcal{S} :

$$\pi_0 = \Pr(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{0}|\mathbf{s}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})d\mathbf{s}.$$

301 We then have to deal with the issue that n itself is a random variable, and that leads to
 302 the combinatorial term in front of the likelihood which involves the total population size
 303 N . This produces the conditional-on- N or “binomial form” of the likelihood (Borchers and

304 Efford, 2008; Royle, 2009):

$$\frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \right\} \pi_0^{N-n}$$

305 For the RSF data from the sample of individuals with telemetry devices we adopt the
 306 same basic strategy of describing the conditional-on- \mathbf{s} likelihood and then computing the
 307 marginal likelihood by averaging over possible values of \mathbf{s} . We have \mathbf{m}_i , the $nG \times 1$ vector
 308 of pixel counts for individual i , where these counts are derived from a telemetry study or
 309 similar. We index these elements as m_{ig} for individual i and grid cell g , noting that our index
 310 j is reserved only for trap locations, which are a subset of the nG coordinates $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{nG}$.
 311 The conditional-on- \mathbf{s}_i distribution of the telemetry data from individual i is, omitting the
 312 multinomial combinatorial term which does not depend on parameters,

$$f(\mathbf{m}_i | \mathbf{s}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \propto \prod_{g=1}^{nG} \pi(\mathbf{x}_g | \mathbf{s}_i)^{m_{ig}}$$

313 where

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}_g | \mathbf{s}_i) = \frac{\exp(-\alpha_1 d_{ig}^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}_g))}{\sum_g \exp(-\alpha_1 d_{ig}^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}_g))}$$

314 The marginal distribution is

$$f(\mathbf{m}_i | \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(\mathbf{m}_i | \mathbf{s}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) g(\mathbf{s}_i) d\mathbf{s}_i$$

315 and therefore the likelihood for the RSF data is

$$\mathcal{L}_{rsf}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{Ntel}) = \prod_{i=1}^{Ntel} f(\mathbf{m}_i | \boldsymbol{\alpha}).$$

316 A key technical aspect of computing these likelihoods is the evaluation of the 2-dimensional
 317 integral over the state-space \mathcal{S} , which we approximate (Appendix 1) by a summation over a
 318 fine mesh of points. We note also that the binomial form of the likelihood here is expressed
 319 in terms of the parameter N , the population size for the landscape defined by \mathcal{S} . Given \mathcal{S} ,
 320 density is computed as $D(\mathcal{S}) = N/\text{area}(\mathcal{S})$. In our simulation study below we report N as
 321 the two are equivalent summaries of the data once \mathcal{S} is defined. Borchers and Efford (2008)
 322 develop a likelihood based on a further level of marginalization, in which N is removed from
 323 the likelihood by averaging over a Poisson prior for N .

324 5 Simulation Analysis

325 We carried-out a simulation study using the landscape shown in Fig. 1, and based on
 326 populations of size $N = 100$ and $N = 200$ individuals with activity centers distributed
 327 uniformly over the landscape. This covariate was simulated by generating a field of spatially
 328 correlated noise to emulate a typical patchy habitat covariate relevant to habitat quality
 329 for a species. We subjected individuals to sampling over $K = 10$ sampling periods, using
 330 a 7×7 array of trapping devices located on the the integer coordinates $(u * 5, v * 5)$ for
 331 $u, v = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$. The SCR encounter model was of the form

$$\text{cloglog}(p_{ij}) = \alpha_0 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}d_{ij}^2 + \alpha_2 z(\mathbf{x}_j)$$

332 with $\alpha_0 = -2$, $\sigma = 2$ and $\alpha_2 = 1$. In the absence of the covariate z , this corresponds to a
 333 RSF that is bivariate normal with standard deviation 2. These settings yielded an average of
 334 about $n = 61$ individuals captured for the $N = 100$ case and about $n = 123$ for the $N = 200$

335 case. The latter case represents what we believe is an extremely large sample size based on
336 our own experience and thus it should serve to gauge the large sample bias of the likelihood
337 estimator.

338 In addition to simulating data from this capture-recapture study, we simulated 2, 4, 8, 12,
339 16 telemetered individuals to assess the improvement in precision as sample size increases.
340 For all cases we observed 20 telemetry fixes *per* individual, assuming individuals were using
341 space according to a RSF model with the same parameters as those generating the SCR data.
342 We simulated 500 data sets for each scenario and, for each data set, we fit 3 models: (i) the
343 SCR only model, in which the telemetry data were not used; (ii) the integrated SCR/RSF
344 model which combined all of the data for jointly estimating model parameters; and (iii)
345 the RSF only model which just used the telemetry data alone (and therefore α_0 and N are
346 not estimable parameters). The focus of the simulations was to address the following basic
347 questions: (1) how much does the root mean-squared error (RMSE) of \hat{N} improve as we add
348 or increase the number of telemetered individuals? (2) How well does the SCR model do
349 at estimating the parameter of the RSF with *no* telemetry data? (3) How much does the
350 precision of the RSF parameter improve if we add SCR data to the telemetry data?

