
ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Increasing trust in new data sources: crowdsourcing image classification for ecology.

Edgar Santos-Fernandez^{1,2} | Julie Vercelloni^{1,2} | Aiden Price^{1,2} | Grace Heron^{1,2} | Bryce Christensen³ | Erin E. Peterson^{1,2} | Kerrie Mengersen^{1,2}

¹School of Mathematical Sciences. Queensland University of Technology. Australia.

²Centre for Data Science. Queensland University of Technology. Australia.

³Visualisation and Interactive Solutions for Engagement and Research (VISER) Lab. Queensland University of Technology. Australia.

Correspondence

School of Mathematical Sciences. Queensland University of Technology. Australia

Email: santosfe@qut.edu.au; edgar.santosfdez@gmail.com; k.mengersen@qut.edu.au

Funding information

This research was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) Laureate Fellowship Program under the project "Bayesian Learning for Decision Making in the Big Data Era" (ID: FL150100150)

Crowdsourcing methods facilitate the production of scientific information by non-experts. This form of citizen science (CS) is becoming a key source of complementary data in many fields to inform data-driven decisions and study challenging problems. However, concerns about the validity of these data often constrain their utility. In this paper, we focus on the use of citizen science data in addressing complex challenges in environmental conservation. We consider this issue from three perspectives. First, we present a literature scan of papers that have employed Bayesian models with citizen science in ecology. Second, we compare several popular majority vote algorithms and introduce a Bayesian item response model that estimates and accounts for participants' abilities after adjusting for the difficulty of the images they have classified. The model also enables participants to be clustered into groups based on ability. Third, we apply the model in a case study involving the classification of corals from underwater images from the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. We show that the model achieved superior results in general and, for difficult tasks, a weighted consensus method that uses only groups of experts and experienced participants produced better performance mea-

asures. Moreover, we found that participants learn as they have more classification opportunities, which substantially increases their abilities over time. Overall, the paper demonstrates the feasibility of CS for answering complex and challenging ecological questions when these data are appropriately analysed. This serves as motivation for future work to increase the efficacy and trustworthiness of this emerging source of data. **Keywords** – Bayesian inference; citizen science; item response model

1 | INTRODUCTION

Citizen science (CS) and crowdsourcing involve volunteers and amateur scientists in the scientific process. Over the last decade the number of publications using CS data has increased dramatically (Fig 1). CS projects are now entrenched in many fields of science, including the notification and classification of astronomical events to learn about our universe, the identification and monitoring of environmental phenomena to learn about our world, and the reporting and assessment of health and medical outcomes to learn about our own selves. Quantitative information obtained from citizen scientists can be analysed in its own right, or it can fill gaps in professional data collection programs or experimental studies, or it can be used for complementary purposes such as training machine learning algorithms (Bradter et al., 2018).

In the field of ecology, millions of citizen scientists are engaged in research projects worldwide, producing volumes of information in a cost-effective and timely manner and contributing substantively to aspirational targets such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Hsu et al., 2014; Fritz et al., 2019). These projects embrace a wide range of challenges, including assessments of climate change impacts, water and air quality measurements, monitoring of biodiversity trends and patterns in abundance, distribution, and richness of native and exotic species. Citizen science platforms have also become established. For example, iNaturalist, eButterfly and Zooniverse host hundreds of projects involving image classification. These online platforms have gained substantial recognition in recent years because they have the potential to reduce the workload of ecological experts and they engage large communities of contributors.

Notwithstanding the popularity and benefits of CS, considerable data quality concerns remain regarding research involving data elicited by non-expert citizen scientists (Downs et al., 2021). These concerns primarily focus on the potential for bias arising from the unstructured nature of the data and the differing abilities of the participants. For example, while the individual classification accuracy is high in some CS image classification projects, ranging from 70% to 95% (e.g. Kosmala et al., 2016), aggregation via some form of consensus is often required to produce reliable classifications and estimates (Santos Fernandez et al., 2020; Santos-Fernandez and Mengersen, 2021). Many aggregation methods, including majority voting, enjoy great success in the literature. These methods rely on the assumption that participants have greater than 50% chance of answering correctly. However, such an assumption is not always satisfied in the presence of difficult tasks, in which the majority of the classifications can be incorrect (Raykar et al., 2010).

In this paper, we focus on a particular set of problems that are of great interest for citizen science in ecology, namely the classification of objects in photos and videos. We investigate the feasibility of crowdsourcing methods




FIGURE 1 Number of citizen science published articles per year since 2009 according to the Web of Science database and the forecast for the next five years with confidence intervals.

for citizen science as a viable solution for manual classification of images when the task is difficult. This may occur, for example, if the images represent complex ecosystems, depicting aggregations of diverse species communities that change in space and time. Difficult tasks can also be related to images produced by different sources, such as environmental monitoring programs and cameras.

We consider this problem through a Bayesian lens. To set the work in context, we first present a scan of papers that have employed Bayesian models with citizen science in ecology. The 84 exemplar papers are summarised with respect to the aim of the study, the statistical model/method and software employed, the data captured and the platform enlisted. Of particular interest is the acknowledgement and treatment of potential bias in the CS data. We then study how a suitable statistical model based on item response theory (IRT) can improve the quality of crowdsourced information and enable it to be used more confidently to help answer relevant ecological problems and estimate complex measures such as ecosystem health. This model can be used to assess changes in participants' abilities over time and whether they learn with more classification opportunities. It can also be used to identify those categories that are harder to classify and factors affecting the difficulties of the images.

Following discussion of the model, we present a case study of the classification of underwater images from the Great Barrier Reef (GBR), Australia. In the experiment, we showed coral reef images to non-expert participants and asked them to classify five broad categories of benthic communities using the Amazon Mechanical Turk platform (MTurk). The statistical approach developed in this paper allows us to estimate the most difficult benthic categories, investigate different types of difficulty, including those related to images and cameras, and detect different groups of participants, based on their abilities to perform the required tasks. We also examine the relationship between the time that a participant needed to perform the classification and the participants' latent abilities.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. A review of Bayesian methods for citizen science is provided in Section 2 followed by the introduction of a Bayesian item response model which addresses biases in image classification in Section 3. Section 4 details the paper's case study in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia, including a results section summarising the applied models. Finally, Section 5 contains a detailed discussion centred around the quality of citizen science data for image classification specifically and for use in ecological research. It should be noted that

we focus on images in this paper and often refer to images as 'items'. Additionally, we use the term 'label' to refer to the true underlying category of the target observation in any reference images. Despite dealing with the classification of images in this study, the proposed methodology can be extrapolated to other sources of citizen science-produced data such as audio recordings.

2 | BAYESIAN METHODS FOR CITIZEN SCIENCE

Scientists are increasingly employing Bayesian statistical methods to overcome some of the limitations of CS data. We conducted a scan of some of the most relevant developments, following the PRISMA guidelines (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) (Moher et al., 2009). We searched the Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar databases using the keywords "citizen science" and "Bayes", and filtered articles belonging to Ecology and Conservation. The search was restricted to articles in the English language published in peer-reviewed articles from 2010 to 30-Apr-2022.

We found a total of 84 articles meeting the inclusion criteria. For each article, we summarised the statistical method used, the most relevant findings, the data sources, the platform/project and the software/packages used for modelling (if it was mentioned explicitly). The articles are summarized in Table 3. In total, 36.4% of the articles used Bayesian regression and/or hierarchical models. A comparable percentage employed Bayesian species distribution models / Bayesian occupancy models. Approximately 20% of the models incorporate spatial and spatio-temporal dependence. Other statistical models not included in these categories accounted for 18%. In Fig 10 we have summarized the software used for Bayesian computation. Over half of the articles that specified the use of software mentioned the use of R (R Core Team, 2018), frequently in conjunction with dedicated software such as WinBUGS (Lunn et al., 2000), OpenBUGS (Spiegelhalter et al., 2007), Stan (Carpenter et al., 2017) and INLA (Rue et al., 2009). Among the scanned paper, the most popular R packages for Bayesian inference are R2jags (Su and Yajima, 2021), rjags (Plummer, 2022), R2OpenBUGS (Sturtz et al., 2005), rstan (Stan Development Team, 2018), unmarked (Fiske and Chandler, 2011), adegenet (Jombart and Ahmed, 2011), ape (Paradis and Schliep, 2019), jagsUI (Kellner, 2021), R2WinBUGS (Sturtz et al., 2005), rstanarm (Goodrich et al., 2022).

A substantial proportion of the scanned articles deals with topics such as the estimation of the presence/absence of species or their abundance. Hence, many authors resort to Bayesian occupancy and species distribution models (e.g. Della Rocca and Milanese, 2022; Sheard et al., 2021; Coomber et al., 2021; Ver Hoef et al., 2021; Erickson and Smith, 2021; Rodhouse et al., 2021). Ecological data is generally geo-referenced and many of the models account for spatial variation by using for instance conditional autoregressive models (CAR) (Arab et al., 2016; Croft et al., 2019; Dwyer et al., 2016; Purse et al., 2015; Santos Fernandez et al., 2020), covariance matrices (Reich et al., 2018), Gaussian processes (Sicacha-Parada et al., 2020), SPDE (Girardello et al., 2019; Humphreys et al., 2019) or simply incorporating spatially varying covariates.

