

# 1 Automating insect monitoring using unsupervised near-infrared sensors

2 Klas Rydhmer<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Emily Bick<sup>1,3</sup>, Laurence Still<sup>1</sup>, Alfred Strand<sup>1</sup>, Rubens Luciano<sup>1</sup>, Salena Helmreich<sup>1</sup>,  
3 Brittany Beck<sup>1</sup>, Christoffer Grønne<sup>1</sup>, Ludvig Malmros<sup>1</sup>, Knud Poulsen<sup>1</sup>, Frederik Elbæk<sup>1</sup>, Mikkel  
4 Brydegaard<sup>1,4,5,6</sup>, Jesper Lemmich<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Nikolajsen<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>*FaunaPhotonics APS, Støberigade 14, DK-2450, Copenhagen SV, Denmark.*

6 <sup>2</sup>*Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej  
7 23, 1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark*

8 <sup>3</sup>*Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg C, Denmark*

9 <sup>4</sup>*Lund laser Centre, Department of Physics, Lund University, Sölvegatan 14, SE-223 62 Lund, Sweden.*

10 <sup>5</sup>*Center for Animal Movement Research, Department of Biology, Lund University, Sölvegatan 35, SE-223 62  
11 Lund, Sweden.*

12 <sup>6</sup>*Norsk Elektro Optikk AS, Østensjøveien 34, 0667 Oslo, Norway*

13 *\*corresponding author: [klry@faunaphotonics.com](mailto:klry@faunaphotonics.com)*

14

## 15 Abstract

16 Insect monitoring is critical to improve our understanding and ability to preserve and restore  
17 biodiversity, sustainably produce crops, and reduce vectors of human and livestock disease.  
18 However, conventional monitoring methods of trapping and identification are time consuming and  
19 thus expensive.

20 Here, we present a network of distributed wireless sensors, recording backscattered near-infrared  
21 modulation signatures from insects. The instrument is a compact sensor based on dual-wavelength  
22 infrared light emitting diodes and is capable of unsupervised, autonomous long-term insect  
23 monitoring over weather and seasons. The sensor records the backscattered light at kHz pace from  
24 each insect transiting the measurement volume. Insect observations are automatically extracted  
25 and transmitted with environmental metadata over cellular connection to a cloud-based database.  
26 The recorded features include wing beat harmonics, melanisation and flight direction.

27 To validate the sensor's capabilities, we tested the correlation between daily insect counts from an  
28 oil seed rape field measured with six yellow water traps and six sensors during a 4-week period. A  
29 comparison of the methods found a Spearman's rank correlation coefficient of 0.61 and a p-  
30 value=0.0065, with the sensors recording approximately 19 times more insect observations and  
31 demonstrating a larger temporal dynamic than conventional trapping.

32

### 33 Introduction

34 Insecta is the most speciose class of terrestrial fauna<sup>1</sup> and the majority of the world's biodiversity is  
35 composed of this class<sup>2</sup>. In epidemiological and agricultural ecosystems, insects serve as both  
36 beneficial organisms<sup>3-5</sup> and economic pests<sup>6,7</sup>. Data on insects can support biodiversity  
37 conservation<sup>8,9</sup>, human health protection<sup>10</sup> and increased food production<sup>11</sup>.

38 Insects are monitored via established sampling methods including trapping, sweep netting, and  
39 portable aspiration<sup>12-14</sup>. These methods are imperfect resulting in biases towards size<sup>15-17</sup> and  
40 stage<sup>18</sup>. Additionally, conventional methods may be time-consuming, costly and prone to human  
41 error such as person-to-person variation in sampling execution<sup>19-21</sup>. New methods, like insect  
42 anesthetization sampling<sup>22</sup>, are being implemented to minimize these biases. Regardless of sampling  
43 method, insect identification is time consuming and requires specialized training.


44 In order to reduce the cost of insect monitoring and identification, automation of insect trapping<sup>23-</sup>  
45 <sup>27</sup> and identification<sup>27-31</sup> has been developed. While these methods could greatly improve  
46 monitoring via traps, they are unsuitable for monitoring a general insect population since trap  
47 designs and baits are generally biased in regard to species.

48 Automation of insect monitoring without traps could reduce species bias of conventional methods  
49 and human error, thus greatly improving the state of the art. Insect identification has been  
50 automated as early as 1973 using wingbeat frequency<sup>32-34</sup>, and today remote insect sensing includes  
51 acoustic detection<sup>35</sup>, radar observations<sup>36-38</sup> and lidar<sup>39-41</sup>. Acoustic methods work best with a solid  
52 medium<sup>26,42</sup>, though acoustic monitoring of free flying insects has been demonstrated<sup>43-45</sup>. While  
53 radar technologies have much larger monitoring range<sup>16,38,46-48</sup>, they are unsuitable for monitoring  
54 small insects, or insects around vegetation, such as a crop canopy. Lidar can be used to record a  
55 large number of observations in a long transect<sup>49-53</sup> and distinguish between species groups by  
56 wingbeat frequency (WBF)<sup>50,54</sup>. However, lidar equipment requires a trained operator and requires  
57 constant supervision due to eye safety restrictions.

58 Here we present an autonomous near-infrared sensor for monitoring of flying insects in the field.  
59 The sensor aims to minimize human biases, be usable by non-technical personnel, and be capable of  
60 weatherproof long-term monitoring.

