animal2vec and MeerKAT A self-supervised transformer for rare-event raw audio input and a large-scale reference dataset for bioacoustics

Julian C. Schäfer-Zimmermann, ^{1,2,3,*} Vlad Demartsev, ^{1,2,3,4} Baptiste Averly, ^{1,2,3,4} Kiran Dhanjal-Adams, ^{1,2,3} Mathieu Duteil, ^{1,2,3} Gabriella Gall, ^{1,2,3,5} Marius Faiß, ^{1,2} Lily Johnson-Ulrich, ^{4,6} Dan Stowell, ^{7,8} Marta B. Manser, ^{4,6,9} Marie A. Roch, ^{10,†} and Ariana Strandburg-Peshkin^{1,2,3,4,†}

¹Department for the Ecology of Animal Societies, Max Planck Institute of Animal Behavior, Konstanz, Germany

²Department of Biology, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

³Centre for the Advanced Study of Collective Behaviour, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

⁴Kalahari Research Centre, Van Zylsrus, Northern Cape, South Africa

⁵Zukunftskolleg, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

⁶Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁷Department of Cognitive Science and Artificial Intelligence, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

⁸Naturalis Biodiversity Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

⁹Interdisciplinary Center for the Evolution of Language, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

¹⁰Department of Computer Science, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, USA (Dated: July 29, 2024)

Bioacoustic research, vital for understanding animal behavior, conservation, and ecology, faces a monumental challenge: analyzing vast datasets where animal vocalizations are rare. While deep learning techniques are becoming standard, adapting them to bioacoustics remains difficult. We address this with *animal2vec*, an interpretable large transformer model, and a self-supervised training scheme tailored for sparse and unbalanced bioacoustic data. It learns from unlabeled audio and then refines its understanding with labeled data. Furthermore, we introduce and publicly release *MeerKAT*: **Meer**kat Kalahari Audio Transcripts, a dataset of meerkat (*Suricata suricatta*) vocalizations with millisecond-resolution annotations, the largest labeled dataset on non-human terrestrial mammals currently available. Our model outperforms existing methods on *MeerKAT* and the publicly available *NIPS4Bplus* birdsong dataset. Moreover, *animal2vec* performs well even with limited labeled data (few-shot learning). *animal2vec* and *MeerKAT* provide a new reference point for bioacoustic research, enabling scientists to analyze large amounts of data even with scarce ground truth information.

Introduction

Bioacoustics, the study of animal sounds, reveals invaluable insights into the behavior [1–3], ecology [4–6], and conservation [7, 8] of animal species. Automated analysis of acoustic recordings can greatly advance the types of questions that can be asked by enabling annotation of long-duration recordings. Despite the broad potential of bioacoustic datasets, events of interest such as vocalizations are often sparse, brief, and in noisy conditions, making manual as well as automated analysis challenging [9–16].

Deep learning is a common approach to tackle large and dense datasets [17], and, recently, transformer-based models [18] have achieved state-of-the-art results across many tasks and modalities [19]. However, there is a lack of such large-scale datasets and training approaches for sparse data using nextgeneration transformer-based models within bioacoustics [20]. Currently, in bioacoustics, the primary data (audio waveforms) are usually feature-engineered into spectrograms for input to convolutional neural network models (CNNs) originally designed for computer vision [20]. However, using spectrograms and CNNs is justified more by empirical success than conceptual fitness. Spectrograms challenge the notion of translational invariance in CNNs [21], discard phase information or temporal fine structure [20], and the commonly used Mel-scale biases the input toward human hearing [20]. Further, in computer vision, attention-based encoder-only visual transformers

(ViTs) [22, 23] have replaced CNNs, excelling through largescale pretraining on dense datasets. Pretraining is a method of learning a general model, which can then be finetuned on downstream tasks. This training paradigm is referred to as pretraining/finetune, where the gold standard is supervised pretraining [22, 24]. Supervised pretraining requires large, diverse, and fully-labeled datasets (for example, Imagenet for computer vision [25]). However, this strategy is not feasible in bioacoustics due to limited labeled dataset size. The largest publicly available labeled bioacoustic dataset is the Animal subset of Audioset [26], with 112.6 h across 40758 10 s samples. However, Audioset is weakly-labeled [27], is based on YouTube videos that do not reflect realistic bioacoustic recording scenarios, is heavily dominated by recordings of domestic animals and birds ($\approx 75 \%$), and is still significantly shorter than the smallest pretraining corpus in human speech recognition, Librispeech (940 hours) [28].

Self-supervised learning can provide an alternative to supervised pretraining [29–31], where the generalist model is trained using an artificial supervisory task created from the data without using any ground truth labels [31].

Currently, contrastive-learning-based (CLR) pretraining is the dominant scheme in computer vision [32–36] and audio processing [37–40], whereas generative methods (learning by reconstructing), either autoregressive [41] or bidirectional mask-prediction [42–44], yield state-of-the-art results in natural language processing. However, these approaches are conceptually

ill-equipped to handle sparse and unbalanced bioacoustic data. Generative pretraining is known to diverge when faced with sparse and noisy data [45, 46] and CLR-based methods suffer from so-called *easy negative sampling* [47, 48], where a model struggles to converge as the small number of relevant signals is too easy to identify compared to the irrelevant bulk of the data, which, in return, leads to little contribution to the contrastive loss function from the relevant signals.

Despite these obstacles, ViTs have recently been introduced to bioacoustics [49–54], where approaches range from no pretraining [50, 51] to various pretraining strategies, including webscraped human speech [54], human language audio-caption pairs [53], pretraining on ImageNet [25, 49], or repurposing pretrained CNNs from Audioset [26] as a pre-transformer feature extraction step [52]. However, as of now, pretraining a transformer model with bioacoustic data itself remains an open problem.

In sum, deep learning in bioacoustics faces multiple challenges: First, the inherent limitations of spectrographic representations; second, the lack of large-scale fully labeled datasets for supervised pretraining; and third, the conceptual problems of prevailing self-supervised pretraining strategies, such as CLR, with sparse, noisy, and unbalanced bioacoustic data.

We address these challenges by releasing the *animal2vec* framework and the *MeerKAT* dataset.

animal2vec is a framework for training animal call recognizers from raw waveforms containing sparsely distributed calls with non-uniformly distributed call types. It uses a pretraining paradigm called mean teacher self-distillation [55–59], which is known to be more robust with respect to sparse and noisy data [60]. Distillation, in general, is the notion of transferring knowledge from a teacher to a student model, whereas mean teacher self-distillation is to update only the student model via gradient descent and let the teacher model track the student's weights using an exponentially moving average (EMA), see methods section 1 for an intuition on how this works. Further, animal2vec extracts the input features directly from the pressure waveforms using a learned set of SincNet-style filterbanks [61], a custom activation function, and a transformer encoder [18, 59].

animal2vec is conceptually simple, excels with noisy and sparse datasets, achieves state-of-the-art performance, is capable of learning from limited labeled training data (few-shot learning), and provides temporal and spectral interpretability.

MeerKAT: Meerkat Kalahari Audio Transcripts, is a 1068 h large-scale dataset that exhibits realistic sparsity conditions containing data from audio-recording collars worn by free-ranging meerkats (Suricata suricatta) at the Kalahari Research Centre, South Africa [62], of which 184 h are labeled with twelve time-resolved vocalization-type ground truth target classes, each with few-millisecond resolution, making it the largest publicly-available labeled bioacoustic dataset on non-human terrestrial mammals to date.

Here, we first describe the features of the *MeerKAT* bioacoustic dataset (section I) and the *animal2vec* framework (section II). We then evaluate the performance of *animal2vec* on detect-

ing and classifying calls in the *MeerKAT* dataset (section III), including when only a subset of the available data are used (few-shot learning) or when parts of the *animal2vec* framework are removed (known as an *ablation study*). We further demonstrate the interpretability of the learned parameters of *animal2vec* (section IV). Finally, we evaluate the performance of *animal2vec* on a publicly available bioacoustic dataset (section V). We release all the code and pretrained models under an MIT license [63] at our GitHub repository [64], and the *MeerKAT* dataset under a Creative Commons BY-NC license [65] at the Max-Planck data repository Edmond [66].

Our work (i) paves the way to adapt and specialize nextgeneration transformer models to the domain of bioacoustics using the unified *animal2vec* framework, (ii) allows researchers with limited labeled data to classify large amounts of challenging data, and (iii) introduces the first bioacoustic benchmark to evaluate large-scale pretrain/finetune approaches under realistic sparsity and class balancing conditions.

Results

I. The MeerKAT bioacoustic dataset

The compilation of *MeerKAT* reflects an extensive collaborative effort by researchers and students (see Acknowledgements) who recorded, labeled, and validated the dataset over an extended period. The data were collected during two field seasons (Aug-Sep 2017 and Jul-Aug 2019) at the Kalahari Research Centre (KRC) in South Africa. Meerkats are a social mongoose species native to the arid parts of southern Africa. Meerkats forage throughout the day by digging in the ground for prey, remaining cohesive with their group mates while moving within their territory. They use vocalizations to mediate a variety of social behaviors, and their vocal repertoire has been extensively characterized through decades of field research [67, 68].

MeerKAT is released as 384 592 10-second samples, amounting to 1068 h, where 66 398 10-second samples (184 h) are labeled and ground-truth-complete; all call and recurring anthropogenic events in this 184 h are labeled. All samples have been standardized to a sample rate of 8 kHz with 16-bit quantization, which is sufficient to capture the majority of MeerKAT vocalization frequencies (the first two formants are below the Nyquist frequency of 4 kHz [69]). The total dataset size of 59 GB (61 GB, including the label files) is comparatively small, making MeerKAT easily accessible and portable despite its extensive length.

By agreement with the KRC, we have made these data available in a way that can further machine learning research without compromising the ability of the KRC to continue conducting valuable ecological research. Consequently, the filenames of the 10-second samples have been randomly sampled, and their temporal order and individual identity cannot be recovered. However, this information can be requested from us.

In total, eight *vocalization* classes and three *miscellaneous* classes were identified. The vocalization classes are: *close call* [70], *short-note call* [71, 72], *social call* [67], *alarm call*




FIG. 1. The statistics of the *MeerKAT* dataset and precision-recall curves of the presented classifier. a) shows the temporal distributions of all *MeerKAT* classes in 12 violin plots. Each category shows kernel density estimates of duration for the class (colored splits on the right). The global distribution across all categories is shown in gray on the left of each plot to make clear how the label durations of each category relate to the dataset overall. All splits are scaled to full width, where the scaling multiplier is shown at the top of each split, as the number of examples for each category varies considerably. In each split, dashed lines show the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile, where the 50th percentile (median) value is written next to its dashed line. In addition, the event-count, the total duration in minutes, and the percentage with respect to all counts/total duration are displayed at the top of each plot. b) shows four precision-recall curves for (i) the global micro average, and the (ii) close call, (iii) short-note call, and (iv) alarm call class. Results of *animal2vec* using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray. Overlays within each subplot show statistics about the occurrence-wise percentage share and the median duration of all events in this class.

[73], aggressive call [71], move call [71, 74], lead call [74], and other call (see also [67, 68] for a general overview on meerkat vocalizations). Meerkats can produce some calls that do not fit well into the set of described calls. These calls are frequently hybrid calls that bear similarity to multiple call types, or are simply too rare to have their own category. Such calls are labeled as other call within MeerKAT. The three miscellaneous classes are for non-call events. The synch and beep events are generated by a GPS clock that was used to synchronize acoustic streams to one another across animals for the purposes of the behavioral study for which the data were collected (see 2d in [75]). The eating label indicates chewing noises from a successful foraging event. Figure 2 provides concrete examples for a continuous audio stream and for every class.