One of our main aims was to explore the treatment authors give to CS-produced data. We found that researchers often assume that no errors or biases are present in the data, which could affect statistical inference and decision making. For example, many CS projects in ecology use opportunistic data that are obtained without a sampling design or a professional survey, since traditional professional programs are costly and time-consuming and can fail to obtain accurate or precise estimates of infrequent species or other outcomes of interest. Geographical, spatial recording, and preferential sampling bias may arise from opportunistically collected data, with more observations from frequently visited locations such as around roads, with irregular frequencies across time, or as a result of preferential sampling spots with certain habitat types or where specific species are more likely to be found. See the discussion in Chevalier

et al. (2021); Fournier et al. (2017); Zhu et al. (2020). In addition, observer bias may arise as the result of inexperience, or incorrect understanding or perception of a variable of interest. Detection bias may arise if a species or outcome of interest is missed or misidentified.

Overall, we identified several strategies that have been proposed to cope with potential bias in CS data. A discussion around the use of opportunistic data can be found in Coron et al. (2018). Similarly, the temporal bias (observation efforts) arising from the seasonality of visitors to the area of study is addressed by Dwyer et al. (2016), specifically for sightings data. In a spatial context, van Strien et al. (2013b) suggested using post-stratification of sites and showed how opportunistic data can produce suitable estimates when adjusting for bias produced by geographical imbalance and unequal observation efforts. In another study, Humphreys et al. (2019) included human population density to account for the fact that sightings might be more likely in areas with larger populations. These authors also tackled observer bias by using observation effort expressed as observer hours as a predictor in their models.

Imperfect detection is relevant, especially for data contributed by citizen scientists. Occupancy models generally involve a component for the presence/absence and another for the detection/non-detection. These models aim at minimizing the misclassification rate (number of false negatives and false positives). Variations of this models can be found in Strebel et al. (2014), Isaac et al. (2014), Petracca et al. (2018) and van Strien et al. (2013a). See Isaac et al. (2014) for a comparison of several Bayesian occupancy models in terms of the efficiency to detect trends based on different opportunistic data collection scenarios. Detection bias is also considered in Berberich et al. (2016) by accounting for false-positive detection (specificity) bias when spotting red wood ant nests. Viljugrein et al. (2019) also considered diagnostic sensitivity for the probability that an infected animal will be detected by testing. Similarly, Cumming and Henry (2019) corrected for observation effort to account for imperfect detection. More recently, Eisma et al. (2020) suggested a measurement error model to adjust for biases and errors in reports of rainfall measurement data produced by volunteers in Nepal.

There exists a fundamental gap in the literature regarding approaches to overcome other sources of bias. This includes potential biases resulting from the misclassification errors arising during the classification of objects on images by citizen scientists. We discuss this issue in the next section.

3 | ADDRESSING CITIZEN SCIENCE BIAS IN IMAGE CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we first discuss majority voting algorithms that are frequently used to estimate the true labels in manual image classification. This is followed by the introduction of a Bayesian item response model that is used to weight the evidence produced by citizen scientists.

3.1 | Majority vote (MV)

We consider a set of images $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, each composed of $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ elicitation points selected using a spatially balanced random sampling approach. We deal with a binary classification task, in which a participant i is asked whether a category (e.g., coral) is present on a point belonging to a given image. Let Y_{ijk} be the answer of the participant i for the k^{th} point from the j^{th} image.

$$Y_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the participant considered the category to be present} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

By design, multiple participants classify the same point k . Based on these answers, we obtain the majority vote by aggregating the answers, so that the category with the highest proportion of votes wins the vote, which is the mode.

$$\hat{Y}_{jk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if proportion of votes with "category present"} > 0.5 \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In general, this approach performs poorly for difficult tasks. This is because only expert participants are likely to respond correctly, and they can be outvoted by beginners (Raykar et al., 2010). A variation of this method is obtained using a weighted majority voting (WMV) which has been discussed, among others, by Littlestone et al. (1989); Lintott et al. (2008); Hines et al. (2015). In this method, each participant has a vote proportional to some weights, based on their knowledge, skills or past performance.

3.2 | Bayesian IRT model

The estimation of participants' abilities in crowdsourced data has been widely discussed in the literature (Whitehill et al., 2009; Welinder and Perona, 2010; Paun et al., 2018). We develop a Bayesian item response model with the aim of informing a weighted consensus voting approach. Reiterating for completeness the notation introduced earlier, let the binary response variable Y_{ijk} represent whether a question associated with the k^{th} point ($k = 1, \dots, K$) on the j^{th} image ($j = 1, \dots, J$) taken using the l^{th} camera is correctly answered or not by the i^{th} participant ($i = 1, \dots, I$). We assume that Y_{ijkl} follows a Bernoulli distribution with parameter p_{ijkl}

$$Y_{ijkl} \sim \text{Bern}(p_{ijkl}). \quad (3)$$

We use an extension of the item response model, namely the linear logistic test model (LLTM), which is formulated as follows

$$p_{ijkl} = \eta_k + (1 - \eta_k) \frac{1}{1 + \exp\{-\alpha_k(\theta_i - \beta_k - \beta_l)\}}, \quad (4)$$

where β_k and β_l are difficulties associated with the point and the camera. The parameter θ_i represents the ability of the participant. The ability of an average participant can be anchored by setting it equal to zero to avoid identifiability issues with the model. Additionally, α_k gives the slope of the logistic curve and η_k is a pseudo-guessing associated with the point, indicating the probability of answering correctly due to guessing. We use Bayesian inference and therefore we need to define prior distributions for the parameters of interest in Eq4.

$\theta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\theta)$	# hierarchical prior on the abilities
$\sigma_\theta \sim \text{uniform}(0, 10)$	# flat prior on a weakly informative range for the s.d. of the users' abilities
$\beta_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{b_k}, \sigma_{b_k})$	# hierarchical prior on the item difficulties
$\mu_{\beta_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 5)$	# weakly informative prior for the mean of the item difficulties
$\sigma_{\beta_k} \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 5) T0, \infty$	# informative prior for the sd of the item difficulty, allowing for substantially complex tasks
$\beta_l \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_b, \sigma_{b_l})$	# hierarchical prior on the camera difficulties
$\mu_{\beta_l} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 5)$	# weakly informative prior for the mean of camera difficulty
$\sigma_{\beta_l} \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 5) T0, \infty$	# informative prior for the sd of the camera difficulties
$\alpha_k \sim \mathcal{N}(1, \sigma_\alpha)$	# normal prior with mean 1 on the slope
$\sigma_\alpha \sim \text{Cauchy}(0, 5) T0, \infty$	# half Cauchy prior on the slope sd truncated at 0
$\eta_k \sim \text{beta}(1, 5)$	# weakly informative prior on the pseudoguessing

Changes in ability

Several authors have suggested the implementation of dynamic item response models that account for temporal variation in the answers, under the principle that subjects' abilities change with time as a learning curve (e.g. Wang et al., 2013). To capture the learning in the process, we incorporated a temporally dependent component to the model

$$p_{ijklt} = \eta_k + (1 - \eta_k) \frac{1}{1 + \exp\{-\alpha_k (\phi_t + \theta_i - \beta_k - \beta_l)\}}, \quad (5)$$

where ϕ_t is a common learning measure that captures the change in abilities according to the daily occasions that participants performed classifications $t = 1, 2, \dots, 15$. For participant i , $t = 1$ represents the first classification day, $t = 2$ the second, and so on.

Consensus based on a Bayesian item response model

The model described above is set in the context of a broader workflow, described as follows:

1. Produce a representative set of gold standard images e.g. 33% of the total number of images. In this set of images the true labels or answers will be obtained from expert elicitation or other another suitable method. Images in this set will be scored by most of the participants.
2. Fit an item response model and obtain estimates of the participants' abilities accounting for difficulties, guessing, etc.
3. For a weighted consensus, derive a weight for each participant proportional to their estimated ability using the posterior mean. We can compute the weights using $w_i = \exp\theta_i \prod_{i=1}^I \exp\theta_i$. Alternatively, a fully Bayesian framework can be employed by using the draws from the posterior distribution of θ_i to compute the distribution of

w_i .

4. Perform a weighted consensus vote to estimate the labels. Since our response variable is binary, the category with the largest $\sum_{k=1}^K w_i$ wins the weighted vote.

4 | CASE STUDY: CLASSIFICATION OF IMAGES FROM CORAL REEFS

"How inappropriate to call this planet Earth when it is quite clearly Ocean." - Arthur C. Clarke

The Great Barrier Reef (GBR) is located on Australia's north eastern coast and is among the largest and most complex ecosystems in the world (Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, 2009). Two impacts of climate change, including the increasing frequency of reef bleaching events and intensity of cyclones, are negatively affecting this ecosystem causing an unprecedented decline in the prevalence of hard corals (Hughes et al., 2017; De'ath et al., 2012; Ainsworth et al., 2016; Vercelloni et al., 2020). Estimation and assessment of this decline are difficult and expensive to quantify using traditional marine surveys considering the size of the GBR and the speed of decline (Gonzalez-Rivero et al., 2020). For this reason, some researchers are harnessing the strength of citizen science to produce estimates of reef-health indicators across large spatial and temporal scales (Peterson et al., 2020; Santos Fernandez et al., 2020). For instance, Santos Fernandez et al. (2020), utilized a spatial misclassification model, taking into account the proficiency of the participant in terms of sensitivity and specificity to account for bias in the data. Information from these models can then be used by reef managers and scientists to make data-enabled management decisions and inform future research.