### 61 Instrument design

62 The sensor is weatherproof, compact, and intended for field use by non-technicians. Like  
63 entomological lidar instrumentation, an air volume is illuminated, and light backscattered from  
64 insects entering the measurement volume is recorded by a high-speed photodetector. In addition,  
65 the instrument is equipped with a satellite navigation device, a camera for situational photos, and an  
66 environmental sensor monitoring temperature, humidity, and light intensity. An internal Global  
67 System for Mobile Communications (GSM) modem allows for communication and data transfer. The  
68 sensor can be powered by any 12V power supply, including utility power, batteries, or solar power,  
69 and has a maximum power consumption of 30W during monitoring. A photo of the sensor is shown  
70 in Figure 1.



71

72 *Figure 1: As insects fly into the measurement volume, the backscattered light is recorded by the*  
 73 *receiver. Insect observations are automatically extracted and transmitted along with environmental*  
 74 *data, location, and situational photos, to the cloud via a GSM connection. Using a solar panel and*  
 75 *battery, the sensor is capable of unsupervised, long-term monitoring in remote locations.*

76 **Emitter**

77 The emitter module consists of a rectangular array of LEDs emitting two spectral bands at 808 nm  
 78 and 980 nm with total output of 1.6 W and 1.7 W, respectively. The two wavelengths are modulated  
 79 in a square wave at 118.8 kHz and 79.2 kHz respectively. The LEDs are mounted in a checkerboard  
 80 pattern to achieve a homogeneous beam profile. The total area of the checkerboard, and thus the  
 81 beam size at the source, is 82 cm<sup>2</sup>. The light emitted from each diode is partially collimated by an  
 82 asymmetrical lens and expands with 20° and 4° diverging angles ( $\theta_E$ ). The full width half maximum  
 83 (FWHM) of the emitted light is 26 nm for the 808 nm band and 47 nm for the 970 band.

84 **Receiver**

85 The backscattered light from insects entering the overlap between the beam and the receiver's field  
 86 of view (FoV) is collected by a near infrared coated aspheric lens (60 mm focal length,  $\phi$  76.2 mm  
 87 aperture) onto a silicon quadrant photodiode (QPD) with a total area of 1 cm<sup>2</sup>. The receiver is  
 88 focused at 1 m and has a 4° divergence angle ( $\theta_R$ ). Quadrant detection of insects allow for basic  
 89 range and size estimation<sup>55,56</sup> and can differentiate ascending and descending insects as well as  
 90 migrating insects with tailwind or host- or scent-seeking insects with headwind.


91 **Signal processing**

92 Each quadrant of the QPD is amplified by a dedicated trans-impedance amplifier (TIA) with a  
 93 bandwidth of 10 Hz to 1 MHz and a gain of 0.75V/ $\mu$ A around 100kHz. The amplified signals are  
 94 sampled by four analogue-digital converters (ADC) with 14-bit output at a rate of 6 MHz. The digital  
 95 data-streams are sent into a field-programmable gate array (FPGA) where eight digital lock-in  
 96 amplifiers are implemented in VHDL (Very High-Speed Integrated Circuit Hardware Description  
 97 Language). This allows the two spectral bands to be recorded independently on each quadrant,  
 98 resulting in an 8-channel data stream. The data is then filtered by a low-pass filter with a cut-off at  
 99 5kHz and down-sampled to a 20 kHz, 16-bit data stream before it is sent to a microcontroller unit

100 (MCU) for event extraction and further processing. The increase in bit depth is possible due to the  
101 oversampling of the unfiltered signal.


102

103



104

105 *Figure 2. Light is emitted and collimated from the LED board at 808 nm and 980nm and modulated at*  
106 *different carrier frequencies. The backscattered light from an insect entering the measurement*  
107 *volume is collected by a lens and focused onto a QPD. The four QPD-quadrants are independently*  
108 *amplified by a TIA and sampled. The digital data streams are sent to the FPGA, where 8 digital lock-in*  
109 *amplifiers individually amplify each wavelength in the digital signal processing (DSP) unit. The*  
110 *resulting 8-channel data stream is analyzed by the MCU which extracts events from the data stream.*  
111 *The events can then be stored locally or sent via GSM modem to a cloud database.*



112  
 113 *Figure 3. The wide beam yields long insect transit times, and the corresponding frequency resolution*  
 114 *is high enough to accurately capture most species. The frequency response curve (red) is flat in the*  
 115 *wingbeat frequency region and the effect of the LP filter at 5 kHz is indicated. The 5kHz bandwidth*  
 116 *allows a minimum of 4 harmonic overtones to be recorded even for mosquitoes with very high*  
 117 *wingbeat frequencies.*

118 **Measurement volume**

119 The measurement volume is defined by the overlap between the beam and the FoV. Its size and  
 120 shape can be adjusted by changing the angle ( $\theta_s$ ) between the emitter and receiver.


121 The beam, FoV and the measurement volume have been mapped by a custom-built 3-axis robot  
 122 covering a volume of 2 m x 1.5 m x 1.5 m. The robot is equipped with a photodetector, an  
 123 illumination source, and a sphere dropping mechanism. By measuring the intensity of the emitted  
 124 beam and the sensitivity of the FoV in the volume, the signal response from an arbitrary target can  
 125 be estimated. The volumes were measured at 20 planes along the Z axis, from 30 to 1655 mm, each  
 126 plane consisting of 56 x 56 measurement points in a 12 mm grid. The calculated signals were then  
 127 compared to actual measurement values by dropping black and white spheres. The white spheres  
 128 were assumed to be 100% reflective and the black spheres had a 5% reflectivity.