In addition to the vocalization and miscellaneous classes, a superordinate class called *focal* is used to indicate when a call was produced by the focal animal wearing the collar as opposed to a nearby conspecific. Trained analysts made this decision based on relative intensity of calls, changes in the frequency spectrum, and contextual information (see also supplemental information in [75]). Each 10-second file has an accompanying *hierarchical data format v5* (HDF5) label file [76] that lists label categories, start and end time offsets (s), and a focal indicator.

MeerKAT is multi-class and multi-label, which means that ground-truth labels may overlap. Labels are based on multiple annotators and have a temporal resolution of a little over 10 ms which is consistent with other estimates of inter-annotator reliability [77]). All classes, as well as the distribution of the call durations, are shown in figure 1a.

MeerKAT is a highly unbalanced and sparse dataset in terms of event-occurrence, event-durations, and class balance. While the labeled subset covers almost 184 h, the total duration of all labeled data is only 13.2 h (7.2 %). Moreover, considering only the meerkat-vocalization events, this reduces to 7.8 h (4.2 %). For example, while the short note call class is overrepresented in terms of occurrence (27 % of all counts), the median duration is only 37 ms, making it underrepresented in terms of duration (4 % of the total event duration, whereas 9 % would be expected in a balanced dataset). On the other end, the long-duration synch class is an artificial voice from a GPS clock whose median duration is 1258 ms, making it account for 28.1 % of the total duration of all events but only for 4 % of all occurrences. Furthermore, the rarest five classes (other call, alarm call, aggressive call, move call, lead call) added together account for only 14 % of the occurrences and 12 % of the total duration. Differences in the duration and frequency of events make analyzing class abundance challenging. A class can be underrepresented in terms of the number of examples while being simultaneously overrepresented in terms of overall duration or vice versa. In the case of *MeerKAT*, both types of class imbalance are present, and moreover they do not align. Therefore, there is no clear path to implement existing approaches to handle imbalance in this type of dataset [78, 79].

Ultimately, MeerKAT makes a formidable benchmark for ex-

a) A realistic example



b) Class examples with low noise




FIG. 2. Example Mel spectrograms for a representative audio snippet and for each class in dBr scale. (a) a representative stream of audio and (b) the individual classes in *MeerKAT*. a) shows four alarm call events covered by a varying amount of spectrally broad, ultra-short, and non-stationary noise patterns originating from the *MeerKAT*s foraging for food by digging in the ground or bumping their collars into obstacles. Noise patterns such as these permeate the majority of *MeerKAT*. b) shows the spectral variability between classes, where the examples shown do not represent the overall data quality but reflect clean candidates.

ploring sparsity, noise-resistance, and imbalance in bioacoustics, containing events that are rare or plentiful, long or short, artificial or natural, temporally and/or occurrence-wise sparse, and spectrally rich, all while being covered in a challenging amount of spectrally broad, ultra-short, and non-stationary noise patterns (Figure 2).

The overall structure of *MeerKAT*, having a huge unlabeled and a large fully-labeled subset originating from the same pool of audio files, make it an ideal test-bed for pretraining/finetune approaches in bioacoustics. Additional information about recording, labeling, and pre-processing the *MeerKAT* dataset can be found in methods section 2 and 3.

TABLE I. Class-wise dataset statistics and results. a) shows the average precision scores (AP) [80] of each model, where the given percentage indicates the training sample size during finetuning. *Transformer baseline* uses 100% of the training samples for finetuning. The strongest result per class is in bold letters. The two bottom rows show the micro- and macroaverage across all classes except *Focal*. b) shows the training and evaluation split sample sizes used for finetuning. The standard deviation (std) across the stratified multilabel 5-fold cross validation routine [81] is given in smaller brackets next to each value, where, in a), the std refers to the AP scores across the validation splits, and, in b), the std refers to the sample number for each class.

a) Average precision scores [80] b) San			Samp	ole sizes				
	Transformer baseline[59]	а	nimal2ve	rc	Evaluation		Training	
% Training labels	100 %	1 %	25 %	100 %	-	1 %	25 %	100 %
Focal	0.59 (2)	0.86(1)	0.92 (1)	0.94 ₍₁₎	24594 (280)	983 (28)	24650 (135)	98520 (280)
		,	Vocalization	s				
Close call	$0.49_{(1)}$	0.90 (2)	0.93 (2)	0.94(1)	22418 (153)	907 (41)	22342 (137)	89310 (153)
Short-note call	0.14(1)	$0.88_{(1)}$	$0.91_{(1)}$	$0.92_{(1)}$	13336 (158)	522 (40)	13505 (139)	54051 (158)
Social call	$0.30_{(2)}$	0.65 (1)	0.79 (1)	$0.84_{(1)}$	4788 (81)	207 (14)	4847 (42)	19431 (81)
Other call	0.07 (2)	0.33(3)	0.43 (2)	0.50 ₍₃₎	2754 (67)	114 (18)	2799 (58)	11192 (67)
Alarm call	0.03(1)	$0.57_{(1)}$	$0.73_{(1)}$	$0.80_{(1)}$	1649 (118)	71 (12)	1704 (74)	6684 (118)
Aggressive call	0.09(1)	0.54(2)	$0.62_{(1)}$	0.71 (2)	1214 (58)	50 (15)	1338 (28)	5181 (58)
Move call	0.09 (2)	0.53 (1)	$0.59_{(2)}$	0.61 (1)	$1080 {\scriptstyle (23)}$	42 (6)	1071 (34)	$4226_{\scriptscriptstyle{(23)}}$
Lead call	0.01 (1)	$0.41_{(1)}$	0.39 (2)	$0.50_{(1)}$	165 (10)	8 (1)	174 (12)	667 (10)
		ľ	Miscellaneou	IS				
Synch signal	0.91 (1)	$0.89_{(1)}$	$0.96_{\scriptscriptstyle{(1)}}$	0.98 (2)	1999 (2)	80 (0)	1997 (1)	$7990_{\scriptscriptstyle{(2)}}$
Eating	0.12(1)	$0.59_{(1)}$	0.83 (2)	0.87 (1)	760 (10)	31 (2)	754 (11)	3019 (10)
Beep Signal	0.26 (1)	0.74 (1)	$0.77_{(2)}$	0.80(1)	$430_{(5)}$	18 (1)	431 (4)	1725 (5)
Macroaverage	0.26(1)	0.66(1)	0.74 (1)	0.78 ₍₁₎				
Microaverage	0.30(1)	$0.83_{(1)}$	$0.88_{(1)}$	$0.91{\tiny (1)}$				

II. The animal2vec framework

Design of animal2vec

animal2vec uses a self-distillation framework similar to data2vec 2.0 [59], where the model is treated as three components: a single feature extractor and two contextualizing networks (student and teacher, figure 3). The feature extractor is domain-specific, and the two contextualizing networks are domain-agnostic transformer architectures [18]. The feature extractor receives the batch of input samples and produces a fixed-size initial representation that is fed to the two contextualizing networks. The teacher receives the full initial representation from the feature extractor, and the student receives the unmasked timesteps from a masked embedding (figure 3 and methods section 4). The teacher produces a target embedding, and the student produces a prediction embedding. The loss function is then a mean-squared-error regression to match the prediction and the target. The full unlabeled MeerKAT data (all of the 1068 h) is used to pretrain a single model that is used in the finetuning experiments.

For additional information about the transformer architecture, our domain-specific regularization and masking techniques during pretraining, and the pretraining hyperparameters for each setting see methods section 4 to 5 and table S1.

Finetuning animal2vec

For finetuning, we largely follow the approach in [37, 58, 59], but average the embeddings from all transformer layers rather than just using the output of the last layer, use the focal criterion [82] as opposed to cross entropy as loss function, and use between-classes-Learning [83] (BCL). See methods section 6 for further details.

We conduct four experiments: A full finetuning using all available labels, two few-shot experiments using 1 % and 10 % of the labels for finetuning, and one generalizability study with hold-out data not used for pretraining or finetuning. All experiments' finetune and evaluation splits, except for the generalizability study, are produced using stratified 5-fold multi-label cross-validation [81]. Final results are averaged and provided along with their standard deviation. See methods section 3 for further details on how we produced the data splits and methods section 8 for more information on the generalizability study.

Evaluating animal2vec

To evaluate the performance of animal2vec, we compute metrics based on predictions of start and end times of labeled events rather than classification of short-duration audio frames. We assess the correspondence between these predictions and ground truth annotations. We use these metrics as opposed to frame-level predictions as behavioral, communication, and ecology studies predominately require information such as number or sequence of calls, timing between calls, duration, etc., which can easily be derived from event-level predictions. Details on the evaluation process are in the methods section 7. To characterize model performance with the *MeerKAT* dataset, we use precision-recall (PR) curves. A PR curve is constructed by plotting precision values on the vertical axis against recall values on the horizontal axis across various likelihood thresholds. Likelihood is the output of our model and its threshold determines the value above which an instance is predicted as belonging to a class (whether a call was detected). Precision describes how accurate the positive predictions are (out of all events predicted by the model, how many are correct), while recall describes how complete they are (out of all labeled events in the ground truth data, how many were predicted by the model). By varying the likelihood threshold, we can explore the trade-off between the model's precision and recall.

Furthermore, we use the average precision (AP) score [80] to assess class-wise performance. The AP score is a robust estimator for the area under the PR curve [84] and is computed by averaging the interpolated precision values at evenly spaced recall levels across the entire precision-recall curve.

We compare *animal2vec* to the transformer baseline presented in Baevski et al. (2022) [59]. This baseline introduced the pretraining scheme we adapted to bioacoustics, and achieved state-of-the-art results on the Librispeech speech recognition corpus [28]. It is optimized for human speech but is architecturally close to *animal2vec*.

To determine which features of *animal2vec* are most important to its performance, we also perform an ablation study. Ablation studies in machine learning test the importance of different model components by systematically removing them and observing the impact on performance. Here we ablate our choices for the masking and regularization adaptations, the BCL augmentation, the layer averaging strategy, and the use of focal loss in methods section 9. See Table S2 for the finetuning hyperparameters for each setting.

III. Performance of animal2vec on the MeerKAT dataset

Overall, animal2vec consistently outperforms the transformer baseline even in the 1 % few-shot experiment (figure 1b, table Ia). The baseline achieves a precision ≥ 0.5 for recall values below 0.2 (overall AP score is 0.30), whereas even the animal2vec 1 % few-shot model never falls below a precision of almost 0.7 (at recall around 0.8; overall AP score is 0.83). The models trained using the 25 % and 100 % finetune splits outperform the baseline and the 1 % result by a wide margin (overall AP scores of 0.88 and 0.91). Their AP scores and

animal2vec pretraining scheme and model




FIG. 3. animal2vec pretraining schematic.

precision-recall curves are comparable, indicating that, for the global micro average, a saturation level may have been reached above which improvement is not achievable by merely providing more labeled samples.

To demonstrate the variation in performance across different event types, we present three representative event classes in the main text. 1 (common and long): The close call class is the easiest to classify as it is very common (most abundant

single vocalization) and is comparably long (median duration of 115 ms). 2 (common and short): the short-note call class is the hardest to classify in terms of duration as it has the shortest median duration (37 ms) yet it occurs frequently (second most abundant vocalization). 3 (rare and long): the alarm call class is the hardest to classify in terms of occurrence (fourth rarest vocalization) but has a comparable median duration to the close call class (112 ms). We present the precision-recall curves of all other classes in supplemental figures S3 - S13.

The results for the three selected classes in figure 1b show the transformer baseline performing reasonably on the close call class (*the common and long class*; AP score of 0.49) but achieving low scores with the short-note and alarm call class (*the shortest and the rare class*; AP scores of 0.14 and 0.03). *animal2vec* significantly outperforms this baseline, achieving AP scores of 0.90, 0.88, and 0.57 using 1% of the data and 0.94, 0.92, and 0.80 using 100% of the data.