We performed an experiment using Amazon Mechanical Turk (<https://www.mturk.com/>) to assess the feasibility of using crowdsourced data for the estimation of hard coral cover, represented as the two-dimensional proportion of the seafloor covered in hard corals. Hard corals play an important role in reef ecosystems; their hard skeletons provide habitat for many organisms and they are vulnerable to a range of impacts that accumulate with climate change (Hughes et al., 2017). The dataset used in the study consisted of 514 geotagged images obtained from the XL Catlin Seaview Survey (González-Rivero et al., 2014) and the University of Queensland's Remote Sensing Research Centre (Roelfsema et al., 2018), which we used to assess the participants' abilities to identify hard corals. In practice, coral cover estimates from images are often based on a subset of classification points, rather than the whole image (Thompson et al., 2016; Sweatman et al., 2005). In these two programs, 40 to 50 spatially balanced, random classification points were selected on each image and classified by coral reef scientists (Gonzalez-Rivero et al., 2020; Roelfsema et al., 2021). We consider the classifications from the reef scientists as a gold standard (i.e. the ground truth).

We engaged participants and provided instructions in an 11-page training document https://github.com/EdgarSantos-Fernandez/reef_misclassification/HelpGuide_MTurk20200203.pdf, describing how to identify the different benthic categories, which included: *hard* and *soft* corals, *algae*, *sand*, *water* and *other*. Participants were also given the option to select *unsure* if they were uncertain about which category to select. Several image classification examples were included in this guide and the differences between commonly misclassified benthic groups were highlighted <https://www.virtualreef.org.au/wp-content/uploads/VirtualReefDiver-Classification-HelpGuide-Part2.pdf>.

After studying the training document, a qualification task was used to assess the proficiency of the participants to accurately complete the task. More specifically, the participants were shown five images containing one classification point each and asked to select the correct class from the five possible choices. The qualification was granted to those scoring at least three correct classifications out of five.

We designed a sampling protocol to select images representative of the GBR in terms of community composition (proportion of hard and soft corals, algae, and sand) and camera types (Canon, Lumix, Olympus, Sony, and Nikon). This produced a dataset composed of 514 images. We produced 514 human intelligence tasks (HITS) with a maximum number of 70 assignments per HIT (i.e. maximum number of times each image can be classified).

Images were randomly assigned to the participants. We were concerned that classifying 40 or 50 points per image was too time consuming and that it would reduce participation. In addition, previous research has shown that accurate estimates of coral cover can be obtained with approximately 10 points Bejbom et al. (2015). Therefore, we asked participants to classify 15 classification points on each image, randomly selected from the 40-50 points previously classified by reef scientists. See the example in Fig.2. Participants were required to select a classification category for all of the points before submitting the classification. Every assignment (i.e. an image) was expected to take approximately one minute to complete. The payment was set to 0.10 USD per image and participants reported earning more than the federal minimum wage in the United States (\$7.25 per hour) for their contributions. We monitored the quality of the classifications to prevent low-quality participants from contributing.

4.1 | Performance measures

Our category of interest in the analyses is *hard corals*. We used a suite of performance measures to describe the ability of the participants, which are based on the true positive (TP), true negative (TN), false positive (FP), and false negative (FN). In this context, TP are the points classified as hard coral given that the point is truly occupied by hard corals. A TN occurs when the point is correctly classified as something other than hard coral when there is no hard coral present. Similarly, FP represents points classified as hard coral when hard coral is absent, while FN occurs when hard coral is incorrectly classified as something else. This information was then used to generate other performance measures such as:

- Sensitivity: measures the ability of a participant to identify a category when it is present: $se = TP / (TP + FN)$.
- Specificity: measures the ability of a participant to correctly identify a category when it is absent: $sp = TN / (TN + FP)$.
- Classification accuracy: the proportion of correctly identified classification points: $acc = (TP + TN) / (TP + TN + FN + FP)$.
- Precision: the probability of correctly classifying points that truly contain the category hard coral divided by the total number of points classified as containing it $pre = TP / (TP + FP)$.
- Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) (Matthews, 1975): a measure of the effectiveness of the classifier using all the elements of the confusion matrix.
- positive likelihood ratio (lr_+): gives the number of true positives for every false positive.
- negative likelihood ratio (lr_-): measures the number of false negatives for every true negative.

We fitted the Bayesian item response model given in Eq 5. We extracted the posterior distribution of the abilities (θ_i) and clustered subjects. We then used these clusters to construct several model variations based on majority voting, restricted to experts or experts/experienced subjects. Three replicates were generated for different gold standard proportions and the results were averaged out.



FIGURE 2 Example of an underwater image from the Great Barrier Reef, Australia used for classification. Participants were asked to classify what they observed within the points into multiple categories.

4.2 | Results

The data contributed by participants were aggregated using the five different methods. First, we considered the *raw* estimates obtained directly from the participants' classifications (i.e. *raw*), without any grouping or consensus applied (Table 1). The columns in this table represent the number of classification points (n) and the performance measures.

We considered a traditional consensus and weighted variation based on item response model from Eq.5. The robustness of the results were assessed for the proposed consensus method using different proportions of images where the truth was known (10%, 20%, 33% and 50%); noting that images were randomly selected without replacement.

Using the raw data without combining the subjects' answers produced relatively low-quality performance compared to other aggregation methods, $se = 0.642$ and $sp = 0.618$ with an accuracy of 0.626 and $MCC = 0.246$. On average, the subjects identified 1.682 TP hard coral points for every FP hard coral classification. Using a traditional consensus approach combining all of the participants' responses substantially increased the performance measures compared to the raw data method e.g. $se = 0.825$ and $MCC = 0.487$.

The majority voting methods using a selection of the participants outperform ($MCC > 0.53$) in all the variants explored. The ratio of TP/FP points identified under these methods is above 3. However, the likelihood ratio (FN/TN) was similar to the one obtained using the consensus approach. Fig 9 compares the statistical performance measures. In the case of the MV methods, we show four values per method representing the proportion of images in the gold standard set (10, 20, 33 and 50%). The last method (weighted variation) performed well compared to the approach based on experts and experienced, achieving marginal improvements in *acc* and *pre*. We found that the item response model captures well the abilities of the subjects, even with a small training dataset. This indicates that a minimal training set (e.g. 50 images) is enough to cluster subjects based on proficiency (i.e. expert, experienced, etc.).

Four groups of participants were obtained from the quantiles of the posterior means of the abilities (Figure 3): *beginners*, *competent*, *experienced* and *experts*. The vertical axis gives the latent ability score (θ_i) and the x-axis the proportion of correctly classified points. Skilful participants have large ability score values. The size of the point gives the number of classification points and indicates the engagement in the project. The vertical bar is the 95% posterior highest density interval and represents the dispersion around the posterior ability estimate. In black, we represent a reference participant who self-identified with diving experience. This participant falls within the expert category, yet remarkably it was not the best-performing one.

In Fig 4 we assess the dynamics of the rate of learning as the participants increased daily classification occasions (i.e. they work on the task a second, third, fourth time, etc). Fitting a linear regression to the posterior means at the occasion t produced a slope significantly different from 0 (p-value = 0.019), which indicates that the participants' skills increase with participation and they become better at classifying the points. After controlling for pseudo-guessing and discrimination, the average participant increased their probability of correct classification by approximately 4% after five occasions, and 8% and 12% in the 10th and 15th occasions, respectively.

There were also differences in the difficulty of classifying each of the classes (Fig 5). The results showed that the soft coral category was the hardest to identify in the images since they are frequently misclassified as hard corals. As expected, points containing sand had the highest chances of correct classification. This category also exhibited the highest likelihood of being correctly identified by chance, as evidenced by the posterior distribution of the pseudo-guessing parameter (Fig 6).

Substantial differences were found among the cameras used to take the images. Images taken by the Nikon camera represented the vast majority and they were substantially more difficult (Fig 7). This camera was used to take images in the northern section of the GBR on a unique habitat as part of the XL Catlin Seaview survey (González-Rivero et al., 2014). Images from the Canon camera, taken as part of the Heron survey across different habitats, were easier




FIGURE 3 Abilities posterior estimates for four groups of participants (beginner, competent, experienced and experts) using a gold standard dataset ($n = 171$) and 95% highest density interval as a function of the proportion of correct answers. The size of the dot represents the number of points classified. The black dot represents a reference diver that engaged in the projects as a participant.




FIGURE 4 Posterior estimates of the learning parameter ϕ and 95% highest density interval as a function of the daily classification occasion. These estimates were obtained fitting the whole dataset ($n = 514$ images). The size of the dot is relative to the number of points classified. The error bars represent the 95% highest density interval of ϕ .




FIGURE 5 Violin/box plots with difficulty parameters of the points on images (β_k) associated with the benthic categories




FIGURE 6 Violin/box plots of the posterior estimates of the pseudoguessing parameter associated with the benthic categories.




FIGURE 7 Posterior estimates of the difficulties and 95% highest density interval of the five cameras used on the study as a function of the proportion of correct answers. The size of the dot represents the number of points classified in images taken from each camera.

to classify (Roelfsema and Phinn, 2010). However, the difficulty associated with the camera might be confounded by the regions where images were taken (North versus South of the GBR and habitats), where biodiversity differs.

4.2.1 | Classification time and quality

We evaluated the feasibility of using classification time as a straightforward indicator of classification quality. This is relevant in the context where participants are getting paid for completed images and thus trying to maximize their effort and it could be used as a straightforward way of detecting low-performing respondents.

The boxplots in Fig 8 show the distributions of the classification times for each of the participant groups. We note that those participants identified as expert seem to require significantly higher median classification times compared to those in the beginner and competent groups as shown in Table 2. The comparison was made using the non-parametric Wilcoxon test, with an alternative hypothesis that the sampled elements from the group in the rows had substantially *greater* mean rank values than those in the columns (Table 2). However, due to the substantial overlap between these distributions and variability in the data, these results should be interpreted with caution.