351 Results for $N = 100$, $N = 200$ and $N_{tel} = (2, 4, 8, 12, 16)$ are presented in Table 1. We
352 note that the first row of each batch (labeled “SCR only”) represent the same estimator and
353 data configuration. These replicate runs of the SCR-only situation give us an idea of the
354 inherent MC error in these simulations, which is roughly about 0.25 and 0.89 on the N scale
355 for the $N = 100$ and $N = 200$ cases, respectively. The mean N for the SCR-only estimator
356 across all 5 simulations for $N = 100$ was $\text{mean}(\hat{N}) = 99.418$, an empirical bias of 0.6%. For
357 $N = 200$, the estimated N across all 5 simulations (5 levels of N_{tel}) was $\text{mean}(\hat{N}) = 199.712$,

358 an empirical bias of about 0.15%, within the MC error of the true value of $N = 200$. The
359 results suggests a very small bias of $< 1\%$ in the MLE of N for both the SCR-only and
360 combined SCR/RSF estimators. In practice, we expect a small amount of bias in MLEs as
361 likelihood theory only guarantees asymptotic unbiasedness.

362 In terms of RMSE for estimating N , we see that (Table 1), generally, there is about a 5%
363 reduction in RMSE when we have at least 2 telemetered individuals. And, although there is a
364 lot of MC error in the RMSE quantities, it might be as much as a 10% reduction as the sample
365 size of captured individuals increases under the higher $N = 200$ setting. This incremental
366 improvement in RMSE of \hat{N} makes sense because, while the telemetry provides considerable
367 information about the structural parameters of the model, it provides no information about
368 mean p , i.e. α_0 , which comes only from the SCR data. Thus estimating N benefits only
369 slightly from the addition of telemetry data.

370 The MLE of the RSF parameter α_2 exhibits negligible or no bias under *both* the SCR
371 only and SCR/RSF estimators. It is well-estimated from SCR data alone and even better
372 than RSF data alone (in terms of RMSE) until we have more than 200 or so telemetry
373 observations. The biggest improvement from the use of telemetry data comes in estimating
374 the parameter σ . We see that $\hat{\sigma}$ is effectively unbiased, and there is a very large improvement
375 in RMSE of $\hat{\sigma}$, perhaps as much as 50-60% in some cases, when the telemetry data are used in
376 the combined estimator (that really doesn't translate much into improvements in estimating
377 N as we saw previously). Improvement due to adding telemetry data diminishes as the
378 expected sample sizes increases, and so telemetry data does less to improve the precision of
379 $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2$ for $N = 200$ than for $N = 100$. This is because the SCR data along are informative
380 about both of those parameters.

381 The results as they concern likelihood estimation of N suggest that there is not a substan-
 382 tial benefit to having telemetry data. Estimators “SCR only” and “SCR/RSF” both appear
 383 approximately unbiased for $N = 100$ and $N = 200$, and for any sample size of telemetered
 384 individuals. The RMSE is only 5-10% improved with the addition of telemetry information.
 385 However, we find that there is substantial bias in \hat{N} if we use the *misspecified* model that
 386 contains no resource selection component. That is if we leave the covariate $z(\mathbf{x})$ out of the
 387 model and incorrectly fit a model with symmetric and spatially constant encounter model,
 388 we see about 20% bias in the estimates of N in a limited simulation study that we carried-
 389 out (Tab. 2). As such, accounting for resource selection is important, even though, when
 390 accounted for, telemetry data only improves the estimator incrementally. In addition, we
 391 find that the importance of telemetry data is relatively more important for smaller sample
 392 sizes. We carried-out one simulation study for the $N = 100$ case but with lower average
 393 encounter probabilities, setting $\alpha_0 = -3$. This produces relatively smaller data sets with
 394 $E[n] = 37$. The results are shown in Tab. 3. There are some important features evident
 395 from this table. First, as a result of the small samples, the MLE of N is biased for both SCR
 396 only and SCR/RSF estimators although less biased for the SCR/RSF estimator than for
 397 SCR only. The persistent bias in \hat{N} for both models results from the information about α_0
 398 coming only from SCR data, and that estimator itself is intrinsically biased in small samples.
 399 Conversely, the estimator of α_2 , the RSF parameter, appears unbiased for all 3 estimators
 400 (SCR only, SCR/RSF and RSF only), as does the estimator of σ . We see relatively larger
 401 improvements in RMSE (compared with Tab. 1) of \hat{N} , and those improvements increase
 402 substantially as N_{tel} increases.