As observed in the global average, results using $25\,\%$ and $100\,\%$ of the labels are comparable, indicating a saturation effect, where further improvements are not attainable through more labeling. We observe this saturation effect for all but four classes (other, alarm, aggressive, and lead calls). These four classes are among the five rarest classes (table Ia). The move call class is the only rare class where animal2vec was able to achieve a comparable result in the $25\,\%$ and $100\,\%$ setting. We attribute this to the move call class being somewhat easier to predict, having a longer median duration of $182\,\text{ms}$ (the third longest of all vocalization classes), but being not so rare as the comparably long lead call class (figure 1a).

The results for the miscellaneous classes (synch, beep, and eating) are comparable to the vocalization classes, except for the synch signal class. There, the transformer baseline performs almost on par with *animal2vec*, achieving an AP score of 0.91. This is expected as a synch signal contains synthetic speech stating the current time. The baseline performs well on this class since it was designed for human speech [59]. However, even in this case, *animal2vec* (1%) matches the baseline performance (AP score of 0.89), learning from only 80 labeled examples, compared to the 7990 labeled examples in the baseline.

The results of the generalizability study are presented and discussed in methods section 8, where we show that *animal2vec* generalizes well without a reduction in AP score when large parts of the *MeerKAT* dataset are left out of the pretraining and finetuning, and only used for evaluation.

IV. Interpreting animal2vec trained models

The structure of *animal2vec* has the advantage of allowing some degree of interpretability, allowing us to understand what features the trained model has learned to attend to in both the spectral and temporal domains.

In the spectral domain, the importance of different frequency bands can be deduced from the cumulative frequency response (CFR) of the learned sinc filters (as per [61]). In the temporal domain, importance can be inferred from the attention maps of the transformer architecture. We discuss only the temporal interpretation using attention maps in the main text and refer the reader to methods section 10 for an analysis of the CFR of the sinc module in *animal2vec*, where we show that the CFR of the sinc filters in *animal2vec* align with the expected frequencies found in meerkat vocalizations.

Attention is the dominant information-extraction mechanism in transformer architectures where multiple dot-product-based projections (called heads) [18] enable contextualized reasoning that considers each signal's future and past when making a prediction; see section S2 in the supplemental material for more details. Visualizing the weights of these projections (called attention scores) provides a path for understanding the model's decision-making process.

Interpreting attention maps is a much-debated topic [85–89]. The consensus is that attention maps often provide excellent and intuitive explanations but sometimes are entirely misleading. Therefore, scientists still need to interpret them cautiously [88]. We follow the nomenclature in [90] and interpret the attention scores not as explanations but as importance. Furthermore, we provide scripts in our repository [64] to extract all attention maps from all heads and layers.

To illustrate temporal interpretability, we provide an example (figure 4) that shows a heatmap of all attention maps averaged across the model (256 attention maps in total, see table S1 and section S2 in the supplemental material).

In this example, the dominant feature is, as expected, the diagonal, which represents importance given by the model to use the current audio frame to make predictions about the current audio frame. In addition, three other observations are striking in figure 4. (i) For the three move calls that are not covered in regions of spectrally broad noise (first, second, and fourth from the top), *animal2vec* attends to the future and the past of the current audio frame (left and right from the diagonal) for the whole duration of the call. (ii) For the one noisy move call (third from the top), *animal2vec* attends to the previous move call while predicting the noisy one, and (iii) *animal2vec* attends to almost all frames in the input sequence for most of the ultra-short, spectrally broad noise patterns.

The most challenging prediction in this segment is the one on the noisy move call. *animal2vec* did not miss it and achieved an intersection over union (IOU) of 0.95 with the ground truth, meaning that the labeling expert estimated onset and offset almost exactly as *animal2vec* did. Interestingly, *animal2vec* stops attending to the previous move call when it stops predicting a move call event, although this area is fully buried under noise and other background signals. We hypothesize that the repetition of vocalizations within a sequence can be a proxy for predicting them. This is corroborated by the somewhat extreme example in figure S1. There, a repetition of 15 alarm calls, closely following each other, is shown. *animal2vec* attends to the majority of all previous and future calls while predicting the current one.

Behavioral research confirms that meerkat vocalizations often appear in repeated sequences within and among conspecifics [75, 91]. Attending to previous repetitions as a proxy for making predictions has been shown to be beneficial for classifier

Globally averaged attention map




FIG. 4. Globally averaged attention map of a four-second segment showing four move calls. *animal2vec* operates on pressure waves, but spectrograms are shown here for visualization. Each row shows the importance of the surrounding context for predicting the class associated with an audio frame where dashed lines show the onset/offset of each *animal2vec* call prediction, which are additionally shown using a blue colormap. An attention map shows the *importance* of every input frame with respect to every other frame. For predicting, *animal2vec* attends to the immediate past and future of an event, as well as to a previous instance in the case of the noisy move vocalization.

performance on fin whale songs [92] using long short-term memory enhanced convolutional models, whereas *animal2vec* extends this observation to using future predictions as well.

V. Performance of animal2vec on the NIPS4Bplus benchmark dataset

To connect our work to published results and to show that small-scale datasets can be used for supervised finetuning if *animal2vec* is pretrained with data from a comparable domain, we provide results on the publicly available NIPS4Bplus bird-song dataset [93, 94]. We pretrain our model with a subset of the data from the xeno-canto database [95], a large community science project holding recordings of bird vocalizations, provided as part of the Cornell Birdcall Identification Kaggle challenge [96–98]. This pretraining dataset has no overlap with the NIPS4Bplus dataset and a total duration of approximately 700 h, see methods section 11 for more details.

The NIPS4Bplus dataset is an openly available multi-class and multi-label birdsong audio dataset with annotations for call onset and duration initially created for the NIPS4B 2013 challenge [99]. It contains 687 recordings of 51 bird species categorized into 81 classes with a total duration of \approx 1 h, see methods section 12 for a brief description.

TABLE II. Microaverage classification results on the NIPS4Bplus dataset [14]. The metrics for the models trained on pre-segmented sequences are taken from [93] and the one for binary timestep prediction is the best result from [94], called *WHEN model using MMM loss*. In addition, we provide results for *animal2vec*'s Onset/Offset/Overlap predictions, using the same methodology described in methods section 7.

Model	Precision	Recall	F 1			
a) Predictions on pre-segmented sequences						
Densenet121	0.76	0.75	0.76			
Resnet50	0.76	0.74	0.75			
SincNet	0.75	0.73	0.74			
VGG16	0.74	0.73	0.74			
Waveform + CNN	0.72	0.71	0.71			
Onset/Offset/Overlap predictions						
animal2vec	0.81	0.88	0.82			
b) Binary predictions on timesteps						
WHEN (MMM)	-	-	0.74			
animal2vec	0.79	0.86	0.82			

We evaluate precision, recall, and F1 scores of *animal2vec* and compare these to results reported in [93, 94] (table II). While Morfi et al. (2018) [94] reported results from an event detector that produced a binary classification hypotheses for each spectrogram frame, Bravo Sanchez et al. (2021) [93] report class-prediction scores for pre-segmented sequences only containing the event to be classified.

We compare *animal2vec* class-wise event-based predictions, see methods section 7, to the results of Bravo Sanchez et al. (2021) [93] in table IIa. Event-based predictions are arguably more challenging than pre-segmented sequences, as onsets, offsets, and signal-absent conditions also have to be predicted. Furthermore, to enable a comparison with Morfi et al. (2018) [94], we examine frame-level predictions of *animal2vec* and calculate event detection scores by treating any prediction for any class for a given timestep as an event prediction (table IIb. Consequently, we create many false positives with this approach, which, presumably, reduces the reported precision score of *animal2vec*.

With this in mind, the increase in F1 of about 0.06 compared to Densenet121 (the strongest model in [93]), and 0.08 compared to the WHEN (MMM) model in [94], sets a new baseline on the NIPS4BPlus dataset. We note that this also outperforms a SincNet implementation [93] which utilizes a comparable audio-analysis frontend to *animal2vec*.

However, it is important to note that if pretraining is not an option, *animal2vec* is not a feasible path due to its size. Models such as the very small SincNet (2.6M parameters) provide a good alternative with a reasonable trade-off between model interpretability, computational complexity, and classification

performance.

Discussion

In this work, we present *animal2vec* and *MeerKAT* and make them openly available. *animal2vec* is a self-supervised framework and transformer-based model tailored for bioacoustics, while *MeerKAT* is the largest public dataset on non-human terrestrial mammals and is specifically designed for the pretraining/finetune training paradigm.

Bioacoustics is, in many regards, a more demanding field than human speech recognition research due to its lack of labeled large-scale datasets and domain-specific pretraining methods in combination with a focus on rare and brief events of interest. *animal2vec* addresses these challenges and outperforms a comparable transformer architecture devised for human speech by a large margin on the *MeerKAT* dataset. In addition, *animal2vec* demonstrates strong few-shot learning capabilities, enabling researchers without access to large amounts of labeled data to effectively finetune *animal2vec*.

MeerKAT, comprising over 1000 h of audio, of which 184 h have detailed labels, enables analysis of event detection performance and noise resilience. We designed animal2vec as a modular framework, where our novel feature extraction module can be used as a frontend for other models, our transformer model can be used with other frontends, and both can be used with other pretraining or finetuning approaches on different datasets or jointly trained with MeerKAT.

To enable comparison with existing work, we evaluated a xeno-canto pretrained animal2vec on the NIPS4Bplus dataset, setting a new baseline. The immediate future for animal2vec is (i) to incorporate more data from more species (insects, birds, marine, and terrestrial animals), recording environments (marine, avian), using a more diverse set of recorders (passive acoustic monitoring, different portable recorders using different microphones, audio from video traps, community science data [100]) where challenges like the large variability in different sampling rates need to be solved, and (ii) to include more data modalities such as accelerometer and GPS data from next-generation biologging tags [2], where animal2vec needs to be enabled to make use of such auxiliary data streams but not to decrease in performance when they are missing.

Ultimately, our vision for *animal2vec* and *MeerKAT* is for them to be the first stepping stone towards a next-generation reference work, where, in the future, we envision a foundational-level pretrained *animal2vec* model that researchers can directly use for finetuning on their data without the need for large-scale GPU facilities.

While much work remains to achieve this vision, we hope that providing data and code that are open, accessible, and portable will help stimulate the bioacoustics community to work with us toward achieving this goal.

Methods

1: Mean-teacher distillation

Mean-teacher distillation is a method in self-supervised learning in which two models (a student and a teacher) are jointly optimized without using dataset labels. The general idea is to provide a sample from the dataset to the teacher and a masked copy to the student model. The teacher's output is considered the target, and the student solves a regression problem to minimize the mean-squared error between its and the teacher's output. In *animal2vec*, the teacher is a copy of the student model, whose weights are obtained by tracking the student's weights using an exponential moving average.

Grill and colleagues [56] provide intuition for why mean-teacher distillation works. They randomly initialized two models: A fixed non-trainable (teacher) and a trainable model (student). The teacher received the input, and the student was trained to regress the embeddings produced by the teacher. Evaluating the student model, after training, on ImageNet [25] using the linear-evaluation protocol [101, 102] resulted in 18.8 % top-1 accuracy, whereas the fixed teacher scored 1.4 %.

Consequently, it is possible to obtain improved embeddings from the embeddings of an inferior model. Intuitively, in the mean teacher self-distillation regime, the student learns an improved representation by regressing the teacher's output, which in return improves the teacher, as its weights are updated by tracking the student's ones. This is a feedback loop and sequentially increases the performance of both models over the course of the pretraining. Afterward, only the student model is used for subsequent finetuning.