129 The measurement volume properties for targets with various optical cross sections (OCS) at different  
 130 angles are shown in Table 1. The size of the measurement volume is dependent on the minimum  
 131 acceptable sensitivity, which is related to the noise in the instrument. In the following results, the  
 132 edge of the volume is defined as the limit where the signal to noise ratio (SNR) is larger than 10 for  
 133 typical noise levels in a field installation. The volumes for a 10 mm<sup>2</sup> target are shown in Figure 4.

$\theta_s$ (deg)	SNR at 25 cm for 10 mm <sup>2</sup> target	Far limit (10 mm <sup>2</sup> target) (cm)	Measurement volume for 1 mm <sup>2</sup> target (liters)	Measurement volume for 10 mm <sup>2</sup> target (liters)	Measurement volume for 100 mm <sup>2</sup> target (liters)
5	725	> 1650	8	52	100
12.5	1430	130	7	27	87
20	1680	95	5	16	70

134 *Table 1: Measurement volume parameters at different angles for different target OCS. The target*  
135 *OCS values correspond roughly to a small midge, a small beetle, and a honeybee.*

136



137

138 *Figure 4. Measured FoV, beam, and measurement volume for the three angles. Each volume is*  
139 *mapped at 20 planes along the Z axis and each plane consists of 56 x 56 measurement points with 12*  
140 *mm spacing. For the FoV and beam, all measurement points below 2% of the maximum value are*  
141 *excluded. For the measurement volume all points with a SNR < 10 for a 10 mm<sup>2</sup> target are excluded.*  
142 *A low angle yields a longer and larger, but less sensitive, measurement volume. The FoV is identical in*  
143 *all configurations.*


## 144 [Data processing](#)

### 145 [Automated event extraction](#)

146 The sensor records intervals of 10 minutes (4 quadrants, 2 spectral bands, 16 bit and 20 kHz sample  
147 rate after demux of carrier frequency) and automatically extracts insect observations from each  
148 recording. The event extraction is inspired by earlier work but modified to reduce computational  
149 load<sup>40,41,54,57</sup>. In each channel, the signal was downsampled to 2 kHz and a rolling median filter with a  
150 width of 2 s and 50% overlap was used to estimate the quasi-static baselines (the baselines can  
151 change with environmental conditions, static objects in the beam etc.) Similarly, a standard  
152 deviation filter with identical properties was applied to all datapoints below the median. This  
153 reduces the influence of rare events, such as insects, on the noise level estimation.

154 The interpolated median signals were removed from the full resolution data and we employed a  
 155 Boolean condition for insect detection when the time series exceed 10 times the estimated standard  
 156 deviation. The Boolean time series were eroded by 500  $\mu\text{s}$  and dilated by 30 ms. The erosion rejects  
 157 short spikes which could not be interpreted and dilation includes insect observation flanks. The  
 158 logical OR function was applied across all QPD-quadrants and spectral channels. Extracted  
 159 observations are transmitted to a cloud database along with metadata such as baseline and noise  
 160 level, via GSM connection or stored locally until a connection is available. An example of the event  
 161 extraction process is shown in Figure 5, and the insect event is shown in greater detail in Figure 6.


162



163

164 *Figure 5. An example of the event extraction process in a single channel for visibility. a) The data, in*  
 165 *the 810 nm band of a single QPD segment after the rolling median has been removed. The part of the*  
 166 *signal above the event threshold is marked in grey, and the final insect event after erosion and*  
 167 *dilation of the binary map is marked in green. b) Intensity distribution of the data.*

168 Each insect observation, along with its associated timestamp and device identifier, is automatically  
 169 uploaded to the cloud via one-way AMQP (Advanced Message Queuing Protocol), with unique  
 170 connections for each device. Virtual computing is then used to further process, analyze, and securely  
 171 store data for further use and aggregation.



173

174 *Figure 6: a) The 810 nm signal for a single insect event in of one of the QPD segments. The insect*  
 175 *wingbeats appear as undulating spikes. The minimum envelope of the signal is interpreted as the*  
 176 *insect body contribution to the signal. b) The Welch spectral density of the event. The fundamental*  
 177 *wingbeat frequency and harmonics are seen in the event signal. This event has a fundamental*  
 178 *wingbeat frequency of 160 Hz and an average body-to-wing ratio of 0.4.*

### 179 Feature extraction / Data interpretation

180 The QPD segments collect backscattered light from different sections of the measurement volume.  
 181 For a single object passing through the measurement volume, the signal strength within each QPD-  
 182 quadrant is related to the object's OCS as well as its position. As the OCS varies with each wingbeat,  
 183 the wingbeat frequency can be resolved. Many methods have been used to extract the wingbeat  
 184 frequency from insect observations<sup>57-59</sup> and most are based on identifying the fundamental  
 185 frequency in the frequency domain, as shown in Figure 6 b).