6 Discussion

How animals use space is a fundamental interest to ecologists, and important in the conservation and management of many species. Normally this is done by telemetry and models referred to as resource selection functions (Manly et al., 2002). Conversely, spatial capture-recapture models have grown in popularity over the last several years (Efford, 2004; Borchers and Efford, 2008; Royle, 2008; Efford et al., 2009; Royle et al., 2009; Gardner et al., 2010a,b; Kéry et al., 2010; Sollmann et al., 2011; Mollet et al., 2012; Gopaldaswamy et al., 2012). These, and indeed, most, development and applications of SCR models have focused on density estimation, not understanding space usage. However, it is intuitive that space usage should affect encounter probability and thus it should be highly relevant to density estimation in SCR applications. Despite this, a description of the relationship between encounter probability and space usage has not been developed in the literature on spatial capture-recapture models. Essentially all published applications of SCR models to date have been based on simplistic encounter probability models that are symmetric and do not vary across space. One exception is Royle et al. (2012) who developed SCR models that use ecological distance metrics (“least-cost path”) instead of normal Euclidean distance. Here we developed an SCR model in terms of a basic underlying model of space or resource use, that is consistent with existing views of resource selection functions (RSFs) (Manly et al., 2002).

In developing the SCR model in terms of an underlying model of space usage, we achieve a number of enormously useful extensions of existing SCR and RSF methods: (1) We have shown how to integrate classical RSF data from telemetry with spatial capture-recapture data based on individual encounter histories obtained by classical arrays of encounter devices

426 or traps. This leads to an improvement in our ability to estimate density, and also an
427 improvement in our ability to estimate parameters of the RSF function. Thus, the combined
428 model is both an extension of standard SCR models and also an extension of standard
429 RSF models. As many animal population studies have auxiliary telemetry information, the
430 ability to incorporate such information into SCR studies has enormous applicability and
431 immediate benefits in many studies. While adding RSF data to SCR data may increase
432 precision of the MLE of N only incrementally, the effect can be more substantial in sparse
433 data sets and, generally, RSF produces relatively huge gains in precision in the MLE of σ . (2)
434 We have shown that one can estimate RSF model parameters directly from SCR data *alone*.
435 While further exploration of this point is necessary, it does establish clearly that SCR models
436 *are* explicit models of space usage. Because capture-recapture studies are, arguably, more
437 widespread than telemetry studies alone, this greatly broadens the utility and importance of
438 data from those studies. (3) It is also now clear that one of the important parameters of SCR
439 models, that controlling “home range radius”, can be directly estimated from telemetry data
440 alone. The combined RSF+SCR model does yield large improvements in estimation of σ . As
441 a practical matter, this suggests we could estimate σ entirely from data extrinsic to the SCR
442 study which might provide great freedom in the design of SCR studies. For example, traps
443 could be spaced far enough apart to generate relatively few (even no) spatial recaptures,
444 but dramatically increase the coverage of the population, i.e., the observed sample size of
445 captured individuals relative to N . (4) Finally, we found that an ordinary SCR model with
446 symmetric encounter probability model produces extremely biased estimates of N when the
447 population of individuals does exhibit resource selection. As such, it is important to account
448 for space usage when important covariates are known to influence space usage patterns.

449 Use of telemetry data in capture-recapture studies has been suggested previously. For ex-
450 ample, White and Shenk (2001) and Ivan (2012) suggested using telemetry data to estimate
451 the quantity “probability that an individual is exposed to sampling” but their estimator
452 requires that individuals are sampled in proportion to this unknown quantity, which seems
453 impossible to achieve in many studies. In addition, they do not directly integrate the telem-
454 etry data with the capture-recapture model so that common parameters are jointly estimated.
455 In fact, they don’t acknowledge shared parameters of the two models. Sollmann et al. (2012)
456 did recognize this, and used some telemetry data to estimate directly the parameter σ from
457 the bivariate normal SCR model in order to improve estimates of density. This was an
458 important conceptual development in the sense that it recognized the relationship between
459 SCR models and models of space usage, but their model did not include an explicit resource
460 selection component, and they did not implement a joint estimation framework.

461 We developed a formal analysis framework here based on marginal likelihood (Borchers
462 and Efford, 2008). In principle, Bayesian analysis does not pose any unique challenges for
463 this new class of models although we expect some loss of computational efficiency due to
464 the increased number of times the components of the likelihood would need to be evaluated.
465 We imagine that some problems would benefit from a Bayesian formulation, however. For
466 example, using an open population model that allows for recruitment and survival over time
467 (Gardner et al., 2010a) is convenient to develop in the **BUGS** language and incorporating
468 information on unmarked individuals has been done using Bayesian formulations of SCR
469 models (Chandler and Royle, 2012; Sollmann et al., 2012) but, so far, not likelihood methods.