2: MeerKAT audio and labels

Overall, 2521 h of audio has been recorded in 1284 files. The majority of the audio (2269 h in 756 3-hour-long files) originated from acoustic collars (Edic Mini Tiny+ A77, Zelenograd, Russia, which sample at 8 kHz with 10 bit quantization) that were attached to the animals (41 individuals throughout both campaigns), where each file corresponds to a recording for a single individual and day. The remainder of the dataset (252 h in 528 files of varying length) was recorded using Marantz PMD661 digital recorders (Carlsbad, CA, U.S.) attached to directional Sennheiser ME66 microphones (Wedemark, Germany) sampling at 48 kHz with 32 bit quantization. When recording, field researchers held the microphones close to the animals (within 1 m). The data were recorded during times when *MeerKAT*s typically forage for food by digging in the ground for small prey, see [2] and [75] for more details.

Labeling was done to cover as many different files from as many days and individual *MeerKAT*s as possible. In total, 325 files were partially labeled (at least 1 h, but not the full file to cover more files), of which 278 contain audio from collars and 47 from directional microphones. The 325 files were split into 384 592 10-second samples, amounting to 1068 h, of which 66 398 10-second samples (184 h) are labeled.

All 10-second samples have been standardized to a sample rate of 8 kHz with 16-bit quantization, where downsampling was done using Torchaudio's resample method [103] with a Kaiser window [104] and a low-pass filter width of 8 ms. This yields a total dataset size of just under 59 GB (61 GB including the label files).

3: Experimental design for MeerKAT

We conducted the following experiments: (i) A full finetuning using all training data, (ii - iii) two few-shot experiments, and (iv) one generalizability study with a holdout data not used for pretraining or finetuning. The finetuned models for the scenarios (i) to (iii) are using the same pretrained model checkpoint, while the finetuned model in scenario (iv) uses its own pretrained model checkpoint. The finetune and evaluation splits for scenario (i) and (ii) are produced using stratified 5-fold multi-label cross-validation [81]. Final results are averaged and provided along with their standard deviation.

Our strategy to produce (i) to (iii) was to produce the five folds of finetune and evaluation splits in the first step using all available data. This produces the scenario in (i). Then, for each of the five finetune splits, we construct two stratified few-shot versions using $1\,\%$ and $25\,\%$ of the data, keeping the evaluation split identical for all scenarios. This produces the scenarios in (ii) and (iii) and yields a total of 15 finetune and five evaluation splits: Five folds for each of the three finetune splits (using $1\,\%, 25\,\%$, and $100\,\%$ of the training data) and one evaluation split for each fold.

For the holdout generalizability study (iv), we randomly selected $62 \approx 20\%$ full files of the 325 base files in *MeerKAT* and used all labeled 10 s-segments

within them to produce a 33.5h evaluation split. The data used in this evaluation split are not used during pretraining or finetuning.

4: For pretraining, animal2vec uses a large transformer architecture, a custom feature extractor, and a novel activation function

We follow [37, 58, 59] and use large transformers [18] for the student and the teacher with N=16 layers (figure 3) and 16 attention heads with an embedding dimensionality of 1024 (see section S2 in the supplemental material). We use a custom feature extractor tailored for bioacoustic data that employs SincNet-style filterbanks [61] and a stack of 1D convolutional layers that learns a downsampling to an effective sample rate of $f_{sr, eff}=200\,\mathrm{Hz}$. The feature extractor module (figure 3, highlighted in yellow) has a receptive field size of 46 ms. Our Sinc module differs from [61] in that it uses no max pooling, a different activation function, layer normalization, and a Sinc filter kernel length $k=\lfloor f_{sr}/126\rfloor$, where f_{sr} is the signal sample rate. This rule fixes the spectral resolution to 126 Hz and results in a kernel size of 63 for MeerKAT and 253 for NIPS4Bplus. A spectral resolution of 126 Hz was empirically found to work best for both datasets and is of a similar resolution to that used in [61].

Research on activation functions has shown that early convolutional layers benefit from near-linear parametric activation functions as these often act as bandpass filters [105]. Therefore, we use a custom version of the Swish activation function [106] (sometimes called SiLU with learnable β parameter [107]) called PSwish with additional learnable parameter α of the form: $h(x) = x \alpha \sigma(\beta x)$, where σ is the sigmoid function. Each sinc filter is followed by its own learnable PSwish activation function initialized with $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 0$, and exclude α and β from the weight decay regularization as smaller activation parameters are not necessarily beneficial in parametric activations [105]. Setting up α and β this way, PSwish is a linear activation when training starts but can become an individual non-linearity for every filter throughout training.

As in [59], we embed only unmasked timesteps with the student network, use a learned positional encoding [108], and implement a 1D convolutional network to regress the prediction embedding, where the masked timesteps are filled with Gaussian noise prior to passing it to the transformer network [109]. Furthermore, we re-use the teacher representation as target for multiple masked versions of the input sample, this is called multi-mask training [59]. Passing only unmasked timesteps to the student and re-using the teacher for multi-masking improves efficiency and reduces the computational cost significantly [59] since the computational complexity of transformer networks scales quadratically with their input length [18].

The teacher network tracks the student weights using an EMA update rule, where we use the implementation and parameters in [58, 59].

The output of our model consists of likelihood estimates with a resolution of 200 Hz. A full schematic of the model in pretraining mode is shown in figure 3. The final model has 315M trainable parameters. We train for 100 epochs using the decoupled Adam optimizer (weight decay of 0.01) [110], a cosine learning rate schedule [111], linear warmup for 10 000 steps, a final learning rate of 1×10^{-4} , gradient clipping of 1 [112], and a batch size of 1020 s on four NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB GPUs for 20 d. The code is written in PyTorch [113] using the fairseq framework [114]. The pretraining parameters for all settings can be found in table S1 in the supplemental material.

We estimate that our setup consumed 3200 kWh (the typical yearly consumption of a German household [115]) with a carbon footprint of approximately 1400 kg_{CO2eq}. (average emission factor of 2023 for Germany is 400 g_{CO2eq}. kW⁻¹ h⁻¹ [116]). While the resources to train such a model are expensive, leased resources such as using Google Cloud tensor processing unit (TPU) v5p chips are capable of pretraining our model for a more modest cost (about \$500 at the time of writing) and reduce the carbon footprint significantly [117]. Furthermore, as outlined in the conclusions, we strive to produce a broadly pretrained variant of *animal2vec*, the most computationally demanding part of *animal2vec*. Once this is established, researchers do not have to repeat this task and can finetune *animal2vec* with their specific data using consumer-grade hardware. In addition, researchers can already use our *MeerKAT*- or xeno-canto-pretrained *animal2vec* models to finetune their custom downstream tasks




FIG. 5. Mask length distributions of the baseline (solid red line) and our *animal2vec* model (solid yellow line) during pretraining. For comparison we also show the distribution of the sample lengths (dashed teal line). Modeled after figure 2 in the appendix in [37].

5: Bioacoustic data requires strong regularization

Regularization alters the model architecture, the input data, or the training process to increase robustness against out-of-distribution samples, noise, label imbalance, and overfitting [60]. Using strong regularization has a rich history in bioacoustics since natural sounds inherently present immense variability between species, individuals, and environments. Models in bioacoustics can easily overfit to training data, struggling to generalize to new scenarios. [20, 118–120].

For animal2vec pretraining we use decoupled weight decay [110], dropout [121], LayerDrop [122], and layer normalization [123] in all layers. We augment the input audio files using the stochastic A-weighted input mixing in between-classes-learning [83] (BCL, A-weighted stochastic mixing, figure 3). We reduce the window length in BCL from 100 ms to 50 ms to calculate the Aweighted sound pressure levels to account for the fact that animal vocalizations act on a shorter timescale than the generic sound input BCL was designed for. However, the most critical regularization technique during the animal2vec pretraining stage is the stochastic strategy used to mask the embeddings input to the student model (figure 3) where we use the same ruleset as in [37, 58, 59]. First, the masking routine randomly selects a proportion (specified by the probability parameter p) of the total timesteps in the embedding space. These act as starting points for the masked spans. Then, starting from each selected timestep, the model masks a consecutive span of steps (the length of this span is determined by the mask length parameter M) by filling the span with randomized values from a normal distribution. Masked spans can overlap, where the union of the overlapping regions is then used for masking. Higher values for p select more start frames, and higher values for M mask longer spans, starting from these start frames.

Most research on pretraining using mean-teacher self-distillation and raw audio as input is concerned with human speech audio [58, 59]. However, reconstructing masked timesteps from their surroundings is easier for human speech than for bioacoustic data.. Humans have rich vocal expressions where information is correlated over longer stretches of time compared to *MeerKATs* and most other non-human animals. Furthermore, sparsity is much less pronounced in human speech data than in bioacoustic datasets [20, 59].

The best set of parameters for human speech and a sampling rate of $16\,\mathrm{kHz}$ is p=0.065 and M=10 [37, 58, 59], which produces a distribution in which $49\,\%$ of all timesteps are masked, and the most frequent span length (the mode in the red mask length distribution in figure 5) is $50\,\mathrm{ms}$. Such a distribution would almost always mask a complete short-note call (median duration of $35\,\mathrm{ms}$, figure 1a) when a starting point was selected near such a call. It would expose long stretches of noise to the teacher as only $49\,\%$ of all timesteps

are masked, but over 96 % of MeerKAT contains various challenging noise patterns.

Therefore, the masking strategy in animal2vec selects more starting points (p = 0.150) with shorter mask lengths (M = 2). This way, almost 96% are masked, but the mode of the mask length distribution is 22 ms (the yellow mask length distribution in figure 5).

6: For finetuning, we use strong regularization to tackle sparsity and a self-weighted loss to address label imbalance

For finetuning, we mostly follow the approach in [37, 58, 59]. We discard the teacher and the 1D convolutional network (figure 3) and freeze the weights of the feature extractor. We add a classification head containing a sigmoid-activated linear projection layer and perform a warm-up phase for 10 000 steps, where the student weights are also frozen. The warm-up phase aligns the randomly initialized classification head with the rest of the model. Prior to the classification head, we average the embeddings from all transformer layers rather than just using the output of the last layer; this has been shown to improve results in human speech recognition [58].

After the warm-up phase, we unfreeze the student model and finetune the classification head along with the student model for the remainder of the training. To account for the label imbalance in MeerKAT, we use the focal criterion [82] as opposed to cross entropy as loss function. Focal loss adds a regularization term of the form $(1 - p_t)^{\gamma}$ to the cross entropy, where p_t is the model's estimated probability for observing a particular class - the model's likelihood. Setting γ to a positive number reduces the relative difference in loss between examples where the model is confident (high likelihood) and where it is not (low likelihood). This approach penalizes the effort to improve predictions with high likelihood and forces the model to focus on the ones with low likelihood. As during pretraining, we use between-classes-Learning [83] (BCL) with our modified window length for augmenting the input audio, and we mask parts of the input using the same stochastic masking strategy but with fewer masked spans, depending on the finetuning setting (table S1). For the MeerKAT (100 %) setting, we use p = 0.0825 and M = 4, which sets the mode of the mask distribution to 22 ms while 60 % of all timesteps are masked. Compared to the pretraining setting, we aim to maintain a masking distribution with a mode duration below the shortest vocalizations in the dataset but mask fewer of total timesteps. The idea of masking during finetuning is not to create an artificial regression task, as during pretraining, but to use masking as a regularization technique.

7: We report real-life relevant per-event metrics

While our model generates likelihood estimates at a temporal resolution of 200 Hz, we evaluate performance using per-event scores since reporting metrics on a frame level are biased with respect to event length. Longer events cover more timesteps and need more predictions than shorter ones. This favors overly positive or, likewise, disfavors overly negative models. We calculate event-based scores where a single event is a single prediction, regardless of the event length. In addition, frame-level metrics are not relevant to most biological/ecological questions for which call labels are needed. We report how many calls were correctly identified and how many were missed, rather than focusing on the likelihood of each audio frame.