5 | DISCUSSION

5.1 | Improving trust in citizen science data

Citizen science (CS) has become an essential information source in many domains. However, the validity of research outputs using these data sources is often questioned, especially when participants with varying skills are involved in challenging tasks. The lack of trust in this new type of data hampers the full potential of CS programs to support management and data-driven decision-making. Our scan of recently published papers highlighted the broad use of CS data in addressing ecological questions such as mapping species abundance and understanding their associated drivers through time. Some, but not all, of the studies recognized the potential inherent bias in CS data, acknowledging its ecological implications and adapting methodological approaches accordingly. Notwithstanding these efforts, further work is required to advance current statistical practice with CS data.




FIGURE 8 Box plots of the classification time as a function of the participants ability groups.

5.2 | Improving trust in citizen science data for image classification

Our case study focused on the classification of objects in images and described a method that weights the evidence to produce the true latent labels, which are used to predict the health of coral populations along the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. This was achieved via estimation of participants' abilities after accounting for factors such as image difficulty.

Applications based on image-based classification data are drawing increasing attention in many domains. It is therefore natural that there will be further opportunities to learn from the contribution of participants. However, new statistical methods are required if these opportunities are to be meaningfully realised. For example, the identification of benthic categories on images is currently deemed to be too challenging for most citizen scientists, who have little knowledge of what a hard coral looks like. Similarly, not all participants have the same commitment and skills and they engage differently in CS programs. This is critical when dealing with CS data and statistical models need to weigh the evidence, based on these factors.

Obtaining the true classes using marine biologists or expert elicitation is expensive when large numbers of images need to be classified. Our results show that an item response model is a viable option when there are budget constraints. The item response modelling framework provides an effective way to assess participants' skills and cluster/group them by the level of expertise. This approach allows flexibility for the CS programs to select data and perform various assessments along the way (Santos-Fernandez and Mengersen, 2021). For example, our case study demonstrates increasing learning of the participants with time. This insight showcases the importance of retention in CS programs as people naturally learn, even with complicated tasks. These models also allowed us to identify careless or low-skilled respondents and detect software bots, who generally fall into the beginners' category. Responses from these participants are generally messy; therefore our voting algorithm does not include them. In our experience, this step was critical to achieving good classification performance.

We also showed that multiple factors affect the difficulty of the task, including the underlying category on the images and the camera type. Identifying those categories and images that produce greater misclassification errors is critical to producing useful training and qualification materials. Identifying and combining expert responses is a

suitable solution and this can be done even with a reduced gold standard dataset.

Citizen science project managers can benefit from the approach in many ways: (1) Clustering participants allows weighting the evidence; (2) the ability to identify beginners means that they can be asked to re-qualify before contributing additional data; (3) gamification, such as leaderboards, can be constructed using the latent ability values and the number of classifications; and (4) a priori knowledge about which images are the most difficult could be used to assign them to the most skillful participants.

Currently, paid platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk do not consider the contribution of the participants or their expertise. Instead, whoever requests the job can refuse payment for poor-quality work. A system based on ability scores, as developed in this research, constitutes a better approach to compensate participants and is more effective than the current binary system. We found that for easy classification tasks, with broad evenness in the responses of the participants, most approaches will perform relatively well. However, when the task is difficult, aggregating the answers of the participants using simple consensus tends to have poor performance. Using instead a weighted majority voting approach improves performance outcomes.

5.3 | Improving trust in citizen science data for ecology

The literature scan showed that most existing applications involve land-based ecosystem datasets. A substantial gap exists in the use of CS for marine ecology, especially in coral reef studies. Reef CS programs mostly exist to empower people and increase awareness, but few of them engage with robust and regular assessments of data quality which, in turn, reduce the trust of scientists and managers in using information collected by non-experts. However, marine research is evolving and collaborative CS programs such as Virtual Reef Diver combines modern statistical modelling and coral reef ecology to improve the integrity of CS data for decision-making. These methods can help marine ecology realise its full potential and contribute preservation of the health of the Great Barrier Reef by harnessing the strong engagement of several groups, including the online community. The valuable feedback we received in the study allowed us to improve project design, training, and compensation processes. An important feedback loop is also closed when measures of performance from the model are shared with the participants.

Guidelines when analysing new data sources such as CS data are essential to increase the trust among the scientific community. Our study focuses on Bayesian methods to analyse CS data, we acknowledge that other quantitative approaches not considered here, especially from the general crowdsourcing literature, can also add important value to CS projects. The item response model or similar statistical techniques should be systematically applied to first quantify and assess the quality of CS data and second support choices of a further analytical framework for ecological purposes. For example, insights from the model can be combined into species distribution models to weight observations according to participant skills or other parameters of interest before estimations of occupancy probability.

Data availability statement

The dataset used in the case study can be found in the repository: <https://github.com/EdgarSantos-Fernandez/reef>.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) Laureate Fellowship Program under the project “Bayesian Learning for Decision Making in the Big Data Era” (ID: FL150100150) and the Centre of Excellence for

Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers (ACEMS). We thank the editor and the reviewers for their valuable feedback and constructive suggestions. Thanks to the members of the VRD team (<https://www.virtualreef.org.au/about/>). We also like to thank all the participants who contributed to the classification of images. Ethical approval was granted for the collection of this data by the Research Ethics Advisory Team, Queensland University of Technology (QUT). Approval Number: 1600000830. Computations were performed through the QUT High Performance Computing (HPC) infrastructure.

References

- Ainsworth, T. D., Heron, S. F., Ortiz, J. C., Mumby, P. J., Grech, A., Ogawa, D., Eakin, C. M. and Leggat, W. (2016) Climate change disables coral bleaching protection on the Great Barrier Reef. *Science*, **352**, 338–342.
- Allen, M. L., Wang, S., Olson, L. O., Li, Q. and Krofel, M. (2020) Counting cats for conservation: seasonal estimates of leopard density and drivers of distribution in the serengeti. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **29**, 3591–3608.
- Arab, A. and Courter, J. R. (2015) Spatio-temporal trend analysis of spring arrival data for migratory birds. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, **44**, 2535–2547.
- Arab, A., Courter, J. R. and Zelt, J. (2016) A spatio-temporal comparison of avian migration phenology using citizen science data. *Spatial Statistics*, **18**, 234–245.
- Armstrong, D. P. (2016) Using reference sites to account for detection probability in occupancy surveys for freshwater turtles. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology*, **11**, 505–518.
- Barnes, M., Szabo, J. K., Morris, W. K. and Possingham, H. (2015) Evaluating protected area effectiveness using bird lists in the australian wet tropics. *Diversity and Distributions*, **21**, 368–378.
- Beck, S., Foote, A. D., Koetter, S., Harries, O., Mandleberg, L., Stevick, P. T., Whooley, P. and Durban, J. W. (2014) Using opportunistic photo-identifications to detect a population decline of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in british and irish waters. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **94**, 1327–1333.
- Beijbom, O., Edmunds, P. J., Roelfsema, C., Smith, J., Kline, D. I., Neal, B. P., Dunlap, M. J., Moriarty, V., Fan, T.-Y., Tan, C.-J. et al. (2015) Towards automated annotation of benthic survey images: Variability of human experts and operational modes of automation. *PLoS one*, **10**, e0130312.
- Benshemesh, J., Southwell, D., Barker, R. and McCarthy, M. (2020) Citizen scientists reveal nationwide trends and drivers in the breeding activity of a threatened bird, the Malleefowl (*Leipoa ocellata*). *Biological Conservation*, **246**, 108573.
- Berberich, G. M., Dormann, C. F., Klimetzek, D., Berberich, M. B., Sanders, N. J. and Ellison, A. M. (2016) Detection probabilities for sessile organisms. *Ecosphere*, **7**, e01546.
- Bradter, U., Mair, L., Jönsson, M., Knape, J., Singer, A. and Snäll, T. (2018) Can opportunistically collected citizen science data fill a data gap for habitat suitability models of less common species? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **9**, 1667–1678.
- Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M. D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M., Guo, J., Li, P. and Riddell, A. (2017) Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of statistical software*, **76**.
- Chapman, D. S., Bell, S., Helfer, S. and Roy, D. B. (2015) Unbiased inference of plant flowering phenology from biological recording data. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **115**, 543–554.