186 In addition to the wingbeat frequency, the body and wing contribution can be measured from each  
 187 time signal which allows calculation of additional features such as body-to-wing ratio. Additional  
 188 features can be calculated by comparing the relative intensity of the body and wing signals in the  
 189 two spectral bands. These bands differentially index melanin absorption<sup>60-62</sup> and may yield some  
 190 sensitivity to wing interference patterns<sup>61,63,64</sup>, although not enough to uniquely determine wing  
 191 membrane thickness. Together these features can be used to quantify the morphology of different  
 192 insect groups and allow remote classification of insects according to order, family, genus or  
 193 species<sup>59,64-66</sup>.

### 194 Field validation

#### 195 Methodology

196 The sensor was field-tested against a conventional insect monitoring method, yellow water traps (22  
 197 cm diameter)<sup>67,68</sup>, in an organic oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.) field in Sorø, Denmark (55°29'04.3"N  
 198 11°29'34.6"E). During a four-week period (04/22/19 - 05/22/19), insects were monitored with six  
 199 sensors and six yellow water traps. Sensors and traps were placed in a grid pattern, consisting of  
 200 four linear transects 30 m from and perpendicular to the field's southern-most edge. Each transect  
 201 consisted of three monitoring points (either sensors or traps) with 45 m spacing, and a separation of



202 22.5 m between transects. The first and third transect consisted of sensors and the second and  
203 fourth were yellow water traps. During the field study presented in this work,  $\theta_S$  was set to  $20^\circ$  in  
204 order to maximize the signal strength of small targets at close range.

205 Fundamentally the two methods observe different insect behaviors. While the sensor looks at  
206 insects flying above the crop canopy, the yellow water traps look at insects that occur within it.  
207 Further confounding the comparison, yellow is attractive to some insects<sup>68</sup>. Therefore, some  
208 proportion of insects will be attracted to the yellow water traps, resulting in overrepresentation of  
209 some species<sup>69,70</sup>.


## 210 Data analysis

211 The water traps were emptied daily, and sensor data was recorded continuously. All insects in the  
212 traps were collected, but to allow for a more direct comparison of methods, non-flying insects and  
213 thrips found in water traps were excluded from further analysis.

214 The sensor data was aggregated according to the collection time of the water traps but one day,  
215 April 30<sup>th</sup>, was excluded due to instrument malfunction. The average number of recorded insect  
216 observations per sensor per day and per hour was calculated. The calculated numbers were  
217 normalized by sensor uptime, which was on average 90% throughout the measurement period.

## 218 Results

219 The insect activity recorded by the sensors and traps respectively are shown in Figure 7. Insect  
220 counts from sensors and traps cannot be directly equated due to differences in measurement  
221 subject (insect flights vs insect landings) and non-homogeneous insect distribution; however, they  
222 serve to visualize similarities in gross changes in insect activity over the sample period. The results  
223 demonstrate a significant correlation between the sensor and trap results, specifically with a  
224 Spearman's rank correlation coefficient of 0.61 and a p-value=0.0065<sup>71</sup>. Over the course of the  
225 season, an average of  $1122 \pm 242$  (SE) insect observations per day were collected per sensor  
226 (excluding downtime), compared to an average of  $63 \pm 6$  (SE) insects caught per water trap per day  
227 over the same period.



228

229 *Figure 7. a) Average insect counts across sensors per day b) Average insect count across yellow traps*  
230 *per day. c) Sensor vs trap counts during days where both sensor and trap data was available. The red*  
231 *line is the linear least square fit (LSTQ) with a Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.61.*

## 232 Discussion

233 Here we present a sensor for automated unsupervised field monitoring of insect flight activity. The  
234 sensor illuminates an air volume and records the backscattered light from insects that fly through  
235 the measurement volume. Discrete insect observations are automatically extracted from the  
236 continuous raw data flow and transmitted over a cellular connection to a database in the cloud. Field  
237 validation showed the number of recorded insect observations correlates with the number of  
238 individual insects trapped by a conventional insect monitoring method. Furthermore, the sensor  
239 recorded an order of magnitude more insects than the conventional method over the same time  
240 period.

241 The automation of insect monitoring has the potential to reduce monitoring bias, cost, and human  
242 labor, potentially resulting in an increased ability to collect large quantities of biodiversity, public  
243 health, and economically relevant insect data. Additionally, the observations from the sensors were  
244 available in real time, whereas emptying and counting insects from traps required a significant  
245 amount of labor. While this work was limited to comparing total insect counts from the traps, it is  
246 possible for a skilled expert to identify these insects to the sub-species level. This is an area where the  
247 traps have a strong advantage over this sensor and similar instrumentation. However, we expect  
248 significant progress with species identification from sensor observations.

249 One of the most striking differences in monitoring methods is the day-to-day variability in the  
250 number of data points collected (Figure 7). While the yellow traps catch a similar number of insects  
251 each day, the difference between low and high flight activity days were more visible in the sensor.  
252 Early analysis of the trap and sensor data indicates that the peak recorded during May 7-11 is due to  
253 a pollen beetle (*Brassicogethes aeneus*) activity spike. This will be the subject of further studies.

254 Another marked difference between the sensor and the water traps is the number of data points  
255 collected over the same collection period. Each sensor observed  $\sim 19$  x more insect observations  
256 than insects collected in the water trap. While in general the correlation between the two values is  
257 considered more relevant than the absolute number, one advantage of a much higher observation  
258 rate in the sensors is an increased probability of recording rare species. Further work is required to  
259 successfully identify rare species from sensor signals, but if realized, sensors could provide a method  
260 to monitor rare species across large areas with lower labor costs.