We calculate this as follows:

- Event boundary prediction: We slide a fixed-length average-pooling window (filter width is 100 ms) across the model's likelihood output to predict event onsets and offsets within a continuous audio stream. A fixed threshold is applied to binarize the output, generating a step function representing our event boundary estimates.
- Intersection-over-union (IOU) calculation: Using the IOU metric, we measure the overlap between the ground truth event spans and our predictions. Predicted spans without corresponding ground truth events are assigned an IOU of zero.
- Final likelihood assignment: If the IOU for a predicted event exceeds
 0.5, the average model likelihood within the predicted span is used
 as the final scalar likelihood. All reported metrics utilize these final
 likelihood values.

TABLE III. Results on the evaluation split for the holdout generalizability study. The average precision scores (AP) [80] for the baseline and *animal2vec*. Both models use 100 % of the training samples for finetuning. The strongest result per class is in bold letters. The two bottom rows show the micro- and macroaverage across all classes except *Focal*. Arrows and values in a smaller font next to the results show the change of score with respect to table I.

Average precision scores [80]

Transformer	haseline[59]	animal2vec (100%)
Transioning	Dascillicia	anumal 2 vec (100.70)

Focal	0.54 \ 0.05	0.93 ↓ 0.01			
	vocanzations				
Close call	$0.47 \downarrow 0.02$	0.93 ↓ 0.01			
Short-note call	0.14 10.00	0.90 ↓ 0.01			
Social call	0.27 \ 0.03	0.82 ↓ 0.02			
Other call	0.04 \ 0.03	0.46 ↓ 0.04			
Alarm call	0.03 \$ 0.00	0.80 \$ 0.00			
Aggressive call	0.10 ↑ 0.01	0.69 ↓ 0.02			
Move call	0.08 \downarrow 0.01	0.61 1 0.00			
Lead call	0.01 \$0.00	0.51 ↑ 0.01			
Miscellaneous					
Synch signal	0.89 \ 0.02	0.98 \$ 0.00			
Eating	0.11 0.01	0.86 ↓ 0.01			
Beep signal	0.22 \ 0.04	0.80 \(\tau 0.00			
Macroaverage	0.24 \ 0.02	0.76 ↓ 0.02			
Microaverage	0.28 \ 0.02	0.90 ↓ 0.01			

 Error identification: Ground truth events without predicted boundaries are considered false negatives. Predicted spans lacking a ground truth counterpart, or those with insufficient IOU, are considered false positives.

A schematic of this process can be found in figure S14 in the the supplemental material.

8: animal2vec generalizes well

For analyzing the generalizability of animal2vec, we tested the cross-validated models against a held-out set of data ($\approx 20\%$ of the MeerKAT labeled data) that was not used in pretraining or fine-tuning (see methods section 3). Table III holds the class-wise AP scores of this experiment. We analyze them in terms of change with respect to the results from Table I. Observations that stand out are that (i) global averages show that animal2vec generalizes better than the baseline model, and (ii) performance on the highly diverse other call class is strongly decreased in both models.

- (i) The macroaverage in the baseline is reduced by about 8 % (a drop from 0.24 to 0.21), and the microaverage by about 7 % (a drop from 0.30 to 0.28), compared to 3 % (a drop from 0.78 to 0.76) and 1 % (a drop from 0.91 to 0.90) in *animal2vec*.
- (ii) The other call class is a collective class for vocalizations that did not fit well into any of the other classes, and as such, performance with this class was always significantly lower compared to classes with sample counts on the same order (for example, the social call class in the 100 % setting, or the short-note call class in the 25 % setting), or having similar median duration (like the aggressive call class that only

TABLE IV. Ablation studies for *animal2vec* compared to the transformer baseline [59], evaluated using the *MeerKAT* (100 %) setting. The microaveraged average precision scores (AP) [80] are obtained after finetuning on the *MeerKAT* dataset.

Average precision score [80]

Transformer baseline [59]	0.30
Changes to pretraining as described in [59]:	
 Change feature extractor layout 	
L $f_{\rm sr, eff}$ from 50 to 200 Hz	+0.16
[∟] SincNet-style filterbanks [61]	+0.03
LeakyReLU [124]	+0.02
 Change pretraining masking strategy 	
[∟] Adapting probability parameter <i>p</i>	+0.05
[∟] Adapting mask length parameter <i>M</i>	+0.11
• Between-classes learning [83] (No Targets)	+0.04
Changes to finetuning as described in [37, 59]:	
 Average over all transformer layers 	+0.04
• Focal loss [82] instead of cross entropy	+0.05
• Between-classes learning [83]	+0.03
 Change finetuning masking strategy 	
L Prob. p from 0.0650 to 0.0825	+0.03
[∟] Length <i>M</i> from 10 to 4	+0.05
animal2vec	0.91

contains half the amount of samples). We observe a relative decrease by about 43 % (a drop from 0.07 to 0.04) in the baseline and about 8 % (a drop from 0.50 to 0.46) for *animal2vec* - the largest decrease in any vocalization class for both models.

However, the overall performance of *animal2vec* remains competitive with data that were included in the unlabeled pretraining, where the observed 1 % decrease in microaverage performance could also be explained by statistical fluctuations (The standard deviation of the microaverage in table I is on the same order).

9: animal2vec is not more than the sum of its parts, but they are thought-through and plenty

Here, we provide an ablation study [125] on every addition we did compared to the baseline presented in [59]. We conducted 13 full animal2vec pretrainings along with their 5-fold cross-validated finetunings (100 %), wherein each ablation, we added a single component present in animal2vec but missing in the baseline. Table IV holds the microaverage AP scores for these ablations. The table is organized in the same order in which the components were added. The changes that produced the most substantial increase in AP are the alteration of the 1D convolutional layer stack to produce an effective sampling rate $f_{\rm sr,\ eff}$ of 200 Hz instead of 50 Hz (an increase of 0.16), and the changes to the pretraining masking strategy. Changing the masking length M yielded an increase of 0.11 AP, and changing the masking probability p increased AP by about 0.05.

Importantly, while the change in $f_{\rm sr, eff}$ produced a 16-fold increase in computational complexity, as four times higher $f_{\rm sr, eff}$, results in a 16 times higher complexity in transformers [18], the changes to the masking strategy reduced the complexity 66-fold (the baseline masks 49 %, whereas we mask 93.7 %). Therefore, discussing just the change in $f_{\rm sr, eff}$ and pretraining masking strategy,

Cumulative frequency response of sinc filters

Learned by animal2vec

Initialized using Mel scale

Smoothed LPC spectrum of meerkat alarm calls from [46]




FIG. 6. Cumulative frequency response (CFR) of the SincNet filters learned by *animal2vec* after pretraining (solid yellow) and initialized with the Mel-scale (solid red). For comparison, the 800 Hz cepstral-smoothed linear predictive coding (LPC) spectrum of *MeerKAT* alarm calls [69] (dashed grey) and the integrated spectral energies of the vocalization samples in figure 2b (dashed teal) are shown. All lines are area-normalized.

we increase AP by 0.32 and reduce the computational cost to around 24 % of the baseline.

10: animal2vec's frequency response broadly aligns with the frequencies found in *MeerKAT* calls

First, we discuss the spectral interpretability of *animal2vec* via the cumulative frequency response (CFR) of the learned sinc filters (figure 6).

Both reference curves, the dashed lines in figure 6, show good agreement with each other. The most notable features of the data from [69] are the bimodal structures with nodes at around 1 kHz and 2.2 kHz. This is mostly mirrored by our reference data from figure 2, where the spectral distribution shows a trimodal distribution, with peaks at around 600 Hz, 1.1 kHz, and 2 kHz. Both reference lines decay fast to almost zero amplitude between ≈ 2.5 to $3.0\,\mathrm{kHz}$. The CFR of animal2vec's learned sinc filters show the strongest response to signals at 355 Hz, an increase by about 115 Hz with respect to the filters initialized using the Mel scale (maximum at 240 Hz). This increase is expected as the Mel scale is derived for human vocalizations which are overall lower in frequency compared to MeerKAT vocalizations [67, 69]. For frequencies above 500 Hz animal2vec's CFR largely follows the trimodal structure of the MeerKAT reference data, even mirroring the decline for frequencies between ≈ 2.5 to 3.0 kHz, highlighting that *animal2vec* learned the relevant frequencies to identify the MeerKAT vocalizations. Since the feature extraction module (the yellow stack in figure 3, including the sinc module) is frozen throughout subsequent finetuning, the presented CFR is learned in the fully self-supervised pretraining, without any labels used.

11: To finetune on NIPS4Bplus, we pretrain on unlabeled xeno-canto data

Transformer-based architectures lack the inductive bias found in convolutional-based models; as such, learning from small-scale datasets is prohibitively more difficult [126]. Consequently, and since NIPS4Bplus is a birdsong dataset, we pretrained our model with a subset of the xeno-canto database [95], which is a large community science project for recordings of bird vocalizations and shares enough similarity with the NIPS4Bplus dataset to provide a good starting point for downstream finetuning. We use the data provided as part of the Cornell Birdcall Identification Kaggle challenge [96–98]. This pretraining dataset has no overlap with the NIPS4Bplus dataset and a total length of approximately

700 h, where we cropped/padded all files to have a maximal length of 6 s. Files with a duration longer than 6 s were split into multiple samples. We resampled all files to 32 kHz with 16 bit quantization. We provide scripts in our repository to reproduce this pretraining corpus; see *Code availability* statement. We do not use the label information from this pretraining dataset at any time.

12: NIPS4Bplus is a diverse multi-label small-scale dataset

The NIPS4Bplus dataset is an openly available and densely annotated multiclass and multi-label birdsong audio dataset initially created for the NIPS4B 2013 challenge [99]. It contains 687 recordings of 51 bird species categorized into 81 classes (Multiple bird species produce a vocalization and a song signal). Song Meter SM2BAT recorders using SMX-US microphones (both manufactured by Wildlife Acoustics, Maynard, MA, U.S.) were placed in 39 locations across France and Spain. The total duration of all field recordings is 30 h, where the final dataset release has a duration of 3435 s in 687 5 to 6-second files(≈ 1 h) [14], sampled at 44.1 kHz with 16 bit quantization. 1104 s (33.7 %) of the total duration are bird vocalizations or songs, of which 184 s contain overlapping signals. The selected recordings are chosen to maximize diversity across bird species, recording location, and signal type. A full description of the dataset is available in [14].

We resample the entire dataset to 32 kHz with 16 bit quantization to strike a balance between the computational cost of our model and the necessary sampling rate to capture all relevant features. A Nyquist frequency of 16 kHz is sufficient for our experiments as the fundamental frequencies of birds rarely exceed 12 kHz [127]. Furthermore, we pad all recordings to 6 s length and store them in the same format as *MeerKAT*. We provide scripts in our repository to reproduce this processed version of NIPS4Bplus; see *Code availability* statement.