- Cheney, B., Thompson, P. M., Ingram, S. N., Hammond, P. S., Stevick, P. T., Durban, J. W., Culloch, R. M., Elwen, S. H., Mandlerberg, L., Janik, V. M. et al. (2013) Integrating multiple data sources to assess the distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in scottish waters. *Mammal Review*, **43**, 71–88.
- Chevalier, M., Broennimann, O., Cornuault, J. and Guisan, A. (2021) Data integration methods to account for spatial niche truncation effects in regional projections of species distribution. *ECOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS*, **31**.
- Coomber, F. G., Smith, B. R., August, T. A., Harrower, C. A., Powney, G. D. and Mathews, F. (2021) Using biological records to infer long-term occupancy trends of mammals in the UK. *BIOLOGICAL CONSERVATION*, **264**.
- Coron, C., Calenge, C., Giraud, C. and Julliard, R. (2018) Bayesian estimation of species relative abundances and habitat preferences using opportunistic data. *Environmental and ecological statistics*, **25**, 71–93.
- Crawford, B. A., Olds, M. J., Maerz, J. C. and Moore, C. T. (2020) Estimating population persistence for at-risk species using citizen science data. *Biological Conservation*, **243**, 108489.
- Croft, S., Ward, A. I., Aegerter, J. N. and Smith, G. C. (2019) Modeling current and potential distributions of mammal species using presence-only data: A case study on british deer. *Ecology and Evolution*, **9**, 8724–8735.
- Cumming, G. S. and Henry, D. A. (2019) Point counts outperform line transects when sampling birds along routes in south african protected areas. *African Zoology*, **54**, 187–198.
- Della Rocca, F. and Milanese, P. (2022) The new dominator of the world: Modeling the global distribution of the japanese beetle under land use and climate change scenarios. *LAND*, **11**.
- Dennis, E. B., Morgan, B. J., Freeman, S. N., Ridout, M. S., Brereton, T. M., Fox, R., Powney, G. D. and Roy, D. B. (2017) Efficient occupancy model-fitting for extensive citizen-science data. *PLoS one*, **12**, e0174433.
- De'ath, G., Fabricius, K. E., Sweatman, H. and Puotinen, M. (2012) The 27-year decline of coral cover on the Great Barrier Reef and its causes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109**, 17995–17999.
- Downs, R. R., Ramapriyan, H. K., Peng, G. and Wei, Y. (2021) Perspectives on citizen science data quality. *Frontiers in Climate*, **3**, 25.
- Dwyer, R. G., Carpenter-Bundhoo, L., Franklin, C. E. and Campbell, H. A. (2016) Using citizen-collected wildlife sightings to predict traffic strike hot spots for threatened species: a case study on the southern cassowary. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **53**, 973–982.
- Eisma, J. A., Schoups, G., Davids, J. and Van de Giesen, N. (2020) A bayesian model for quantifying errors in citizen science data: application to rainfall observations from nepal.
- Erickson, K. D. and Smith, A. B. (2021) Accounting for imperfect detection in data from museums and herbaria when modeling species distributions: combining and contrasting data-level versus model-level bias correction. *ECOGRAPHY*, **44**, 1341–1352.
- Eritja, R., Palmer, J. R., Roiz, D., Sanpera-Calbet, I. and Bartumeus, F. (2017) Direct evidence of adult aedes albopictus dispersal by car. *Scientific Reports*, **7**, 1–15.
- Espeset, A. E., Harrison, J. G., Shapiro, A. M., Nice, C. C., Thorne, J. H., Waetjen, D. P., Fordyce, J. A. and Forister, M. L. (2016) Understanding a migratory species in a changing world: climatic effects and demographic declines in the Western Monarch revealed by four decades of intensive monitoring. *OECOLOGIA*, **181**, 819–830.
- Farhadinia, M. S., Moll, R. J., Montgomery, R. A., Ashrafi, S., Johnson, P. J., Hunter, L. T. and Macdonald, D. W. (2018) Citizen science data facilitate monitoring of rare large carnivores in remote montane landscapes. *Ecological indicators*, **94**, 283–291.

- Faulkner, S. C., Verity, R., Roberts, D., Roy, S. S., Robertson, P. A., Stevenson, M. D. and Le Comber, S. C. (2017) Using geographic profiling to compare the value of sightings vs trap data in a biological invasion. *Diversity and Distributions*, **23**, 104–112.
- Fiske, I. and Chandler, R. (2011) unmarked: An R package for fitting hierarchical models of wildlife occurrence and abundance. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **43**, 1–23. URL: <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v43/i10/>.
- Fournier, A. M., Sullivan, A. R., Bump, J. K., Perkins, M., Shieldcastle, M. C. and King, S. L. (2017) Combining citizen science species distribution models and stable isotopes reveals migratory connectivity in the secretive virginia rail. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **54**, 618–627.
- Fritz, S., See, L., Carlson, T., Haklay, M. M., Oliver, J. L., Fraisl, D., Mondardini, R., Brocklehurst, M., Shanley, L. A., Schade, S. et al. (2019) Citizen science and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature Sustainability*, **2**, 922–930.
- Girardello, M., Chapman, A., Dennis, R., Kaila, L., Borges, P. A. and Santangeli, A. (2019) Gaps in butterfly inventory data: A global analysis. *Biological conservation*, **236**, 289–295.
- Gomez, A. M., Serre, M., Wise, E. and Pavelsky, T. (2021) Integrating community science research and space-time mapping to determine depth to groundwater in a remote rural region. *WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH*, **57**.
- Gonzalez-Rivero, M., Beijbom, O., Rodriguez-Ramirez, A., Bryant, D. E., Ganase, A., Gonzalez-Marrero, Y., Herrera-Reveles, A., Kennedy, E. V., Kim, C. J., Lopez-Marcano, S. et al. (2020) Monitoring of coral reefs using artificial intelligence: A feasible and cost-effective approach. *Remote Sensing*, **12**, 489.
- González-Rivero, M., Bongaerts, P., Beijbom, O., Pizarro, O., Friedman, A., Rodriguez-Ramirez, A., Upcroft, B., Laffoley, D., Kline, D., Bailhache, C. et al. (2014) The Catlin Seaview Survey—kilometre-scale seascape assessment, and monitoring of coral reef ecosystems. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **24**, 184–198.
- Goodrich, B., Gabry, J., Ali, I. and Brilleman, S. (2022) rstanarm: Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan. URL: <https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm/>. R package version 2.21.3.
- Granroth-Wilding, H., Primmer, C., Lindqvist, M., Poutanen, J., Thalmann, O., Aspi, J., Harmoinen, J., Kojola, I. and Laaksonen, T. (2017) Non-invasive genetic monitoring involving citizen science enables reconstruction of current pack dynamics in a re-establishing wolf population. *BMC ecology*, **17**, 44.
- Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (2009) *Great barrier reef outlook report 2009: In brief*. Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority.
- Hertzog, L. R., Frank, C., Klimek, S., Roeder, N., Boehner, H. G. S. and Kamp, J. (2021) Model-based integration of citizen science data from disparate sources increases the precision of bird population trends. *DIVERSITY AND DISTRIBUTIONS*, **27**, 1106–1119.
- Hill, J. M. and Lloyd, J. D. (2017) A fine-scale us population estimate of a montane spruce–fir bird species of conservation concern. *Ecosphere*, **8**, e01921.
- Hines, G., Swanson, A., Kosmala, M. and Lintott, C. (2015) Aggregating user input in ecology citizen science projects. In *Twenty-Seventh IAAI Conference*.
- Hof, C. A., Smallwood, E., Meager, J. and Bell, I. P. (2017) First citizen-science population abundance and growth rate estimates for green sea turtles chelonia mydas foraging in the northern great barrier reef, australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **574**, 181–191.
- Hsu, A., Malik, O., Johnson, L. and Esty, D. C. (2014) Development: Mobilize citizens to track sustainability. *Nature News*, **508**, 33.
- Hughes, T. P., Barnes, M. L., Bellwood, D. R., Cinner, J. E., Cumming, G. S., Jackson, J. B., Kleypas, J., Van De Leemput, I. A., Lough, J. M., Morrison, T. H. et al. (2017) Coral reefs in the anthropocene. *Nature*, **546**, 82–90.

- Hultquist, C., Oravec, Z. and Cervone, G. (2021) A bayesian approach to estimate the spatial distribution of crowdsourced radiation measurements around fukushima. *ISPRS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF GEO-INFORMATION*, **10**.
- Humphreys, J. M., Murrow, J. L., Sullivan, J. D. and Prosser, D. J. (2019) Seasonal occurrence and abundance of dabbling ducks across the continental united states: Joint spatio-temporal modelling for the genus anas. *Diversity and Distributions*.
- Isaac, N. J., van Strien, A. J., August, T. A., de Zeeuw, M. P. and Roy, D. B. (2014) Statistics for citizen science: extracting signals of change from noisy ecological data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 1052–1060.
- Jombart, T. and Ahmed, I. (2011) adegenet 1.3-1: new tools for the analysis of genome-wide snp data. *Bioinformatics*.
- Kadoya, T. and Washitani, I. (2010) Predicting the rate of range expansion of an invasive alien bumblebee (*Bombus Terrestris*) using a stochastic spatio-temporal model. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 1228–1235.
- Kagawa, O., Uchida, S., Yamazaki, D., Osawa, Y., Ito, S. and Chiba, S. (2020) Citizen science via social media revealed conditions of symbiosis between a marine gastropod and an epibiotic alga. *Scientific reports*, **10**, 1–10.
- Kellner, K. (2021) *jagsUI: A Wrapper Around 'rjags' to Streamline 'JAGS' Analyses*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=jagsUI>. R package version 1.5.2.
- Kosmala, M., Wiggins, A., Swanson, A. and Simmons, B. (2016) Assessing data quality in citizen science. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **14**, 551–560.
- Lavariega, M. C., Ríos-Solís, J. A., Flores-Martínez, J. J., Galindo-Aguilar, R. E., Sánchez-Cordero, V., Juan-Albino, S. and Soriano-Martínez, I. (2020) Community-based monitoring of jaguar (*panthera onca*) in the chinantla region, mexico. *Tropical Conservation Science*, **13**, 1940082920917825.
- Lintott, C. J., Schawinski, K., Slosar, A., Land, K., Bamford, S., Thomas, D., Raddick, M. J., Nichol, R. C., Szalay, A., Andreescu, D. et al. (2008) Galaxy zoo: morphologies derived from visual inspection of galaxies from the sloan digital sky survey. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **389**, 1179–1189.
- Littlestone, N., Warmuth, M. K. et al. (1989) *The weighted majority algorithm*. University of California, Santa Cruz, Computer Research Laboratory.
- Lopez, B., Minor, E. and Crooks, A. (2020) Insights into human-wildlife interactions in cities from bird sightings recorded online. *LANDSCAPE AND URBAN PLANNING*, **196**.
- Lottig, N. R., Wagner, T., Henry, E. N., Cheruvilil, K. S., Webster, K. E., Downing, J. A. and Stow, C. A. (2014) Long-term citizen-collected data reveal geographical patterns and temporal trends in lake water clarity. *PloS one*, **9**, e95769.
- Louvrier, J., Papaix, J., Duchamp, C. and Gimenez, O. (2020) A mechanistic-statistical species distribution model to explain and forecast wolf (*canis lupus*) colonization in south-eastern france. *Spatial Statistics*, 100428.
- Lunn, D. J., Thomas, A., Best, N. and Spiegelhalter, D. (2000) WinBUGS - A Bayesian modelling framework: concepts, structure, and extensibility. *Statistics and computing*, **10**, 325–337.
- Lyon, J. P., Bird, T. J., Kearns, J., Nicol, S., Tonkin, Z., Todd, C. R., O'Mahony, J., Hackett, G., Raymond, S., Lieschke, J. et al. (2019) Increased population size of fish in a lowland river following restoration of structural habitat. *Ecological Applications*, **29**, e01882.
- Maguire, T. J. and Mundle, S. O. (2020) Citizen science data show temperature-driven declines in riverine sentinel invertebrates. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, **7**, 303–307.
- Mair, L., Harrison, P. J., Jönsson, M., Löbel, S., Nordén, J., Siitonen, J., Lämås, T., Lundström, A. and Snäll, T. (2017) Evaluating citizen science data for forecasting species responses to national forest management. *Ecology and evolution*, **7**, 368–378.