261 Insect observations recorded by the sensor are precisely timestamped at the point of occurrence,  
262 allowing variable aggregation over time as well as higher time granularity in measurements. This  
263 may have advantages in standardization compared to conventional trapping periods which may be  
264 affected by variable intra-collection times due to human factors (e.g. missed or delayed collections  
265 due to weekends or public holidays). Furthermore, the higher granularity and continuous monitoring  
266 during unsociable hours allows for the comparatively easy and low-labor collection of data on insect  
267 circadian rhythms, as well as direct weather interactions.

268 We hypothesize that the sensors observe different insect behaviors compared to conventional  
269 monitoring methods since only airborne (flying or jumping) insects are recorded. Therefore, we did  
270 not expect a perfect correlation between the sensors and the conventional methods. Sweep netting  
271 is likely the most similar monitoring method since it also catches insects in flight above the crop.  
272 However, sweep netting, which also collects insects on plants, occurs at a point measurement in  
273 time and is typically performed along a transect, rather than at a fixed point in the field<sup>19</sup>. Also, each  
274 trapping method is biased towards different insects, influencing catch<sup>15,17</sup>.

275 Trapping methods, such as the water traps used in this study, monitor insects landing, walking, or  
276 jumping to a specific point and do not record insects in flight. Also, each trapping method is biased

277 towards different insects, with the trap color influencing the trap catch<sup>68</sup>. Although we do not yet  
278 know in what manner, the sensor is also most likely biased towards certain species groups. Most  
279 primarily, its only capable of recording airborne insects. Insect vision is focused towards the visual or  
280 ultraviolet spectrum and not capable of resolving infrared light and we believe the emitted beam has  
281 very little influence on insect behavior<sup>72</sup>. However, in a homogeneous landscape such as an  
282 agricultural field, any foreign object could serve as an attractant and the placement above the  
283 canopy could attract insects. Finally, the size of the measurement volume varies with the OCS of the  
284 insects and larger insects will be over-represented. To provide a complete picture of the insect  
285 population, this should be considered. Along with species specific observations, this is an area where  
286 we expect significant progress.

287 The automated unsupervised field sensor has the potential to facilitate pest prevention, public  
288 health studies and biodiversity monitoring. In further work we will explore the possibilities of  
289 unsupervised long-term monitoring of insect activity and species recognition.  
290

## 291 [Conclusions](#)

292 In this work, we have introduced an unsupervised automated sensor for insect monitoring. The  
293 measurement principle is similar to entomological lidar setups but is optimized for near-field  
294 measurements. This simplifies the installation process and increases the robustness of the sensor,  
295 allowing it to be operable by non-technical experts and enables long-term unsupervised monitoring.

296 The sensor automatically extracts insect events from the raw data and transmits these via a built-in  
297 modem for further processing. From the recorded observations, features such as the wingbeat  
298 frequency, body-wing ratio, and melanisation factor are computed and used to predict the insect  
299 classification down to species. During a 4-week deployment in an oilseed rape field, the detected  
300 flight activity was shown to be correlated with a conventional monitoring method.

301 The capabilities and scalability of this sensor-based method has the potential to improve the state of  
302 the art in insect monitoring. The sensor can be used to explore areas such as biodiversity  
303 assessment, insecticide resistance, and long-term monitoring of remote areas, facilitating research  
304 studies currently difficult or impossible to conduct with conventional methods.

## 305 [Acknowledgments](#)

306 The authors want to thank Jakob Dyhr for kindly making his organic oilseed rape field in Sorø,  
307 Denmark, available for the field experiments. Thanks to Lene Sigsgaard, Samuel Jansson and Sam  
308 Cook for helpful discussions.

## 309 [Funding](#)

310 This work was supported by Innovation Fund Denmark under grant no. 9078-00183B and the Danish  
311 Environmental Protection Agency under grant no. MST-667-00253.

## 312 [Author contributions:](#)

313 KR Wrote the first draft, produced figures, and conducted data analysis. KR, EB, and LS developed  
314 paper outline and structure. EB contributed to the introduction, field validation, discussion, and  
315 conclusion. LS contributed to the data processing section and discussion. KP and LM contributed to  
316 the instrument software development. AS, RL, and FE contributed to the instrument development  
317 and instrument characterization section.

318 MS contributed with editing and contributed to figures.

319 SH, BB, CG & JL collected and counted insects during the field trials.

320 TN led the development of the instrumentation. JL took over development leadership in 2020.

### 321 **Competing Interests**

322 All authors are or were (partly) affiliated with FaunaPhotonics, the company that developed the  
323 sensor described in this study.