470 In our formulation of the joint likelihood for RSF and SCR data, we assumed the data
471 from capture-recapture and telemetry studies were independent of one another. This implies

472 that whether or not an individual enters into one of the data sets has no effect on whether
473 it enters into the other data set. We cannot foresee situations in which violation of this
474 assumption should be problematic or invalidate the estimator under the independence as-
475 sumption. In some cases it might so happen that some individuals appear in *both* the RSF
476 and SCR data sets. In this case, ignoring that information should entail only an incremental
477 decrease in precision because a slight bit of information about an individuals activity center
478 is disregarded. Heuristically, an SCR observation (encounter in a trap) is like one additional
479 telemetry observation, and so the misspecification (independence) regards the two pieces of
480 information as having separate activity centers. Our model pretends that we don't know
481 anything about the telemetered individuals in terms of their encounter history in traps. In
482 principle it shouldn't be difficult to admit a formal reconciliation of individuals between the
483 two lists. In that case, we just combine the two conditional likelihoods before we integrate
484 s from the conditional likelihood. This would be almost trivial to do if *all* individuals were
485 reconcilable (or none as in the case we have covered here) but, in general , we think you will
486 always have an intermediate case – i.e., either none will be or at most a subset of teleme-
487 tered individuals will be known. More likely you have variations of “well, that guy looks
488 telemetered but we don't know which guy it is....hmmm” and that case, basically a type of
489 marking uncertainty or misclassification, is clearly more difficult to deal with.

490 We conclude that the key benefit of our combined SCR/RSF model is its ability inte-
491 grate realistic patterns of space usage directly into SCR models and avoid extreme bias in
492 estimating N and, secondarily, we are able to obtain RSF information from SCR alone.
493 Therefore, our new class of integrated SCR/RSF models allows investigators to model how
494 the landscape and habitat influence movement and space usage of individuals around their

495 home range, using non-invasively collected capture-recapture data or capture-recapture data
496 augmented with telemetry data. This should improve our ability to understand, and study,
497 aspects of space usage and it might, ultimately, aid in addressing conservation-related prob-
498 lems such as reserve or corridor design. And, it should greatly expand the relevance and
499 utility of spatial capture-recapture beyond simply its use for density estimation.

500 **Acknowledgments**

501 **References**

- 502 Borchers, D., 2011. A non-technical overview of spatially explicit capture–recapture models.
503 *Journal of Ornithology* pages 1–10.
- 504 Borchers, D. L. and M. G. Efford, 2008. Spatially explicit maximum likelihood methods for
505 capture–recapture studies. *Biometrics* **64**:377–385.
- 506 Chandler, R. B. and J. A. Royle, 2012. Spatially-explicit models for inference about density
507 in unmarked populations. *Biometrics (in review)* .
- 508 Efford, M., 2004. Density estimation in live-trapping studies. *Oikos* **106**:598–610.
- 509 Efford, M. G., D. K. Dawson, and D. L. Borchers, 2009. Population density estimated from
510 locations of individuals on a passive detector array. *Ecology* **90**:2676–2682.
- 511 Fieberg, J., 2007. Utilization distribution estimation using weighted kernel density estima-
512 tors. *The Journal of wildlife management* **71**:1669–1675.

- 513 Fieberg, J. and C. Kochanny, 2005. Quantifying home-range overlap: the importance of the
514 utilization distribution. *Journal of Wildlife Management* **69**:1346–1359.
- 515 Forester, J. D., H. K. Im, and P. J. Rathouz, 2009. Accounting for animal movement in
516 estimation of resource selection functions: sampling and data analysis. *Ecology* **90**:3554–
517 3565.
- 518 Foster, R. J. and B. J. Harmsen, 2012. A critique of density estimation from camera-trap
519 data. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* **76**:224–236.
- 520 Gardner, B., J. Reppucci, M. Lucherini, and J. Royle, 2010a. Spatially explicit inference for
521 open populations: estimating demographic parameters from camera-trap studies. *Ecology*
522 **91**:3376–3383.
- 523 Gardner, B., J. A. Royle, M. T. Wegan, R. E. Rainbolt, and P. D. Curtis, 2010b. Estimating
524 black bear density using DNA data from hair snares. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*
525 **74**:318–325.
- 526 Gopalaswamy, A. M., J. A. Royle, M. Delampady, J. D. Nichols, K. U. Karanth, and D. W.
527 Macdonald, 2012. Density estimation in tiger populations: combining information for
528 strong inference. *Ecology* .
- 529 Hooten, M., D. Johnson, E. Hanks, and J. Lowry, 2010. Agent-based inference for animal
530 movement and selection. *Journal of agricultural, biological, and environmental statistics*
531 **15**:523–538.
- 532 Ivan, J., 2012. Density, demography, and seasonal movements of snowshoe hares in central
533 Colorado. Ph.D. thesis, Colorado State University.