- Mang, T., Essl, F., Moser, D., Karrer, G., Kleinbauer, I. and Dullinger, S. (2017) Accounting for imperfect observation and estimating true species distributions in modelling biological invasions. *Ecography*, **40**, 1187–1197.
- Matthews, B. W. (1975) Comparison of the predicted and observed secondary structure of t4 phage lysozyme. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Protein Structure*, **405**, 442–451.
- Meiman, S., Civco, D., Holsinger, K. and Elphick, C. S. (2012) Comparing habitat models using ground-based and remote sensing data: Saltmarsh Sparrow presence versus nesting. *Wetlands*, **32**, 725–736.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., Group, P. et al. (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the prisma statement. *PLoS med*, **6**, e1000097.
- Morii, Y., Ohkubo, Y. and Watanabe, S. (2018) Activity of invasive slug *limax maximus* in relation to climate conditions based on citizen's observations and novel regularization based statistical approaches. *Science of the Total Environment*, **637**, 1061–1068.
- Mugford, J., Moltchanova, E., Plank, M., Sullivan, J., Byrom, A. and James, A. (2021) Citizen science decisions: A Bayesian approach optimises effort. *ECOLOGICAL INFORMATICS*, **63**.
- Outhwaite, C. L., Powney, G. D., August, T. A., Chandler, R. E., Rorke, S., Pescott, O. L., Harvey, M., Roy, H. E., Fox, R., Roy, D. B. et al. (2019) Annual estimates of occupancy for bryophytes, lichens and invertebrates in the uk, 1970–2015. *Scientific data*, **6**, 1–12.
- Pagel, J., Anderson, B. J., O'Hara, R. B., Cramer, W., Fox, R., Jeltsch, F., Roy, D. B., Thomas, C. D. and Schurr, F. M. (2014) Quantifying range-wide variation in population trends from local abundance surveys and widespread opportunistic occurrence records. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 751–760.
- Paradis, E. and Schliep, K. (2019) ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*, **35**, 526–528.
- Patten, M. A., Hjalmarson, E. A., Smith-Patten, B. D. and Bried, J. T. (2019) Breeding thresholds in opportunistic odonata records. *Ecological Indicators*, **106**, 105460.
- Paun, S., Carpenter, B., Chamberlain, J., Hovy, D., Kruschwitz, U. and Poesio, M. (2018) Comparing bayesian models of annotation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, **6**, 571–585.
- Penone, C., Le Viol, I., Pellissier, V., JULIEN, J.-F., Bas, Y. and Kerbiriou, C. (2013) Use of large-scale acoustic monitoring to assess anthropogenic pressures on orthoptera communities. *Conservation Biology*, **27**, 979–987.
- Peterson, E. E., Santos-Fernández, E., Chen, C., Clifford, S., Vercelloni, J., Pearse, A., Brown, R., Christensen, B., James, A., Anthony, K. et al. (2020) Monitoring through many eyes: Integrating disparate datasets to improve monitoring of the great barrier reef. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, **124**, 104557.
- Petracca, L. S., Frair, J. L., Cohen, J. B., Calderón, A. P., Carazo-Salazar, J., Castañeda, F., Corrales-Gutiérrez, D., Foster, R. J., Harmsen, B., Hernández-Potosme, S. et al. (2018) Robust inference on large-scale species habitat use with interview data: The status of jaguars outside protected areas in central america. *Journal of applied ecology*, **55**, 723–734.
- Plummer, M. (2022) *rjags: Bayesian Graphical Models using MCMC*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rjags>. R package version 4-13.
- Purse, B. V., Comont, R., Butler, A., Brown, P. M., Kessel, C. and Roy, H. E. (2015) Landscape and climate determine patterns of spread for all colour morphs of the alien ladybird *harmonia axyridis*. *Journal of Biogeography*, **42**, 575–588.
- R Core Team (2018) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.

- Raykar, V. C., Yu, S., Zhao, L. H., Valadez, G. H., Florin, C., Bogoni, L. and Moy, L. (2010) Learning from crowds. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **11**, 1297–1322.
- Régnier, T., Dodd, J., Benjamins, S., Gibb, F. M. and Wright, P. J. (2021) Age and growth of the critically endangered flapper skate, *Dipturus intermedius*. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **31**, 2381–2388.
- Reich, B. J., Pacifici, K. and Stallings, J. W. (2018) Integrating auxiliary data in optimal spatial design for species distribution modelling. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **9**, 1626–1637.
- Rodhouse, T. J., Rose, S., Hawkins, T. and Rodriguez, R. M. (2021) Audible bats provide opportunities for citizen scientists. *Conservation Science and Practice*, **3**, e435.
- Roelfsema, C., Kovacs, E., Ortiz, J. C., Wolff, N. H., Callaghan, D., Wettle, M., Ronan, M., Hamylton, S. M., Mumby, P. J. and Phinn, S. (2018) Coral reef habitat mapping: A combination of object-based image analysis and ecological modelling. *Remote sensing of environment*, **208**, 27–41.
- Roelfsema, C., Kovacs, E. M., Markey, K., Vercelloni, J., Rodriguez-Ramirez, A., Lopez-Marcano, S., Gonzalez-Rivero, M., Hoegh-Guldberg, O. and Phinn, S. R. (2021) Benthic and coral reef community field data for heron reef, southern great barrier reef, australia, 2002–2018. *Scientific data*, **8**, 1–7.
- Roelfsema, C. and Phinn, S. (2010) Calibration and validation of coral reef benthic community maps derived from high spatial resolution satellite imagery. *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing*, **4**, 043527.
- Roth, T., Strebler, N. and Amrhein, V. (2014) Estimating unbiased phenological trends by adapting site-occupancy models. *Ecology*, **95**, 2144–2154.
- Rue, H., Martino, S. and Chopin, N. (2009) Approximate bayesian inference for latent gaussian models by using integrated nested laplace approximations. *Journal of the royal statistical society: Series b (statistical methodology)*, **71**, 319–392.
- Ryan, S. F., Lombaert, E., Espeset, A., Vila, R., Talavera, G., Dincă, V., Doellman, M. M., Renshaw, M. A., Eng, M. W., Hornett, E. A. et al. (2019) Global invasion history of the agricultural pest butterfly pieris rapae revealed with genomics and citizen science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **116**, 20015–20024.
- Santos-Fernandez, E. and Mengersen, K. (2021) Understanding the reliability of citizen science observational data using item response models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **12**, 1533–1548.
- Santos Fernandez, E., Peterson, E. E., Vercelloni, J., Rushworth, E. and Mengersen, K. (2020) Correcting misclassification errors in crowdsourced ecological data: A bayesian perspective. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, n/a. URL: <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/rssc.12453>.
- Schwoerer, T., Dial, R. J., Little, J. M., Martin, A. E., Morton, J. M., Schmidt, I. J. and Ward, E. J. (2022) Flight plan for the future: floatplane pilots and researchers team up to predict invasive species dispersal in Alaska. *BIOLOGICAL INVASIONS*, **24**, 1229–1245.
- Sheard, J. K., Rahbek, C., Dunn, R. R., Sanders, N. J. and Isaac, N. J. (2021) Long-term trends in the occupancy of ants revealed through use of multi-sourced datasets. *Biology Letters*, **17**, 20210240.
- Shima, A. L., Gillieson, D. S., Crowley, G. M., Dwyer, R. G. and Berger, L. (2018) Factors affecting the mortality of Lumholtz's tree-kangaroo (*Dendrolagus Lumholtzi*) by vehicle strike. *Wildlife Research*, **45**, 559–569.
- Sicacha-Parada, J., Steinsland, I., Cretois, B. and Borgelt, J. (2020) Accounting for spatial varying sampling effort due to accessibility in citizen science data: A case study of moose in norway. *Spatial Statistics*, 100446.
- Siddharthan, A., Lambin, C., Robinson, A.-M., Sharma, N., Comont, R., O'mahony, E., Mellish, C. and Wal, R. V. D. (2016) Crowdsourcing without a crowd: Reliable online species identification using bayesian models to minimize crowd size. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, **7**, 45.