- * jzimmermann@ab.mpg.de
- † Shared senior authorship
- [1] Bradbury, J. W. & Vehrencamp, S. L. *Principles of animal communication* (Sinauer Associates Sunderland, MA, 1998).
- [2] Demartsev, V. et al. Signalling in groups: New tools for the integration of animal communication and collective movement. Methods Ecol. Evol. (2022).
- [3] Rutz, C. *et al.* Using machine learning to decode animal communication. *Science* **381**, 152–155 (2023).
- [4] Penar, W., Magiera, A. & Klocek, C. Applications of bioacoustics in animal ecology. *Ecol. Complex.* 43, 100847 (2020).
- [5] Fleishman, E. et al. Ecological inferences about marine mammals from passive acoustic data. Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc. 98, 1633–1647 (2023).
- [6] Rasmussen, J. H., Stowell, D. & Briefer, E. F. Sound evidence for biodiversity monitoring. *Science* 385, 138–140 (2024).
- [7] Laiolo, P. The emerging significance of bioacoustics in animal species conservation. *Biol. Conserv.* 143, 1635–1645 (2010).
- [8] Mcloughlin, M. P., Stewart, R. & McElligott, A. G. Automated bioacoustics: methods in ecology and conservation and their potential for animal welfare monitoring. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 16, 20190225 (2019).
- [9] Sugai, L. S. M., Silva, T. S. F., Ribeiro, J. W., Jr & Llusia, D. Terrestrial passive acoustic monitoring: Review and perspectives. *Bioscience* 69, 15–25 (2019).
- [10] Lindseth, A. V. & Lobel, P. S. Underwater soundscape monitoring and fish bioacoustics: A review. Fishes 3, 36–30 (2018).
- [11] Madhusudhana, S. et al. Choosing equipment for animal bioacoustic research. Exploring Animal Behavior Through Sound: Volume 37 (2022).
- [12] Allen, A. N. *et al.* A convolutional neural network for automated detection of humpback whale song in a diverse, long-term passive acoustic dataset. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **8** (2021).

- [13] Lostanlen, V., Salamon, J., Farnsworth, A., Kelling, S. & Bello, J. P. Birdvox-full-night: A dataset and benchmark for avian flight call detection. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 266–270 (IEEE, 2018).
- [14] Morfi, V., Bas, Y., Pamuła, H., Glotin, H. & Stowell, D. NIPS4Bplus: a richly annotated birdsong audio dataset. *PeerJ Comput. Sci.* 5, e223 (2019).
- [15] Ness, S., Symonds, H., Spong, P. & Tzanetakis, G. The orchive: Data mining a massive bioacoustic archive. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.0589 (2013).
- [16] Wall, C. C. et al. The next wave of passive acoustic data management: How centralized access can enhance science. Front. Mar. Sci. 8, 703682 (2021).
- [17] LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y. & Hinton, G. Deep learning. *Nature* 521, 436–444 (2015).
- [18] Vaswani, A. et al. Transformer: Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 5998–6008 (2017).
- [19] Lin, T., Wang, Y., Liu, X. & Qiu, X. A survey of transformers. AI Open 3, 111–132 (2022).
- [20] Stowell, D. Computational bioacoustics with deep learning: a review and roadmap. *PeerJ* 10, e13152 (2022).
- [21] Wyse, L. Audio spectrogram representations for processing with convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Deep Learning and Music*, 37–41 (2017).
- [22] Dosovitskiy, A. et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2020).
- [23] Khan, S. et al. Transformers in vision: A survey. ACM Comput. Surv. (2021).
- [24] Radford, A. et al. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 28492–28518 (2023).
- [25] Deng, J. et al. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In 2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 248–255 (IEEE, 2009).
- [26] Gemmeke, J. F. et al. Audio set: An ontology and humanlabeled dataset for audio events. In 2017 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP), 776–780 (IEEE, 2017).
- [27] Zhou, Z.-H. A brief introduction to weakly supervised learning. Natl. Sci. Rev. 5, 44–53 (2018).
- [28] Panayotov, V., Chen, G., Povey, D. & Khudanpur, S. Librispeech: an ASR corpus based on public domain audio books. In 2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP), 5206–5210 (IEEE, 2015).
- [29] Longpre, S. et al. A pretrainer's guide to training data: Measuring the effects of data age, domain coverage, quality, & toxicity. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13169 (2023).
- [30] Chen, H.-Y., Tu, C.-H., Li, Z.-H., Shen, H. & Chao, W.-L. On the importance and applicability of pre-training for federated learning. *Int Conf Learn Represent* (2022). 2206.11488.
- [31] Liu, X. et al. Self-supervised learning: Generative or contrastive. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 1–1 (2021).
- [32] He, K., Fan, H., Wu, Y., Xie, S. & Girshick, R. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition 9726–9735 (2020).
- [33] Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M. & Hinton, G. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1597–1607 (PMLR, 2020).

- [34] Robinson, J. D. et al. Can contrastive learning avoid shortcut solutions? Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (2021).
- [35] Tomasev, N. et al. Pushing the limits of self-supervised resnets: Can we outperform supervised learning without labels on imagenet? In First Workshop on Pre-training: Perspectives, Pitfalls, and Paths Forward at ICML 2022 (2022).
- [36] Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Swersky, K., Norouzi, M. & Hinton, G. E. Big self-supervised models are strong semi-supervised learners. vol. 33, 22243–22255 (2020).
- [37] Baevski, A., Zhou, Y., Mohamed, A. & Auli, M. wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations. vol. 33, 12449–12460 (2020).
- [38] Saeed, A., Grangier, D. & Zeghidour, N. Contrastive learning of general-purpose audio representations. In ICASSP 2021 -2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 3875–3879 (2021).
- [39] Niizumi, D., Takeuchi, D., Ohishi, Y., Harada, N. & Kashino, K. Byol for audio: Self-supervised learning for general-purpose audio representation. In 2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), 1–8 (IEEE, 2021).
- [40] Niizumi, D., Takeuchi, D., Ohishi, Y., Harada, N. & Kashino, K. Byol for audio: Exploring pre-trained general-purpose audio representations. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 31, 137–151 (2023).
- [41] Brown, T. et al. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems 33, 1877–1901 (2020).
- [42] Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K. & Toutanova, K. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. NAACL HLT 2019 - 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies - Proceedings of the Conference 1, 4171–4186 (2018).
- [43] Liu, Y. et al. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692 (2019)
- [44] Hsu, W.-N. et al. HuBERT: Self-supervised speech representation learning by masked prediction of hidden units. IEEE ACM Trans. Audio Speech Lang. Process. 29, 3451–3460 (2021).
- [45] Lin, C.-C., Jaech, A., Li, X., Gormley, M. R. & Eisner, J. Limitations of autoregressive models and their alternatives. In Toutanova, K. et al. (eds.) Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, 5147–5173 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2021).
- [46] Zhu, D., Hedderich, M. A., Zhai, F., Adelani, D. & Klakow, D. Is bert robust to label noise? a study on learning with noisy labels in text classification. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Insights from Negative Results in NLP*, 62–67 (2022).
- [47] Jaiswal, A., Babu, A. R., Zadeh, M. Z., Banerjee, D. & Makedon, F. A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies (Basel)* 9, 2 (2020).
- [48] Chung, Y.-A. et al. W2v-bert: Combining contrastive learning and masked language modeling for self-supervised speech pretraining. In 2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU), 244–250 (IEEE, 2021).
- [49] Gong, Y., Chung, Y.-A. & Glass, J. AST: Audio Spectrogram Transformer. In *Proc. Interspeech* 2021, 571–575 (2021).
- [50] Wyatt, S. et al. Environmental sound classification with tiny transformers in noisy edge environments. In 2021 IEEE 7th World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT), 309–314 (IEEE, 2021).

- [51] Wolters, P., Sizemore, L., Daw, C., Hutchinson, B. & Phillips, L. Proposal-based few-shot sound event detection for speech and environmental sounds with perceivers. Preprint at https: //arxiv.org/abs/2107.13616 (2021).
- [52] You, L., Coyotl, E. P., Gunturu, S. & Van Segbroeck, M. Transformer-based bioacoustic sound event detection on few-shot learning tasks. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 1–5 (IEEE, 2023).
- [53] Robinson, D., Robinson, A. & Akrapongpisak, L. Transferable models for bioacoustics with human language supervision. In ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 1316–1320 (IEEE, 2024).
- [54] Gu, N. et al. Positive transfer of the whisper speech transformer to human and animal voice activity detection. In ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 7505–7509 (IEEE, 2024).
- [55] Tarvainen, A. & Valpola, H. Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semisupervised deep learning results. Advances in neural information processing systems 30 (2017).
- [56] Grill, J.-B. et al. Bootstrap your own latent-a new approach to self-supervised learning. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. 33, 21271–21284 (2020).
- [57] Caron, M. et al. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international* conference on computer vision, 9650–9660 (2021).
- [58] Baevski, A. et al. data2vec: A general framework for self-supervised learning in speech, vision and language. In Chaudhuri, K. et al. (eds.) Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 162 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 1298–1312 (PMLR, 2022).
- [59] Baevski, A., Babu, A., Hsu, W.-N. & Auli, M. Efficient self-supervised learning with contextualized target representations for vision, speech and language. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1416–1429 (PMLR, 2023).
- [60] Song, H., Kim, M., Park, D., Shin, Y. & Lee, J.-G. Learning from noisy labels with deep neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.* 34, 8135–8153 (2023).
- [61] Ravanelli, M. & Bengio, Y. Speaker recognition from raw waveform with sincnet. In 2018 IEEE spoken language technology workshop (SLT), 1021–1028 (IEEE, 2018).
- [62] The kalahari research centre KRC. https: //kalahariresearchcentre.org. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [63] The MIT license. https://opensource.org/license/ mit. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [64] Official GitHub repository for animal2vec. https://github.com/livingingroups/animal2vec. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [65] Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [66] Schäfer-Zimmermann, J. C. et al. MeerKAT: Meerkat Kalahari Audio Transcripts (2024). URL https://doi.org/10.17617/3.0J0DYB.
- [67] Manser, M. B. The evolution of auditory communication in suricates, Suricata suricatta. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (1998).
- [68] Manser, M. B., Jansen, D. A. W. A., Graw, B. & le Roux, A. Vocal complexity in meerkats and other mongoose species. Adv. Stud. Behav. 46, 281–310 (2014).
- [69] Townsend, S. W., Charlton, B. D. & Manser, M. B. Acoustic

- cues to identity and predator context in meerkat barks. *Anim. Behav.* **94**, 143–149 (2014).
- [70] Townsend, S. W., Hollén, L. I. & Manser, M. B. Meerkat close calls encode group-specific signatures, but receivers fail to discriminate. *Anim. Behav.* 80, 133–138 (2010).
- [71] Collier, K., Townsend, S. W. & Manser, M. B. Call concatenation in wild meerkats. *Anim. Behav.* 134, 257–269 (2017).
- [72] Demartsev, V., Strandburg-Peshkin, A., Ruffner, M. & Manser, M. Vocal turn-taking in meerkat group calling sessions. *Curr. Biol.* 28, 3661–3666.e3 (2018).
- [73] Manser, M. B. The acoustic structure of suricates' alarm calls varies with predator type and the level of response urgency. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 268, 2315–2324 (2001).
- [74] Bousquet, C. A. H., Sumpter, D. J. T. & Manser, M. B. Moving calls: a vocal mechanism underlying quorum decisions in cohesive groups. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 278, 1482–1488 (2011).
- [75] Demartsev, V. et al. Mapping vocal interactions in space and time differentiates signal broadcast versus signal exchange in meerkat groups. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 379 (2024).
- [76] The HDF Group. Hierarchical Data Format, version 5. URL https://github.com/HDFGroup/hdf5.
- [77] Hallgren, K. A. Computing inter-rater reliability for observational data: an overview and tutorial. *Tutorials in quantitative methods for psychology* **8**, 23 (2012).
- [78] He, H. & Garcia, E. A. Learning from imbalanced data. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 21, 1263–1284 (2009).
- [79] Chawla, N. V., Bowyer, K. W., Hall, L. O. & Kegelmeyer, W. P. SMOTE: Synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* 16, 321–357 (2002).
- [80] Zhu, M. Recall, precision and average precision. *Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo* **2**, 6 (2004).
- [81] Sechidis, K., Tsoumakas, G. & Vlahavas, I. On the stratification of multi-label data. In Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2011, Athens, Greece, September 5-9, 2011, Proceedings, Part III 22, 145–158 (Springer, 2011).
- [82] Lin, T.-Y., Goyal, P., Girshick, R., He, K. & Dollár, P. Focal loss for dense object detection. In 2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), 2999–3007 (2017).
- [83] Tokozume, Y., Ushiku, Y. & Harada, T. Learning from betweenclass examples for deep sound recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2018).
- [84] Boyd, K., Eng, K. H. & Page, C. D. Area under the precisionrecall curve: Point estimates and confidence intervals. In Advanced Information Systems Engineering, Lecture notes in computer science, 451–466 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013).
- [85] Jain, S. & Wallace, B. C. Attention is not explanation. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), 3543–3556 (2019).
- [86] Wiegreffe, S. & Pinter, Y. Attention is not not explanation. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP), 11–20 (2019).
- [87] Akula, A. R. & Zhu, S.-C. Attention cannot be an explanation. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11194 (2022).
- [88] Bibal, A. et al. Is attention explanation? an introduction to the debate. In Muresan, S., Nakov, P. & Villavicencio, A. (eds.) Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for

- Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), 3889–3900 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2022).
- [89] Yeh, C. et al. AttentionViz: A global view of transformer attention. IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph. 30, 262–272 (2024). 2305.03210.
- [90] Bahdanau, D., Cho, K. & Bengio, Y. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. Preprint at https: //arxiv.org/abs/1409.0473 (2014).
- [91] Engesser, S. & Manser, M. B. Collective close calling mediates group cohesion in foraging meerkats via spatially determined differences in call rates. *Anim. Behav.* 185, 73–82 (2022).
- [92] Madhusudhana, S. et al. Improve automatic detection of animal call sequences with temporal context. J. R. Soc. Interface 18, 20210297 (2021).
- [93] Bravo Sanchez, F. J., Hossain, M. R., English, N. B. & Moore, S. T. Bioacoustic classification of avian calls from raw sound waveforms with an open-source deep learning architecture. *Sci. Rep.* 11, 15733 (2021).
- [94] Morfi, V. & Stowell, D. Data-efficient weakly supervised learning for low-resource audio event detection using deep learning. In *Proceedings of the detection and classification of acoustic scenes and events 2018 workshop (DCASE)*, Proceedings of the detection and classification of acoustic scenes and events 2018 workshop, 123–127 (2018).
- [95] Xeno-canto (Stichting Xeno-canto voor natuurgeluiden). http://www.xeno-canto.org. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [96] Howard, A., Klinck, H., Dane, S., Kahl, S. & Denton, T. Cornell birdcall identification (2020). URL https://kaggle.com/ competitions/birdsong-recognition. Accessed: 2023-05-24.
- [97] Xeno-Canto Bird Recordings Extended (A-M). https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/rohanrao/ xeno-canto-bird-recordings-extended-a-m/ versions/11. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [98] Xeno-Canto Bird Recordings Extended (N-Z).
 https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/rohanrao/
 xeno-canto-bird-recordings-extended-n-z/
 versions/11. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [99] Morfi, V., Stowell, D. & Pamula, H. NIPS4Bplus: Transcriptions of NIPS4B 2013 Bird Challenge Training Dataset (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare. 6798548.
- [100] Jäckel, D. et al. Opportunities and limitations: A comparative analysis of citizen science and expert recordings for bioacoustic research. PLOS ONE 16, 1–25 (2021). URL https://doi. org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253763.
- [101] Oord, A. v. d., Li, Y. & Vinyals, O. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. Preprint at https://arxiv. org/abs/1807.03748 (2018).
- [102] Chen, X., Fan, H., Girshick, R. & He, K. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.04297 (2020).
- [103] Resample method of PyTorch 2.2.0. https: //pytorch.org/audio/2.2.0/generated/torchaudio. transforms.Resample.html. Accessed: 2024-04-25.
- [104] Kaiser, J. F. Digital filters. Systems Analysis by Digital Computer, chap. 7, 218–285 (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966)
- [105] He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S. & Sun, J. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision* **11-18-Dece**, 1026–1034 (2016).
- [106] Ramachandran, P., Zoph, B. & Le, Q. V. Searching for activa-

- tion functions. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.05941 (2017).
- [107] Hendrycks, D. & Gimpel, K. Gaussian error linear units (GELUs). Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/1606. 08415 (2016).
- [108] Mohamed, A., Okhonko, D. & Zettlemoyer, L. Transformers with convolutional context for asr. Preprint at https://arxiv. org/abs/1904.11660 (2019).
- [109] He, K. et al. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (2022), 16000–16009 (2022).
- [110] Loshchilov, I. & Hutter, F. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2018).
- [111] Loshchilov, I. & Hutter, F. SGDR: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. International Conference on Learning Representations (2017).
- [112] Bengio, Y., Frasconi, P. & Simard, P. The problem of learning long-term dependencies in recurrent networks. In *IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks*, 1183–1188 vol.3 (IEEE, 2002).
- [113] Paszke, A. et al. PyTorch: An imperative style, highperformance deep learning library. Advances in neural information processing systems 32 (2019).
- [114] Ott, M. et al. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. In Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019: Demonstrations (2019).
- [115] Federal Statistical Office of Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt Destatis). Electricity consumption of households by household size. https://www.destatis.de/EN/Themes/Society-Environment/Environmental-Economic-Accounting/private-households/Tables/electricity-consumption-private-households.html. Accessed: 2024-05-06.
- [116] Electricity Maps ApS. Yearly averaged emission factor for 2023. https://app.electricitymaps.com/zone/DE. Accessed: 2023-05-24.
- [117] Jouppi, Norm and Patterson, David. Google's Cloud TPU v4 provides exaFLOPS-scale ML with industry-leading efficiency. https://shorturl.at/jlmW4. Accessed: 2024-05-08.
- [118] Lasseck, M. Audio-based bird species identification with deep convolutional neural networks. *CLEF (working notes)* 2125 (2018).
- [119] Li, L. et al. Automated classification of *Tursiops aduncus* whistles based on a depth-wise separable convolutional neural network and data augmentation. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 150, 3861 (2021).
- [120] Padovese, B., Frazao, F., Kirsebom, O. S. & Matwin, S. Data augmentation for the classification of north atlantic right whales upcalls. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 149, 2520 (2021).
- [121] Srivastava, N., Hinton, G. E., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I. & Salakhutdinov, R. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 15, 1929–1958 (2014).
- [122] Fan, A., Grave, E. & Joulin, A. Reducing transformer depth on demand with structured dropout. In *International Conference* on *Learning Representations* (2019).
- [123] Ba, J. L., Kiros, J. R. & Hinton, G. E. Layer normalization. Preprint at https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.06450 (2016).
- [124] Maas, A. L., Hannun, A. Y., Ng, A. Y. et al. Rectifier nonlinearities improve neural network acoustic models 30, 3 (2013).
- [125] Meyes, R., Lu, M., de Puiseau, C. W. & Meisen, T. Ablation studies in artificial neural networks. Preprint at https://

- arxiv.org/abs/1901.08644 (2019).
- [126] Lee, S., Lee, S. & Song, B. C. Improving vision transformers to learn small-size dataset from scratch. *IEEE Access* 10, 123212–123224 (2022).
- [127] Goller, F. & Riede, T. Integrative physiology of fundamental frequency control in birds. J. Physiol. Paris 107, 230–242 (2013).
- [128] Alammar, Jay. The Illustrated Transformer. https://jalammar.github.io/illustrated-transformer/. Accessed: 2023-06-18.
- [129] Pichler, M. & Hartig, F. Machine learning and deep learning—a review for ecologists. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 14, 994–1016 (2023).
- [130] Fletcher, N. H. Animal bioacoustics. Springer Handbook of Acoustics, 821–841 (Springer New York, New York, NY, 2014).
- [131] Luong, M.-T., Pham, H. & Manning, C. D. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings* of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 1412–1421 (2015).

Data availability

The *MeerKAT* dataset is openly available at the Max-Planck data repository Edmond [66] under a CC BY-NC license [65].

Code availability

The code for *animal2vec* and the weights for our pretrained and finetuned transformer models are available at our GitHub [64] under an MIT license [63].

Acknowledgments

We thank Rebecca Schäfer for their immense help during the field data collection. We are indebted to many student research assistants for their help with processing and labeling of the audio data (L. Leonardos, C. Maier, J. Denger, L. Batke, S. Eleonori, F. Raabe, H. Brønnvik, J. Ruff, B. Ehrmann and S. Knab). We are grateful to the Kalahari Research Trust and Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conversation for research permission at the Kalahari Research Centre, as well as the support of the Universities of Cambridge and Zurich, and MAVA foundation on the maintenance of the habituated *MeerKAT* population. We thank T. Vink and W. Jubber for organizing the field site, and the managers and volunteers of the Kalahari *MeerKAT* Project for maintaining habituation and long-term data collection of the *MeerKAT*s.

Funding information

Max Planck Society; Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung; Centre for the Advanced Study of Collective Behaviour: EXC 2117-422037984; Human Frontier Science Program: RGP0051/2019; Minerva Foundation; Gips-Schüle Foundation; Young Scholars Fund at the University of Konstanz; Alexander von Humboldt Foundation post-doctoral fellowships; EU MSCA Doctoral Network *Bioacoustic AI* (BioacAI, 101071532); The long-term research on *MeerKATs* is currently supported by funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (No. 742808 and No. 294494) and a Grant from the Natural Environment Research Council (Grant NE/G006822/1) to Tim Clutton-Brock, as well as by Grants from the University of Zurich to M.B.M. and the MAVA Foundation.

Authors' contributions

The field studies at the Kalahari Research Centre in 2017 and 2019 were performed by V.D., B.A., G.G., L.J.U., M.B.M., and A.S.P. Data labeling was performed by many student research assistants (see Acknowledgments) under the supervision of V.D., B.A., and A.S.P. Data cleaning and post-processing were performed by V.D. and J.C.S.Z.. Early studies using different deep learning architectures in combination with the *MeerKAT* dataset were

performed by K.D.A., M.D., M.A.R., A.S.P., and D.S.. The conceptual idea for *animal2vec* was conceived by J.C.S.Z., where M.A.R., A.S.P., and J.C.S.Z. jointly analyzed the results of *animal2vec*. J.C.S.Z. wrote the codebase for *animal2vec*, with guidance from M.A.R., where M.F. and M.A.R. conducted a code review before publication. The figures were created by J.C.S.Z.. The initial manuscript draft was written by J.C.S.Z. All authors provided edits and feedback on the final manuscript.

Ethics

All procedures were approved by ethical committees of University of Pretoria, South Africa (permit: EC031-17) and the Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (permit: FAUNA 1020/2016).

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests.

Supplemental information

S1: Detecting and classifying animal calls from audio data using animal2vec

An introduction for people lacking a technical background

In this section, we provide a non-technical explanation of the animal2vec framework, including its capabilities and potential for usage in animal behavior, ecology, and conservation research. This summary is intended as a starting point for people lacking a technical background (e.g., field biologists) interested in understanding how the system works and what makes it unique and potentially applying it to their own research.

What does animal2vec do?

Imagine you're trying to learn a new language. You'd start by listening to native speakers, picking up on patterns, and gradually associating sounds with meanings. animal2vec does something similar. It first learns from a massive amount of unlabeled audio data, essentially "listening" to various animal sounds. Then, it refines its understanding using a smaller labeled data set, where specific vocalizations are identified and categorized. This two-step process allows animal2vec to detect and classify animal calls (or other acoustic events) from raw audio recordings.

The system is designed to label the onset and offset times of calls and classify them into types. After training, the system can be run on continuous audio files (e.g., wav or mp3 files) and output a set of detections, which can then be used for downstream analyses.

How does animal2vec work, and what are its unique features?

At a very basic level, animal2vec works by training a deep neural network to classify data from an audio stream into a set of different categories, e.g., call types. Compared to other deep learning approaches previously used in bioacoustics, animal2vec has two main unique features: (1) the neural network architecture and (2) the training paradigm.