- 534 Johnson, D., 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating
535 resource preference. *Ecology* **61**:65–71.
- 536 Johnson, D. S., D. L. Thomas, J. M. Ver Hoef, and A. Christ, 2008. A general framework
537 for the analysis of animal resource selection from telemetry data. *Biometrics* **64**:968–976.
- 538 Kéry, M., B. Gardner, T. Stoeckle, D. Weber, and J. A. Royle, 2010. Use of Spatial Capture-
539 Recapture Modeling and DNA Data to Estimate Densities of Elusive Animals. *Conserva-
540 tion Biology* **25**:356–364.
- 541 Manly, B., L. McDonald, D. Thomas, T. McDonald, and W. Erickson, 2002. Resource
542 selection by animals: statistical design and analysis for field studies. Springer, second
543 edition.
- 544 Mollet, P., M. Kéry, B. Gardner, G. Pasinelli, and R. J. A, 2012. Population size estimation
545 for capercaillie (*tetrao urogallus l.*) using dna-based individual recognition and spatial
546 capture-recapture models. *missing missing*:missing.
- 547 Royle, J., 2009. Analysis of capture-recapture models with individual covariates using data
548 augmentation. *Biometrics* **65**:267–274.
- 549 Royle, J. A., 2008. Modeling individual effects in the Cormack–Jolly–Seber model: a state-
550 space formulation. *Biometrics* **64**:364–370.
- 551 Royle, J. A., R. B. Chandler, K. D. Gazenski, and T. A. Graves, 2012. Ecological distance
552 in spatial capture-recapture models. *Ecology in review*.
- 553 Royle, J. A., K. U. Karanth, A. M. Gopalaswamy, and N. S. Kumar, 2009. Bayesian infer-

554 ence in camera trapping studies for a class of spatial capture-recapture models. *Ecology*
555 **90**:3233–3244.

556 Royle, J. A. and K. V. Young, 2008. A Hierarchical Model For Spatial Capture-Recapture
557 Data. *Ecology* **89**:2281–2289.

558 Sollmann, R., M. M. Furtado, B. Gardner, H. Hofer, A. T. A. Jacomo, N. M. Trres, and
559 L. Silveira, 2011. Improving density estimates for elusive carnivores: Accounting for sex-
560 specific detection and movements using spatial capture-recapture models for jaguars in
561 central brazil. *Biological Conservation* **144**:1017–1024.

562 Sollmann, R., B. Gardner, R. B. Chandler, D. Shindle, D. P. Onorato, J. A. Royle, and A. F.
563 O’Connell, 2012. Spatially-explicit models yield first density estimate of the endangered
564 florida panther .

565 White, G. and M. Shenk, 2001. Population estimation with radio-marked individuals. In
566 J. Millsaugh and J. Marzluff, editors, *Radio tracking and animal populations*, pages 329–
567 350. Academic Press, San Diego, USA.

568 Worton, B., 1989. Kernel methods for estimating the utilization distribution in home-range
569 studies. *Ecology* **70**:164–168.

570 **Appendix 1: R script for obtaining MLEs under the**

571 **SCR+RSF model**

572 `### before running this code, put the functions at the end of this script`

```

573 ### into your R workspace
574 ###
575
576
577 ## the following block of code makes up a covariate as a spatially correlated
578 ## noise field, with an exponential spatial correlation function
579 set.seed(1234)
580 gr<-expand.grid(1:40,1:40)
581 Dmat<-as.matrix(dist(gr))
582 V<-exp(-Dmat/5)
583 z<-t(chol(V))%*%rnorm(1600)
584 spatial.plot(gr,z)
585
586
587 ###
588 ### Set some parameter values
589 ###
590 alpha0 <- -2
591 sigma<- 2
592 beta<- 1
593 Ntel<-4      # number of individuals with telemeters
594 nsim<-100
595 Nfixes<-20   # number of telemetry fixes per individual
596 N<- 100      # population size
597

```

```

598
599 # simulate activity centers of all N individuals
600 Sid<- sample(1:1600,N,replace=TRUE)
601 # and coordinates
602 S<-gr[Sid,]
603 # now draw centers of telemetered individuals
604 # have to draw telemetry guys interior or else make up more landscape --
605 # can't have truncated telemetry obs
606
607 poss.tel<- S[,1]>5 & S[,1]<35 & S[,2]>5 & S[,2]<35
608 tel.guys<-sample(Sid[poss.tel],Ntel)
609 sid<-tel.guys
610 stel<-gr[sid,]
611
612 # make up matrix to store RSF data
613 n<-matrix(NA,nrow=Ntel,ncol=1600)
614
615 # for each telemetered guy simulate a number of fixes.
616 # note that n = 0 for most of the landscape
617 par(mfrow=c(3,3))
618 lammat<-matrix(NA,nrow=Ntel,ncol=1600)
619 for(i in 1:Ntel){
620     d<- Dmat[sid[i],]
621     lam<- exp(1 - (1/(2*sigma*sigma))*d*d + beta* z)
622     n[i,]<-rmultinom(1,Nfixes,lam/sum(lam))