- Snäll, T., Kindvall, O., Nilsson, J. and Pärt, T. (2011) Evaluating citizen-based presence data for bird monitoring. *Biological conservation*, **144**, 804–810.
- Soykan, C. U., Sauer, J., Schuetz, J. G., LeBaron, G. S., Dale, K. and Langham, G. M. (2016) Population trends for north american winter birds based on hierarchical models. *Ecosphere*, **7**, e01351.
- Spiegelhalter, D., Thomas, A., Best, N. and Lunn, D. (2007) Openbugs user manual. *Version*, **3**, 2007.
- Stan Development Team (2018) RStan: the R interface to Stan. URL: <http://mc-stan.org/>. R package version 2.18.2.
- Steger, C., Butt, B. and Hooten, M. B. (2017) Safari science: assessing the reliability of citizen science data for wildlife surveys. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **54**, 2053–2062.
- Strebel, N., Kéry, M., Schaub, M. and Schmid, H. (2014) Studying phenology by flexible modelling of seasonal detectability peaks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 483–490.
- van Strien, A. J., van Swaay, C. A. and Termaat, T. (2013a) Opportunistic citizen science data of animal species produce reliable estimates of distribution trends if analysed with occupancy models. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **50**, 1450–1458.
- van Strien, A. J., Termaat, T., Kalkman, V., Prins, M., De Knijf, G., Gourmand, A.-L., Houard, X., Nelson, B., Plate, C., Prentice, S. et al. (2013b) Occupancy modelling as a new approach to assess supranational trends using opportunistic data: a pilot study for the damselfly *calopteryx splendens*. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **22**, 673–686.
- Studds, C. E., Wunderle, Jr., J. M. and Marra, P. P. (2021) Strong differences in migratory connectivity patterns among species of Neotropical-Nearctic migratory birds revealed by combining stable isotopes and abundance in a Bayesian assignment analysis. *JOURNAL OF BIOGEOGRAPHY*, **48**, 1746–1757.
- Sturtz, S., Ligges, U. and Gelman, A. (2005) R2winbugs: A package for running winbugs from r. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **12**, 1–16. URL: <http://www.jstatsoft.org>.
- Su, Y.-S. and Yajima, M. (2021) *R2jags: Using R to Run JAGS*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=R2jags>. R package version 0.7-1.
- Sweatman, H., Burgess, S., Cheal, A., Coleman, G., Delean, J. S. C., Emslie, M., Miller, I., Osborne, K., McDonald, A. and Thompson, A. (2005) Long-term monitoring of the great barrier reef.
- Szabo, J. K., Vesk, P. A., Baxter, P. W. and Possingham, H. P. (2010) Regional avian species declines estimated from volunteer-collected long-term data using list length analysis. *Ecological Applications*, **20**, 2157–2169.
- Thompson, A., Costello, P., Davidson, J., Logan, M., Coleman, G., Gunn, K. and Schaffelke, B. (2016) Marine monitoring program: Annual report for inshore coral reef monitoring 2014-2015.
- Ver Hoef, J. M., Johnson, D., Angliss, R. and Higham, M. (2021) Species density models from opportunistic citizen science data. *METHODS IN ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION*, **12**, 1911–1925.
- Vercelloni, J., Lique, B., Kennedy, E. V., González-Rivero, M., Caley, M. J., Peterson, E. E., Puotinen, M., Hoegh-Guldberg, O. and Mengersen, K. (2020) Forecasting intensifying disturbance effects on coral reefs. *Global change biology*, **26**, 2785–2797.
- Viljugrein, H., Hopp, P., Benestad, S. L., Nilsen, E. B., Våge, J., Tavornpanich, S., Rolandsen, C. M., Strand, O. and Mysterud, A. (2019) A method that accounts for differential detectability in mixed samples of long-term infections with applications to the case of chronic wasting disease in cervids. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **10**, 134–145.
- Vincent, J. G., Schuster, R., Wilson, S., Fink, D. and Bennett, J. R. (2022) Clustering community science data to infer songbird migratory connectivity in the western hemisphere. *ECOSPHERE*, **13**.

- Walker, J. and Taylor, P. D. (2020) Evaluating the efficacy of eBird data for modeling historical population trajectories of North American birds and for monitoring populations of boreal and Arctic breeding species. *AVIAN CONSERVATION AND ECOLOGY*, **15**.
- Wang, X., Berger, J. O., Burdick, D. S. et al. (2013) Bayesian analysis of dynamic item response models in educational testing. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **7**, 126–153.
- Welinder, P. and Perona, P. (2010) Online crowdsourcing: rating annotators and obtaining cost-effective labels. In *2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition-Workshops*, 25–32. IEEE.
- Whitehill, J., Wu, T.-f., Bergsma, J., Movellan, J. R. and Ruvolo, P. L. (2009) Whose vote should count more: Optimal integration of labels from labelers of unknown expertise. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2035–2043.
- Wilson, S., Anderson, E. M., Wilson, A. S., Bertram, D. F. and Arcese, P. (2013) Citizen science reveals an extensive shift in the winter distribution of migratory western grebes. *PLoS One*, **8**, e65408.
- Yan, W., Hutchins, M., Loisele, S. and Hall, C. (2016) An informatics approach for smart evaluation of water quality related ecosystem services. *Annals of Data Science*, **3**, 251–264.
- Yoshikawa, T. and Osada, Y. (2015) Dietary compositions and their seasonal shifts in Japanese resident birds, estimated from the analysis of volunteer monitoring data. *PLoS one*, **10**, e0119324.
- Zhu, Q., Hobson, K. A., Zhao, Q., Zhou, Y., Damba, I., Batbayar, N., Natsagdorj, T., Davaasuren, B., Antonov, A., Guan, J. et al. (2020) Migratory connectivity of swan geese based on species' distribution models, feather stable isotope assignment and satellite tracking. *Diversity and Distributions*.
- Zipkin, E. F. and Saunders, S. P. (2018) Synthesizing multiple data types for biological conservation using integrated population models. *Biological Conservation*, **217**, 240–250.

6 | TABLES

TABLE 1 Method 1. Performance measures obtained from the participants' classifications using raw data, and using classic consensus and item response consensus estimates. We considered several proportions of images where the ground truth is known (10, 20, 33 and 50%).

method	n	TP	FP	TN	FN	se	sp	acc	pre	MCC	lr ₊	lr ₋
raw	614,160	132,752	155,482	251,849	74,077	0.642	0.618	0.626	0.461	0.246	1.682	0.579
consensus	23,488	6,779	4,798	10,470	1,441	0.825	0.686	0.734	0.586	0.487	2.624	0.256
experts, GS:10%, <i>n</i> = 51	23,488	6,468	3,468	11,794	1,750	0.787	0.773	0.778	0.652	0.541	3.480	0.275
experts, GS:20%, <i>n</i> = 102	23,488	6,520	3,510	11,752	1,699	0.793	0.770	0.778	0.650	0.543	3.451	0.268
experts, GS:33%, <i>n</i> = 171	23,488	6,541	3,513	11,747	1,677	0.796	0.770	0.779	0.651	0.545	3.457	0.265
experts, GS:50%, <i>n</i> = 257	23,488	6,588	3,495	11,767	1,632	0.801	0.771	0.782	0.653	0.552	3.500	0.258
experts/experienced, GS:10%, <i>n</i> = 51	23,488	6,637	3,883	11,385	1,583	0.807	0.746	0.767	0.631	0.531	3.186	0.258
experts/experienced, GS:20%, <i>n</i> = 102	23,488	6,665	3,906	11,362	1,555	0.811	0.744	0.767	0.631	0.532	3.174	0.254
experts/experienced, GS:33%, <i>n</i> = 171	23,488	6,704	3,969	11,299	1,516	0.816	0.740	0.766	0.628	0.532	3.137	0.249
experts/experienced, GS:50%, <i>n</i> = 257	23,488	6,675	3,925	11,343	1,545	0.812	0.743	0.767	0.630	0.532	3.160	0.253
weighted, exp/exp,GS:10%, <i>n</i> = 51	23,488	6,155	3,043	12,219	2,063	0.749	0.801	0.783	0.671	0.539	3.810	0.311
weighted, exp/exp,GS:20%, <i>n</i> = 102	23,488	6,057	2,806	12,456	2,162	0.737	0.816	0.788	0.684	0.545	4.023	0.322
weighted, exp/exp,GS:33%, <i>n</i> = 171	23,488	6,182	2,852	12,409	2,036	0.752	0.813	0.792	0.684	0.554	4.029	0.305
weighted, exp/exp,GS:50%, <i>n</i> = 257	23,488	6,262	2,898	12,364	1,957	0.762	0.810	0.793	0.684	0.559	4.013	0.294

TABLE 2 p-values obtained using a pairwise Wilcoxon test comparing the classification times between groups.

	beginner	competent	experienced
competent	1.0000		
experienced	0.5932	0.2955	
expert	0.0037	0.0009	0.0781

7 | SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS




FIGURE 9 Comparison of the raw performance measures and those obtained from different methods: consensus (con), item response consensus based on experts/experienced (exp) & experts participants (exp2), and using weighted consensus (con_w). (a) sensitivity (se) vs specificity (sp), (b) accuracy (acc) vs precision (pre), (c) negative likelihood ratio (lr_n) vs positive likelihood ratio (lr_p), (d) Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC).

Summary of Bayesian methods in Citizen Science

TABLE 3 Summary of publications.