324

- 325 1. Stork, N. E. How Many Species of Insects and Other Terrestrial Arthropods Are There on  
326 Earth? (2017) doi:10.1146/annurev-ento-020117.
- 327 2. Scudder, G. *Insect Biodiversity: Science and Society - Google Books*. (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).
- 328 3. Lami, F., Boscutti, F., Masin, R., Sigura, M. & Marini, L. Seed predation intensity and stability  
329 in agro-ecosystems: Role of predator diversity and soil disturbance. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*  
330 **288**, 106720 (2020).
- 331 4. Gallai, N., Salles, J. M., Settele, J. & Vaissière, B. E. Economic valuation of the vulnerability of  
332 world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline. *Ecol. Econ.* **68**, 810–821 (2009).
- 333 5. Egg Parasitoids in Agroecosystems with Emphasis on Trichogramma - Google Books.  
334 [https://books.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=jtIhYFH9RgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=parasitoids](https://books.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=jtIhYFH9RgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&ots=UFPabmkmym&sig=VQQ9h6LD_0sBJvGclI9E8wpHPG8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&f=false)  
335 [+in+agroecosystems&ots=UFPabmkmym&sig=VQQ9h6LD\\_0sBJvGclI9E8wpHPG8&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=jtIhYFH9RgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&ots=UFPabmkmym&sig=VQQ9h6LD_0sBJvGclI9E8wpHPG8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&f=false)  
336 [#v=onepage&q=parasitoids in agroecosystems&f=false](https://books.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=jtIhYFH9RgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&ots=UFPabmkmym&sig=VQQ9h6LD_0sBJvGclI9E8wpHPG8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=parasitoids+in+agroecosystems&f=false).
- 337 6. Sánchez-Guillén, R. A., Córdoba-Aguilar, A., Hansson, B., Ott, J. & Wellenreuther, M.  
338 Evolutionary consequences of climate-induced range shifts in insects. *Biol. Rev.* **91**, 1050–  
339 1064 (2016).
- 340 7. Zalucki, M. P. *et al.* Estimating the economic cost of one of the world's major insect pests,  
341 *Plutella xylostella* (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae): just how long is a piece of string? *J. Econ.*  
342 *Entomol.* **105**, 1115–1129 (2012).
- 343 8. Dornelas, M. & Daskalova, G. N. Nuanced changes in insect abundance. *Science (80-. )*. **368**,  
344 368–369 (2020).
- 345 9. Didham, R. K. *et al.* Interpreting insect declines: seven challenges and a way forward. *Insect*  
346 *Conserv. Divers.* **13**, 103–114 (2020).
- 347 10. Greenwood, B. M., Bojang, K. & Whitty, C. J. M. Target GAT. *Lancet* **365**, 98 (2005).
- 348 11. Dangles, O. & Casas, J. Ecosystem services provided by insects for achieving sustainable  
349 development goals. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **35**, 109–115 (2019).
- 350 12. Burkholder, W. E. & Ma, M. Pheromones for monitoring and control of stored-product  
351 insects. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **30**, 257–272 (1985).
- 352 13. Morris, R. F. *SAMPLING INSECT POPULATIONS*1,2.
- 353 14. Strickland, A. H. *SAMPLING CROP PESTS AND THEIR HOSTS*1.
- 354 15. Bannerman, J. A., Costamagna, A. C., McCornack, B. P. & Ragsdale, D. W. Comparison of  
355 Relative Bias, Precision, and Efficiency of Sampling Methods for Natural Enemies of Soybean  
356 Aphid (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *J. Econ. Entomol.* **108**, 1381–1397 (2015).
- 357 16. Osborne, J. L. *et al.* Harmonic radar: a new technique for investigating bumblebee and honey

- 358 bee foraging flight. in *VII International Symposium on Pollination* 437 159–164 (1996).
- 359 17. Zink, A. G. & Rosenheim, J. A. State-dependent sampling bias in insects: implications for  
360 monitoring western tarnished plant bugs. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **113**, 117–123 (2004).
- 361 18. Rancourt, B., Vincent, C. & De Oliveira, A. D. Circadian Activity of *Lygus lineolaris* (Hemiptera:  
362 Miridae) and Effectiveness of Sampling Techniques in Strawberry Fields. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **93**,  
363 1160–1166 (2000).
- 364 19. Binns, M. R. & Nyrop, P. *SAMPLING INSECT POPULATIONS FOR THE PURPOSE OF IPM*  
365 *DECISION MAKING*. (1992).
- 366 20. Portman, Z. M., Bruninga-Socular, B. & Cariveau, D. P. The State of Bee Monitoring in the  
367 United States: A Call to Refocus Away From Bowl Traps and Towards More Effective Methods.  
368 *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **113**, 337–342 (2020).
- 369 21. Montgomery, G. A., Belitz, M. W., Guralnick, R. P. & Tingley, M. W. Standards and Best  
370 Practices for Monitoring and Benchmarking Insects. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* vol. 8  
371 579193 (2021).
- 372 22. Bick, E., Dryden, D. M., Nguyen, H. D. & Kim, H. A Novel CO<sub>2</sub>-Based Insect Sampling Device  
373 and Associated Field Method Evaluated in a Strawberry Agroecosystem. *J. Econ. Entomol.*  
374 **113**, 1037–1042 (2020).
- 375 23. Wen, C. & Guyer, D. Image-based orchard insect automated identification and classification  
376 method. *Comput. Electron. Agric.* **89**, 110–115 (2012).
- 377 24. Chen, Y., Why, A., Batista, G., Mafra-Neto, A. & Keogh, E. Flying insect classification with  
378 inexpensive sensors. *J. Insect Behav.* **27**, 657–677 (2014).
- 379 25. Potamitis, I. & Rigakis, I. Novel noise-robust optoacoustic sensors to identify insects through  
380 wingbeats. *IEEE Sens. J.* **15**, 4621–4631 (2015).
- 381 26. Eliopoulos, P. A., Potamitis, I., Kontodimas, D. C. & Givropoulou, E. G. Detection of Adult  
382 Beetles Inside the Stored Wheat Mass Based on Their Acoustic Emissions. *J. Econ. Entomol.*  
383 **108**, 2808–2814 (2015).
- 384 27. Årje, J. *et al.* Automatic image-based identification and biomass estimation of invertebrates.  
385 *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **11**, 922–931 (2020).
- 386 28. Hobbs, S. E. & Hodges, G. An optical method for automatic classification and recording of a  
387 suction trap catch. *Bull. Entomol. Res.* **83**, 47–51 (1993).
- 388 29. O'Neill, M. A., Gauld, I. D., Gaston, K. J. & Weeks, P. Daisy: an automated invertebrate  
389 identification system using holistic vision techniques. in *Proceedings of the Inaugural Meeting*  
390 *BioNET-INTERNATIONAL Group for Computer-Aided Taxonomy (BIGCAT)* 13–22 (1997).
- 391 30. Chesmore, E. D. Methodologies for automating the identification of species. *First BioNet-*  
392 *International Work. Gr. Autom. Taxon.* 3–12 (2000).
- 393 31. Martineau, M. *et al.* A survey on image-based insect classification To cite this version : HAL  
394 Id : hal-01441203. (2017).
- 395 32. Moore, A., Miller, J. R., Tabashnik, B. E. & Gage, S. H. Automated identification of flying  
396 insects by analysis of wingbeat frequencies. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **79**, 1703–1706 (1986).
- 397 33. Riley, J. R. Angular and temporal variations in the radar cross-sections of insects. in  
398 *Proceedings of the Institution of Electrical Engineers* vol. 120 1229–1232 (IET, 1973).