```

```

623   par(mar=c(3,3,3,6))
624   lammat[i,]<-lam
625   img<- matrix(lam,nrow=40,ncol=40,byrow=FALSE)
626   image(1:40,1:40,rot(img),col=terrain.colors(10))
627 }
628
629 ## now lets simulate some SCR data on a bunch of guys:
630
631 # make a trap array
632 X<- cbind( sort(rep( seq(5,35,5),7)), rep( seq(5,35,5),7))
633 ntraps<-nrow(X)
634 raster.point<-rep(NA,nrow(X))
635 for(j in 1:nrow(X)){ # which piont in the raster is the trap? must be raster points
636   raster.point[j]<- (1:1600)[ (X[j,1]==gr[,1]) & (X[j,2] == gr[,2])]
637 }
638 points(X,pch=20,cex=2)
639
640 D<- e2dist(S,X) ## N x ntraps
641 Zmat<- matrix(z[raster.point],nrow=N,ncol=ntraps,byrow=TRUE) # note make dims the same
642 loglam<- alpha0 -(1/(2*sigma*sigma))*D*D + beta*Zmat
643 p<- 1-exp(-exp(loglam))
644
645 ## Now simulate SCR data
646
647 K<- 10

```



```

648 y<-matrix(NA,nrow=N,ncol=ntraps)
649 for(i in 1:N){
650 y[i,]<- rbinom(ntraps,K,p[i,])
651 }
652
653 cap<-apply(y,1,sum)>0
654
655 y<-y[cap,]
656 gr<-as.matrix(gr)
657 sbar<- (n%*%gr)/as.vector(n%*%rep(1,nrow(gr)))
658
659 # Basic SCR model with RSF covariate at trap locations.
660 tmp1<-nlm(intlik3rsf.v2,c(-3,log(3),1,0),y=y,K=K,X=X,ztrap=z[raster.point],G=gr)
661
662 # use telemetry data and activity centers for those are marginalized out of the likelihood
663 tmp2<-nlm(intlik3rsf.v2,c(-3,log(3),1,0),y=y,K=K,X=X,ztrap=z[raster.point],G=gr,ntel=n,zall=as
664
665 # use mean "s" instead of estimating it
666 tmp3<-nlm(intlik3rsf.v2,c(-3,log(3),1,0),y=y,K=K,X=X,ztrap=z[raster.point],G=gr,ntel=n,zall=as
667
668 # no SCR data, s is random. Here there are 2 extra parameters that are not estimated: start[1]
669 tmp4<-nlm(intlik3rsf.v2,c(-3,log(3),1,0),y=NULL,K=K,X=X,ztrap=z[raster.point],G=gr,ntel=n,zall=
670
671 # Fits SCR model with isotropic Gaussian encounter model
672 tmp5<- nlm(intlik3rsf.v2,c(-3,log(3),1,0),y=y,K=K,X=X,ztrap=rep(0,ntraps),G=gr)

```

673

674

675 ###

676 ### put all the functions below this line into your R workspace

677 ###

678

679 spatial.plot<-

680 function(x,y){

681 nc<-as.numeric(cut(y,20))

682 plot(x,pch=" ")

683 points(x,pch=20,col=topo.colors(20)[nc],cex=2)

684 ###image.scale(y,col=topo.colors(20))

685 }

686

687 ### This is the likelihood function

688 ### It computes several versions of the likelihood depending on the arguments specified

689 ### see the 5 examples above

690

691 intlik3rsf.v2 <-function(start=NULL,y=y,K=NULL,X=traplocs,ztrap,G,ntel=NULL,zall=NULL,stel=NULL)

692 # start = vector of length 5 = starting values

693 # y = nind x ntraps encounter matrix

694 # K = how many samples?