In terms of architecture, animal2vec is a transformer-based model. A transformer is a neural network architecture that "pays attention to" relevant contextual information in an audio stream when predicting whether any given audio snippet contains a call. For example, if calls are given in sequences, the network can use information from neighboring calls to predict whether a given moment in time contains a call of a given type. Transformers are a recent advance in machine learning that has resulted in massive improvements across various domains, including (most famously) large language models such as the Chat-generative pre-trained transformer (ChatGPT) model. A non-technical explanation of transformer models is available at [128].

In terms of the training paradigm, animal2vec is a self-supervised learning approach. The approach consists of 2 main steps: (1) a pre-training phase where a large amount of unlabeled audio data is used to generate a "good" way to mathematically represent the audio data (also known as an embedding) and (2) a fine-tuning phase where labeled data is used to train the model to detect events of interest (e.g., different call types). The purpose of the pre-training step is that it allows the system to learn features of the raw audio data that are later useful for the task of detecting and classifying calls (this is also known as feature extraction). For example, some human-interpretable examples of features would be peak frequency and entropy, which might be useful for determining whether an audio snippet contains a vocalization or not. However, during pre-training, the machine learning system learns a very large and arbitrarily complex set of features, many of which are not human interpretable. Once the network has learned a good way to represent the audio data, these embeddings can be used to train another neural net system to detect calls. The representation generated in the first step makes it much easier for the system to learn to detect and classify calls.

Importantly, during the pre-training step, the network is not learning to detect animal calls. Instead, it is performing a different learning task that, while not the task we ultimately want to solve, results in the network learning a good way to represent the audio data. In the case of animal2vec (and the scheme it

is related to, data2vec 2.0 [59]), the model during pre-training is learning to predict sections of audio that have been masked from the original input. As a result of this different task, the pre-training step does not require labeled data, meaning that, typically, a much larger amount of data can be used. Labeled data is then only required for the fine-tuning step. The upshot is that much less labeled training data is needed to obtain good classification results than if the pre-trained embeddings were not used.

What are the features of the MeerKAT dataset (and other bioacoustic datasets) that make it particularly challenging?

Bioacoustic datasets can present different challenges for automated detection and classification of signals of interest depending on the species, environment, recording technology, and other factors. However, many bioacoustic tasks share some common challenges.

First, bioacoustic datasets are often noisy, with interesting signals buried in relatively large amounts of background noise. The relative volume, bandwidth, coverage, and type of noise can vary widely. In the MeerKAT dataset, a substantial challenge arises because most recordings come from audio data recorded on tracking collars, and that data was collected while the animals were foraging. Meerkats forage by digging for prey in the sand, and the sound of this digging behavior - heard as punctuated, broadband "crashing" noises - can be heard at high volume and very frequently in the dataset, covering up many of the vocalizations. On the other hand, the collar recordings also have a high signal-to-noise ratio since the microphone is located very close to the animal, producing the sounds of interest.

Second, bioacoustic datasets are often sparse, meaning that signals of interest occur less frequently relative to the amount of non-signal recording.

What are the potential applications of animal2vec?

The development of animal2vec is an ongoing journey and challenge with endless possible applications. As more data from diverse species and environments are incorporated, the model's capabilities will continue to expand. The ultimate vision is to create something called a foundational model. A foundational model is a very large model that has been pretrained in such a broad and extensive way that it easily can adapt to a wide range of tasks. Imagine a model that has been pretrained on all human languages. It has seen during pretraining every language for which there is data. Finetuning such a broadly pretrained model to any task related to any language can then be achieved using only very little annotated data.

animal2vec as a foundational model for bioacoustics would enable researchers to finetune a large and capable model to their needs and species of interest without expensive computing infrastructure. Further, animal2vec is not limited to classification, but can be used for any task that can be solved using bioacoustics, and, we plan on adding support for more data modalities like GPS or accelerometer data, as is common now in modern biologgers [2]. This, in return, would enable animal2vec to help in scenarios in which multiple datastreams have to be combined like is often the case in animal ecology [4, 129], behavior [2, 130], and conservation [7] research.

S2: The attention module in a nutshell

While there are many variants of attention modules [18, 90, 131], a transformer typically uses the scaled matrix-matrix dot product attention [18] as the dominant information extraction mechanism. First, the matrix-matrix product between the input $(X \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d})$ and three learnable matrices $(Q_w, K_w, and V_w)$, where $\{Q_w, K_w, V_w\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is calculated, where L is the segment length of the input sequence and d is the embedding size of the model. Their output is then referred to as Query $(Q = X \cdot Q_w)$, Key $(K = XK_w)$, and Value $(V = XV_w)$, where $\{Q, K, V\} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. Then, the matrix-matrix product between the query and the transposed key matrix is passed through a softmax

layer, and a final matrix-matrix product is calculated with the value matrix. Concretely:

$$\mathcal{H}(Q, K, V) = \underbrace{\text{softmax}\left(QK^{\top}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)}_{\text{Attention}}V = AV \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{H}(Q, K, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ and n is a scalar normalization constant [18]. The output of the softmax layer is referred to as attention $(A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L})$, as it acts as a normalized weighting matrix for the value matrix. So, the whole

attention module learns two things: (i) a softmax-normalized weighting matrix and (ii) a projection of the input. The first is called attention matrix A, and the second is the Value matrix. Therefore, the attention matrix (A) provides relevance in terms of how the projection of the input (V) should be passed to the next layer. In practice, a single transformer layer calculates equation 1 M times (Q_w , K_w , and V_w , with $1 \le w \le M$), where M is referred to as the number of heads (this is what is called Multi-head attention in figure 3 in the main text), and a full transformer model has N layers (see the N× on the left in figure 3 in the main text). Weights of Q, K, and V are not shared between heads or layers, so a full transformer model has M times N attention matrices A

S3: Training parameter for all experiments

TABLE S1. Pretraining parameter for the animal2vec framework on MeerKAT and xeno canto.

Pretraining setting

	Pretraining setting					
Parameter	MeerKAT	Xeno canto	Transformer baseline [59]			
Learning rate	1×10^{-4}	2.5×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}			
Adam β_1 / β_2	0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98			
Weight decay	0.01	0.01	0.01			
Clip norm	1	1	1			
Learning rate schedule	cosine	cosine	cosine			
Warmup steps	10 000	8000	10 000			
GPUs	4 A100-SXM4-80GB	4 3090Ti-24GB	4 A100-SXM4-80GB			
Batch size in sec. per GPU	255	250	255			
Batch size in sec in total	1020	1000	1020			
Transformer layers	16	12	16			
Attention heads	16	12	16			
Embedding dimensions	1024	768	1024			
Updates	408 000 (100 epochs)	264 600 (100 epochs)	408 000 (100 epochs)			
Decoder dim.	768	384	768			
Decoder conv. groups	16	16	16			
Decoder kernel width	7	7	7			
Decoder layers	4	4	4			
Mask probability <i>p</i>	0.1500	0.1500	0.0650			
Mask length M	2	2	10			
Nr. of Sinc filters [61]	127	127	-			
Sinc filter kernel width [61]	63	125	-			
BCL mixing strength (target) [83]	0	0	0			
BCL mixing strength (input) [83]	0.5	0.5	0			
BCL token prob. [83]	1.0	1.0	0			
BCL window length [83]	0.05	0.05	0			
PSwish initial α	2	2	-			
PSwish initial β	0	0	-			
	(512, 10, 5)	(512, 10, 5)	(512, 10, 5)			
	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)			
Feature Extractor layout	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)			
(Nr. of filter, width, stride)	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)			
	(512, 3, 1)	(512, 3, 2)	(512, 3, 2)			
	(512, 2, 1) (512, 2, 1)	(512, 2, 1) (512, 2, 1)	(512, 2, 2) (512, 2, 2)			
Nr. of trainable parameters	315M	94M	315M			

TABLE S2. Finetuning parameter for the animal2vec framework on MeerKAT and NIPS4Bplus. **Finetune setting**

MeerKAT (1 %)	MeerKAT (25 %)	MeerKAT (100 %)	Baseline (100 %)	NIPS4Bplus
1×10^{-4}	7.5×10^{-5}	3×10^{-5}	3×10^{-5}	1×10^{-4}
0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98	0.9 / 0.98
cosine	cosine	cosine	cosine	cosine
	4 A100-S	XM4-80GB		4 3090Ti-24GB
480	480	480	480	392
1920	1920	1920	1920	1568
2000	2000	2000	2000	1000
10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	3000
3000	8000	20 000	20 000	2000
(1000 epochs)	(107 epochs)	(67 epochs)	(67 epochs)	(913 epochs)
13 000 (4333 epochs)	18 000 (240 epochs)	30 000 (100 epochs)	30 000 (100 epochs)	5000 (2283 epochs)
0.1100	0.1000	0.0825	0.0650	0.1100
2	3	4	10	2
0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5
0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5
1.0	1.0	1.0	0	1.0
0.05	0.05	0.05	0	0.05
2	2	2	0	2
16	16	16	8	12
0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
	1 × 10 ⁻⁴ 0.9 / 0.98 cosine 480 1920 2000 10 000 3000 (1000 epochs) 13 000 (4333 epochs) 0.1100 2 0.5 0.5 1.0 0.05 2 16 0.1	1 × 10 ⁻⁴ 7.5 × 10 ⁻⁵ 0.9 / 0.98 0.9 / 0.98 cosine cosine 480 480 1920 1920 2000 2000 10 000 10 000 3000 8000 (1000 epochs) (107 epochs) 13 000 18 000 (4333 epochs) (240 epochs) 0.1100 0.1000 2 3 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 1.0 1.0 0.05 2 2 2 16 16 0.1 0.1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

S4: Additional attention maps and precision-recall curves

Globally averaged attention map




FIG. S1. Globally averaged attention map of a four second segment showing 14 move calls. animal2vec operates on pressure waves, but spectrograms are shown here for visualization. Each row shows the importance of the surrounding context for predicting the class associated with an audio frame where dashed lines show the onset/offset of each animal2vec call prediction, which are additionally shown using a blue colormap. An attention map shows the *importance* of every input frame with respect to every other frame. For predicting, animal2vec attends to the immediate past and future of an event, as well as to previous and future alarm calls.




FIG. S2. The precision-recall curve for the focal class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S3. The precision-recall curve for the close call class. Results of animal2vec using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S4. The precision-recall curve for the short-note call class. Results of animal2vec using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S5. The precision-recall curve for the social call class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S6. The precision-recall curve for the other call class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S7. The precision-recall curve for the alarm call class. Results of animal2vec using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S8. The precision-recall curve for the aggressive call class. Results of animal2vec using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S9. The precision-recall curve for the move call class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S10. The precision-recall curve for the lead call class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S11. The precision-recall curve for the synch signal class. Results of animal2vec using 1 %, 25 %, and 100 % of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S12. The precision-recall curve for the eating class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S13. The precision-recall curve for the beep signal class. Results of animal2vec using 1%, 25%, and 100% of the training data are in red, yellow, and teal, respectively, and the baseline results are in gray.




FIG. S14. Schematic of the onset/offset calculation in animal2vec. The top plot shows the example from figure 2 a) of the main text, whereas the bottom plot shows (i) the model's likelihood output (unsmoothed line right to the teal-colored average pooling window), (ii) the average pooled likelihood (smoothed line in the middle between the binarizing and average pooling window), and the binarized likelihood (step function to the left side of the binarizing window). This illustrates that the onset/offset calculation is done by sliding an average-pooling window (encircled teal 1, filter width is 100 ms) over the model's likelihood output, after which a binarizer (encircled red 2) turns the likelihood into a step function. Onset and offset are then the positions that indicate a change between zero and one.