- 399 34. Reed, S. C., Williams, C. M. & Chadwick, L. E. *FREQUENCY OF WING-BEAT AS A CHARACTER*  
400 *FOR SEPARATING SPECIES RACES AND GEOGRAPHIC VARIETIES OF DROSOPHILA.*
- 401 35. Mankin, R. W., Hagstrum, D. W., Smith, M. T., Roda, A. L. & Kairo, M. T. K. *Perspective and*  
402 *Promise: a Century of Insect Acoustic Detection and Monitoring.*  
403 <https://academic.oup.com/ae/article/57/1/30/2462094> (2011).
- 404 36. Drake, V. A. & Reynolds, D. R. *Radar entomology: observing insect flight and migration.* (Cabi,  
405 2012).
- 406 37. Long, T. *et al.* Entomological Radar Overview: System and Signal Processing. *IEEE Aerosp.*  
407 *Electron. Syst. Mag.* **35**, 20–32 (2020).
- 408 38. Drake, V. A., Hatty, S., Symons, C. & Wang, H. Insect monitoring radar: Maximizing  
409 performance and utility. *Remote Sens.* **12**, (2020).
- 410 39. Brydegaard, M. & Jansson, S. Advances in entomological laser radar. *IET Int. Radar Conf.* 2–5  
411 (2018) doi:10.1049/joe.2019.0598.
- 412 40. Jansson, S. *Entomological lidar : target characterization and field applications.* (Division of  
413 Combustion Physics, Department of Physics, Lund University, 2020).
- 414 41. Malmqvist, E. *From Fauna to Flames : remote sensing with Scheimpflug-Lidar.* (Division of  
415 Combustion Physics, Department of Physics, Lund University, 2019).
- 416 42. Mankin, R. W., Hagstrum, D. W., Smith, M. T., Roda, A. L. & Kairo, M. T. K. Perspective and  
417 promise: A century of insect acoustic detection and monitoring. *Am. Entomol.* **57**, 30–44  
418 (2011).
- 419 43. Miller-Struttman, N. E., Heise, D., Schul, J., Geib, J. C. & Galen, C. Flight of the bumble bee:  
420 Buzzes predict pollination services. *PLoS One* **12**, 1–14 (2017).
- 421 44. Li, Y. *et al.* Mosquito detection with low-cost smartphones: data acquisition for malaria  
422 research. (2017).
- 423 45. Mukundarajan, H., Hol, F. J. H., Castillo, E. A., Newby, C. & Prakash, M. Using mobile phones  
424 as acoustic sensors for high-throughput mosquito surveillance. *Elife* **6**, 1–26 (2017).
- 425 46. Osborne, J. L. *et al.* A landscape-scale study of bumble bee foraging range and constancy,  
426 using harmonic radar. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **36**, 519–533 (1999).
- 427 47. Radar, L., Smith, A. D., Riley, J. R. & Gregory, R. D. *A Method for Routine Monitoring of the*  
428 *Aerial Migration of Insects by Using a Vertical.* *Source: Philosophical Transactions: Biological*  
429 *Sciences* vol. 340 (1993).
- 430 48. Chapman, J. W., Smith, A. D., Woiwod, I. P., Reynolds, D. R. & Riley, J. R. *Development of*  
431 *vertical-looking radar technology for monitoring insect migration.* *Computers and Electronics*  
432 *in Agriculture* vol. 35 [www.elsevier.com/locate/compag](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/compag) (2002).
- 433 49. Malmqvist, E. & Brydegaard, M. Applications of KHZ-CW Lidar in Ecological Entomology. *EPJ*  
434 *Web Conf.* **119**, (2016).
- 435 50. Brydegaard, M. *et al.* Lidar reveals activity anomaly of malaria vectors during pan-African  
436 eclipse. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay5487 (2020).
- 437 51. Malmqvist, E. *et al.* The bat–bird–bug battle: Daily flight activity of insects and their predators  
438 over a rice field revealed by high-resolution scheimpflug lidar. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **5**, (2018).
- 439 52. Fristrup, K. M., Shaw, J. A. & Tauc, M. J. Development of a wing-beat-modulation scanning