695 # X = trap locations

696 # ztrap = covariate value at trap locations

697 # zall = all covariate values for all nG pixels

```

698 # ntel = nguys x nG matrix of telemetry fixes in each nG pixels
699 # stel = home range center of telemetered individuals, IF you wish to estimate it. Not necessa
700
701 nG<-nrow(G)
702 D<- e2dist(X,G)
703
704 alpha0<-start[1]
705 sigma<- exp(start[2])
706 alpha2<- start[3]
707 n0<- exp(start[4])
708 a0<- 1
709
710 if(!is.null(y)){
711 loglam<- alpha0 -(1/(2*sigma*sigma))*D*D + alpha2*ztrap # ztrap recycled over nG
712 probcap<- 1-exp(-exp(loglam))
713 #probcap<- (exp(theta0)/(1+exp(theta0)))*exp(-theta1*D*D)
714 Pm<-matrix(NA,nrow=nrow(probcap),ncol=ncol(probcap))
715 ymat<-y
716 ymat<-rbind(y,rep(0,ncol(y)))
717 lik.marg<-rep(NA,nrow(ymat))
718 for(i in 1:nrow(ymat)){
719 Pm[1:length(Pm)]<- (dbinom(rep(ymat[i,],nG),rep(K,nG),probcap[1:length(Pm)],log=TRUE))
720 lik.cond<- exp(colSums(Pm))
721 lik.marg[i]<- sum( lik.cond*(1/nG) )
722 }

```

```

723 nv<-c(rep(1,length(lik.marg)-1),n0)
724 part1<- lgamma(nrow(y)+n0+1) - lgamma(n0+1)
725 part2<- sum(nv*log(lik.marg))
726 out<- -1*(part1+ part2)
727 }
728 else{
729 out<-0
730 }
731
732 if(!is.null(ntel) & !is.null(stel) ){
733
734 # this is a tough calculation here
735 D2<- e2dist(stel,G)^2
736 # lam is now nG x nG!
737 lam<- t(exp(a0 - (1/(2*sigma*sigma))*t(D2)+ alpha2*zall)) # recycle zall over all ntel guys
738 denom<-rowSums(lam)
739 probs<- lam/denom # each column is the probs for a guy at column [j]
740
741 tel.loglik<- -1*sum( ntel*log(probs) )
742
743 out<- out + tel.loglik
744 }
745
746 if(!is.null(ntel) & is.null(stel) ){
747

```

```

748 # this is a tough calculation here
749 D2<- e2dist(G,G)^2
750 # lam is now nG x nG!
751 lam<- t(exp(a0 - (1/(2*sigma*sigma))*t(D2)+ alpha2*zall)) # recycle zall over all ntel guys
752 denom<-rowSums(lam)
753 probs<- t(lam/denom) # each column is the probs for a guy at column [j]
754 marg<- as.vector(rowSums(exp(ntel%*%log(probs))/nG ))
755
756 tel.loglik<- -1*sum(log(marg))
757
758 out<- out + tel.loglik
759 }
760
761 out
762 }
763

```

Table 1: Mean and RMSE of sampling distribution of the MLE of N and other model parameters under a model of resource selection using only SCR data, SCR combined with RSF data on N_{tel} individuals, and with RSF only data on N_{tel} individuals. Simulations results are based on 500 Monte Carlo simulations of populations containing $N = 100$ or $N = 200$ individuals. The true parameter values were $\alpha_2 = 1$ and $\sigma = 2$.

Estimator	N=100										N=200															
	$N_{tel} = 2$	\hat{N}	RMSE	$\hat{\alpha}_2$	RMSE	$\hat{\sigma}$	RMSE	\hat{N}	RMSE	$\hat{\alpha}_2$	RMSE	$\hat{\sigma}$	RMSE	$N_{tel} = 4$	\hat{N}	RMSE	$\hat{\alpha}_2$	RMSE	$\hat{\sigma}$	RMSE						
SCR only:	99.73	9.97	0.14	0.99	0.14	2.00	0.124	198.85	14.24	0.99	0.10	2.00	0.091	SCR only	99.10	9.83	0.13	0.99	0.13	0.127	200.06	15.34	1.00	0.09	2.00	0.092
SCR/RSF:	99.94	9.54	0.12	0.99	0.12	2.00	0.097	199.37	12.80	0.99	0.09	2.00	0.078	SCR/RSF	99.17	9.47	0.11	0.99	0.11	0.086	200.25	14.36	1.00	0.08	2.01	0.073
RSF only	-	-	0.33	1.03	0.33	2.00	0.160	-	-	1.04	0.33	1.99	0.169	RSF only	-	-	0.22	0.98	0.22	0.119	-	-	1.02	0.21	2.01	0.122
$N_{tel} = 8$														SCR only	99.59	10.00	0.13	1.00	0.13	0.130	200.85	14.06	1.00	0.09	2.00	0.087
SCR/RSF	98.90	10.02	0.10	0.99	0.10	2.00	0.071	200.29	13.98	1.00	0.08	2.00	0.061	SCR/RSF	98.90	10.02	0.10	0.99	0.10	0.071	200.29	13.98	1.00	0.08	2.00	0.061
RSF only	-	-	0.16	0.98	0.16	2.01	0.084	-	-	0.99	0.16	2.00	0.084	RSF only	-	-	0.16	0.98	0.16	0.084	-	-	0.99	0.16	2.00	0.084
$N_{tel} = 12$														SCR only	99.44	10.73	0.13	0.98	0.13	0.128	198.76	14.47	0.99	0.10	2.00	0.091
SCR/RSF	99.96	10.26	0.09	1.00	0.09	2.00	0.059	198.72	14.14	1.00	0.08	2.00	0.054	SCR/RSF	99.96	10.26	0.09	1.00	0.09	0.059	198.72	14.14	1.00	0.08	2.00	0.054
RSF only	-	-	0.12	1.01	0.12	2.00	0.069	-	-	1.01	0.13	2.00	0.069	RSF only	-	-	0.12	1.01	0.12	0.069	-	-	1.01	0.13	2.00	0.069
$N_{tel} = 16$														SCR only	99.23	10.74	0.14	0.99	0.14	0.128	200.04	14.09	0.99	0.10	2.01	0.088
SCR/RSF	99.20	9.79	0.09	1.00	0.09	1.99	0.057	200.25	13.40	1.00	0.07	2.00	0.047	SCR/RSF	99.20	9.79	0.09	1.00	0.09	0.057	200.25	13.40	1.00	0.07	2.00	0.047
RSF only	-	-	0.10	1.00	0.10	1.99	0.061	-	-	1.00	0.11	2.00	0.055	RSF only	-	-	0.10	1.00	0.10	0.061	-	-	1.00	0.11	2.00	0.055

Table 2: Expected value of \hat{N} and $\hat{\sigma}$ for truth $N = 200$ and $\sigma = 2$ under a model of resource selection with a single covariate, when the encounter probability model is misspecified by a symmetric and constant model assuming no resource selection; column “bias” is *percent* bias.

	$E[\hat{N}]$	bias	RMSE	$E[\hat{\sigma}]$	RMSE
n=2	161.48	-19.2	39.98	1.84	0.180
n=4	161.32	-19.3	40.00	1.83	0.191
n=8	161.46	-19.3	40.06	1.84	0.184
n=12	162.40	-18.8	38.95	1.84	0.185
n=16	160.93	-19.5	40.44	1.84	0.190

Table 3: Mean and RMSE of the sampling distribution of the MLE for model parameters for the $N = 100$ and “low p ” case. For each of 500 simulated data sets, a model was fit using the SCR likelihood only, the joint SCR/RSF likelihood, and the RSF likelihood only. For the latter, the parameter N is not statistically identifiable.

Estimator	$E[\hat{N}]$	RMSE	$E[\hat{\alpha}_2]$	RMSE	$E[\hat{\sigma}]$	RMSE
$N_{tel} = 2$						
SCR only	103.85	22.88	1.00	0.19	2.02	0.261
SCR/RSF	102.90	20.98	1.00	0.17	2.00	0.136
RSF only	–	–	1.02	0.30	1.99	0.163
$N_{tel} = 4$						
SCR only	105.65	26.52	1.01	0.20	2.01	0.258
SCR/RSF	103.55	22.92	1.01	0.14	2.00	0.104
RSF only	–	–	1.01	0.21	1.99	0.114
$N_{tel} = 8$						
SCR only	107.41	45.05	0.99	0.19	2.01	0.254
SCR/RSF	104.28	22.13	1.00	0.12	2.00	0.076
RSF only	–	–	1.01	0.15	1.99	0.081
$N_{tel} = 12$						
SCR only	106.35	27.32	0.99	0.19	2.00	0.255
SCR/RSF	104.11	21.81	1.00	0.10	2.00	0.063
RSF only	–	–	1.01	0.12	2.00	0.065
$N_{tel} = 16$						
SCR only	104.05	31.41	0.99	0.19	2.02	0.252
SCR/RSF	101.98	20.78	1.00	0.09	2.00	0.055
RSF only	–	–	1.00	0.10	2.00	0.056

764 FIGURE CAPTIONS

765 **Figure 1:** A typical habitat covariate reflecting habitat quality or hypothetical utility of
766 the landscape to a species under study. Home range centers for 8 individuals are shown with
767 black dots.

768 **Figure 2:** Space usage patterns of 8 individuals under a space usage model that contains a
769 single covariate (shown in Fig. 1). Plotted value is the multinomial probability π_{ij} for pixel
770 j under the model in Eq. 2.




Figure 1: A typical habitat covariate reflecting habitat quality or hypothetical utility of the landscape to a species under study. Home range centers for 8 individuals are shown with black dots.




Figure 2: Space usage patterns of 8 individuals under a space usage model that contains a single covariate (shown in Fig. 1). Plotted value is the multinomial probability π_{ij} for pixel j under the model in Eq. 2.