- 440 lidar system for insect studies. *Lidar Remote Sens. Environ. Monit.* 2017 15 (2017)  
441 doi:10.1117/12.2274656.
- 442 53. Hoffman, D. S., Nehrir, A. R., Repasky, K. S., Shaw, J. A. & Carlsten, J. L. Range-resolved optical  
443 detection of honeybees by use of wing-beat modulation of scattered light for locating land  
444 mines. *Appl. Opt.* **46**, 3007–3012 (2007).
- 445 54. Jansson, S., Malmqvist, E. & Mlacha, Y. Real-time dispersal of malaria vectors in rural Africa  
446 monitored with lidar. *PLoS ONE* (2020).
- 447 55. Jansson, S. & Brydegaard, M. Passive kHz lidar for the quantification of insect activity and  
448 dispersal. *Anim. Biotelemetry* **6**, 6 (2018).
- 449 56. Jansson, S. P. & Sørensen, M. B. An optical remote sensing system for detection of aerial and  
450 aquatic fauna. (2019).
- 451 57. Malmqvist, E., Jansson, S., Török, S. & Brydegaard, M. Effective parameterization of laser  
452 radar observations of atmospheric fauna. *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* **22**, 1 (2015).
- 453 58. Drake, V. A., Wang, H. K. & Harman, I. T. Insect Monitoring Radar: Remote and network  
454 operation. *Comput. Electron. Agric.* **35**, 77–94 (2002).
- 455 59. Kirkeby, C. *et al.* Advances in automatic identification of flying insects using optical sensors  
456 and machine learning. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 1555 (2021).
- 457 60. Jacques, S. L. Erratum: Optical properties of biological tissues: A review (Physics in Medicine  
458 and Biology (2013) 58). *Phys. Med. Biol.* **58**, 5007–5008 (2013).
- 459 61. Li, M. *et al.* Bark beetles as lidar targets and prospects of photonic surveillance. *J.*  
460 *Biophotonics* 1–16 (2020) doi:10.1002/jbio.202000420.
- 461 62. Brydegaard, M. Advantages of shortwave infrared LIDAR entomology. in *Laser Applications to*  
462 *Chemical, Security and Environmental Analysis LW2D-6* (Optical Society of America, 2014).
- 463 63. Brydegaard, M., Jansson, S., Schulz, M. & Runemark, A. Can the narrow red bands of  
464 dragonflies be used to perceive wing interference patterns? *Ecol. Evol.* **8**, (2018).
- 465 64. Gebru, A. *et al.* Multiband modulation spectroscopy for the determination of sex and species  
466 of mosquitoes in flight. *J. Biophotonics* **11**, (2018).
- 467 65. Potamitis, I. Classifying insects on the fly. *Ecol. Inform.* **21**, 40–49 (2014).
- 468 66. Silva, D. F., De Souza, V. M. A., Batista GEAPA, K. E. & Ellis, D. P. W. Applying machine learning  
469 and audio analysis techniques to insect recognition in intelligent traps. Proceedings—2013  
470 12th International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications, ICMLA 2013. 2013.  
471 (2013).
- 472 67. Heathcote, G. D. THE COMPARISON OF YELLOW CYLINDRICAL, FLAT AND WATER TRAPS, AND  
473 OF JOHNSON SUCTION TRAPS, FOR SAMPLING APHIDS. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* **45**, 133–139 (1957).
- 474 68. Capinera, J. L. & Walmsley, M. R. *Visual Responses of Some Sugarbeet Insects to Sticky Traps*  
475 *and Water Pan Traps of Various Colors 1*.
- 476 69. VAISHAMPAYAN, S. M., KOGAN, M., WALDBAUER, G. P. & WOOLLEY, J. T. SPECTRAL SPECIFIC  
477 RESPONSES IN THE VISUAL BEHAVIOR OF THE GREENHOUSE WHITEFLY, TRIALEURODES  
478 VAPORARIORUM (HOMOPTERA: ALEYRODIDAE). *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **18**, 344–356 (1975).
- 479 70. Mound, L. A. Studies on the olfaction and colour sensitivity of *Bemisia tabaci* (Genn.)  
480 (Homoptera, Aleyrodidae). *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **5**, 99–104 (1962).

- 481 71. Virtanen, P. *et al.* SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nat.*  
482 *Methods* **17**, 261–272 (2020).
- 483 72. Van Der Kooij, C. J., Stavenga, D. G., Arikawa, K., Belušič, G. & Kelber, A. Evolution of Insect  
484 Color Vision: From Spectral Sensitivity to Visual Ecology. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **66**, 435–461  
485 (2021).
- 486