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform
Della Rocca and Milanese (2022)	Species distribution model	Assessing and predicting Japanese beetle species distributions to identify potential invasion locations	R(rinat, adehabitattHR, mclust, envirem)	International occurrence records for the Japanese beetle (2010-2020)	iNaturalist
Vincent et al. (2022)	Connectivity analysis (Bayes' rule)	Methodology for estimating patterns of migratory connectivity for songbirds using relative abundance models	R (adehabitat, NbClust, cluster)	Relative abundance estimates data for wood thrush and Wilson's warbler songbirds (2016-2017, international)	eBird
Schwoerer et al. (2022)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Using float-plane flight pathway data to inform early detection of aquatic invasive species	R (rstanarm)	Flight destination data (2015-2016, Alaska, North America)	
Santos-Fernandez and Mengersen (2021)	Spatial item response model for image classification	Produce estimates of the participants abilities adjusting for the difficulty of the image. Implemented a divide-and-conquer approach to fit the model to big datasets.	R (rtan, mirt)	Camera traps images from the Serengeti, Africa classified by volunteers. Big datasets of 10.8 million classifications produced by 28,000 users	https://www.zooniverse.org/projects/zooniverse/snapshot-serengeti
Mugford et al. (2021)	Independent Bayesian Classification Combination (IBCC) model	Bayesian methods for the estimation of iconic taxa classification accuracy	Unknown	Observation and identification data for 13 species of iconic taxa (2012-2017, New Zealand)	iNaturalist NZ
Sheard et al. (2021)	Bayesian occupancy model	Identifying temporal trends in ant species occupancy in Denmark	R (sparta, R2jags)	Detection data for 29 species of ant (1903-2019, Denmark)	The Ant Hunt, EuroAnts, museum records, and personal observations
Coomber et al. (2021)	Bayesian occupancy model	Estimates of long-term occupancy trends for terrestrial mammal species	R (R2jags, sparta)	Biological records of terrestrial mammals (1970-2017, United Kingdom)	The Mammal Society (data set)
Ver Hoef et al. (2021)	Species distribution model	Integration of spatial autocorrelation to estimate sampling effort and model species densities	Unknown	Sighting event data for fur seals and Stellar sea lions (1958-2016, Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska)	Platforms of Opportunity (data set)
Hertzog et al. (2021)	Bayesian hierarchical models	Bird population estimated using combined structured and unstructured citizen science data sets	R (rtrim, greta)	Observation data for a range of birds (2012-2019, Germany)	Ornitho, eBird, Observation

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Erickson and Smith (2021)	Bayesian occupancy model	Incorporating unstructured herbarium and citizen science data into an occupancy modeling framework, with bias correction techniques	R (MCMCvis), open-Refine	Occurrence data for Anacardiaceae and Tracheophytes (2019, Florida, North America)	Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), iNaturalist, naturegucker, Atlas of Living Australia's Questagame
Rodhouse et al. (2021)	Bayesian multi-season occupancy model	Updated species distribution model for the rare spotted bat using new survey data	R (R2jags)	Acoustic capture encounter records for 14 bat species (2003-2010, 2019-2020), presence-only encounter records for <i>E. maculatum</i> (1976-2018, Oregon, North America)	NABat
Hultquist et al. (2021)	Bayesian kriging	Modelling the spatial distribution of crowd-sourced radiation measurements surrounding Fukushima	R (stats, raster, SpatialEco, hexbin, fields, lattice)	Coordinate-based radiation levels (2011-2015, Fukushima, Japan)	Safecast, United States Department of Energy (data set)
Gomez et al. (2021)	Bayesian maximum entropy	Estimating spatio-temporal distribution of depth to groundwater in remote Columbia	Unknown	Well water depth measurements (2008-2009, Bajo Cauca Region, Columbia, South America)	
Régnier et al. (2021)	Von Bertalanffy growth function (VBGF)	Estimating population of the critically endangered skate using photo-identification of trophy pictures and tag-recapture data	R (rjags)	Capture-mark-recapture (CMR) data for skates (2016-2018, Scotland)	NatureScot, Scottish Association for Marine Science (data set)
Studds et al. (2021)	Bayesian assignments	Measuring migratory connectivity for five songbird species	ArcGIS 10.1 (Spatial Analyst), R (stats, wBoot, ade4)	Feather sample data for five songbird species (1995-2010, Caribbean Basin)	American Breeding Bird Survey (BBS)
Eisma et al. (2020)	Measurement error model	Developed a graphical inference model for assessing the accuracy of citizen scientists to report depth of rainfall. The verification was made using a photo of the rain gauge. They reported estimates from several error types.	Infer.NET	153 citizen scientists equipped with a rain gauge and smart phones	Nepal rainfall observations program.

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Peterson et al. (2020)	Spatio-temporal weighted beta regression model	Models the proportion of hard corals as a function of ecological disturbances and management decisions. It integrate data from professional and non-professional data sources	R, INLA	218 citizen-contributed images from Reef Check Australia classified by 12 citizen scientists	Virtual Reef Diver https://www.virtualreef.org.au
Allen et al. (2020)	Zero-inflated Poisson (ZIP) models in an a-priori modeling framework (spatial)	Estimate leopard population densities in the Serengeti	R (pscl), ArcGIS	Camera traps placed in randomly distributed 5kmsq grid, one year data (wet/dry season)	Snapshot Serengeti Project https://www.zooniverse.org/projects/zooniverse/snapshot-serengeti
Crawford et al. (2020)	Cormack-Jolly-Seber model	Estimating population persistence for at-risk species using citizen science data.	R (R2jags), ArcGIS	HerpMapper observations of multiple snake species. Hognose snake was at-risk species that only accounted for 2.5% of observations.	HerpMapper https://www.herpmapper.org/
Kagawa et al. (2020)	Hierarchical Bayesian approach	Using social media to monitor the symbiosis between marine gastropod and epibiotic alga.	R (fetchR, rstan), QGIS	Social median submissions (hashtags, Google forms) along Japan and Korea coastlines	Suagi & Kaigoromo National Survey https://sites.google.com/view/sugai/
Lavariaga et al. (2020)	Spatially explicit capture-recapture. Single-season occupancy-detection model with MLE framework	Framework for community based monitoring of Jaguar in Mexico. Spatially explicit capture-recapture models estimated a density using Bayesian methods.	R (SECR, SPACECAP, unmarked, AICcmodavg), QGIS	Camera-traps in 5 local communities with 8 Jaguar sightings	
Louvrier et al. (2020)	SDM, Bayesian, PDE for dispersion	Mechanistic-statistical species distribution model to explain and forecast wolf (Canis lupus) colonization in South-Eastern France.	JAGS, R (mecastat), OpenBUGS	Professional and non-professional wolf observers collected presence signs all year round (2007-2015)	
Maguire and Mundle (2020)	Dynamic occupancy model (DOM)	Temperature-driven declines in riverine sentinel invertebrates. Funding dependent surveys with sporadic sampling (2002-2018). Missing values modelled with spatial stream networks.	R (h2o, SSN)	Stonefly surveys lead by expert with citizen scientists (2002-2018)	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Sicacha-Parada et al. (2020)	Bayesian Occupancy	Accounting for spatial varying sampling effort due to accessibility of Citizen Science data. Inference about the important of terrain ruggedness index and solar radiation on Moose.	INLA	472 observations of Moose in Norway	GBIF https://www.gbif.org/
Zhu et al. (2020)	Bayesian SDM	Migratory connectivity of Swan Geese from SDMs, feather stable isotope assignment and satellite tracking	MAXENT, (maptools,raster)	R Collected 96 feathers from capturing swan geese in breeding and wintering grounds (2010-2017)	eBird https://ebird.org/home , GBIF https://www.gbif.org/
Santos Fernandez et al. (2020)	Bayesian hierarchical model, Spatial beta regression	Corrects misclassification errors in the annotation of images. Adjust estimates of the proportion hard coral based on citizens abilities or performance measures. It accounts for spatial variation.	R (stats, rstan), Stan	514 images from the Great Barrier Reef classified by 223 citizens. Amazon Mechanical Turk classifications.	Virtual Reef Diver https://www.virtualreef.org.au
Walker and Taylor (2020)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Population trajectory estimation for North American birds	R (brms, rstan)	Identification data for 28 species of songbirds and raptors (1928-2016, North America)	eBird
Benshemesh et al. (2020)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Estimations of trends and drivers of malleefowl breeding activity	R (R2OpenBUGS, coda)	Malleefowl mound activity data (1989-2017, VIC SA, WA, and NSW, Australia)	National Malleefowl Monitoring Database (NMMD)
Lopez et al. (2020)	Bayesian generalised linear model	Using multiple online data platforms to determine which parameters impact the location of bird sightings	R (sp, rjags, AER, spdep)	Bird observation data (2015-2017, Chicago, North America)	iNaturalist, eBird, Flickr
Ryan et al. (2019)	Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) based on Random Forests	Modelling the genetic structure of the population	fastSTRUCTURE (written in Python2.x), VCFtools, R (adegenet, poppr, ape)	Small cabbage white butterfly (<i>Pieris rapae</i>). 32 countries. 150 volunteer scientists and citizens contributing a substantial proportion of the data. https://github.com/citscisean/PierisrapaeInvasionHistory	Pieris Project (http://www.pierisproject.org/)

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Humphreys et al. (2019)	Bayesian regression with a hierarchical framework. Logistic and Poisson regression models in space and time	Estimation of the occurrence and abundance. Effect of predictors such as precipitation, continentality and wetness on dabbling ducks population distributions	R (r-INLA, raster)	1 million records from ten ducks species in the United States from 2015-2017	eBird project (http://ebird.org/home)
Croft et al. (2019)	Hierarchical Bayesian model	Species distribution models for presence-only data in six deer species. Accounts for spatial autocorrelation.	R (hSDM)	Great Britain (GB). National Biodiversity Network (NBN) Atlas. Data from 2012-2016.	
Cumming and Henry (2019)	Bayesian multispecies occupancy model	Models bird point counts across South African National Parks. It accounts for imperfect detection	R (jagsUI, AHM-book)		
Girardello et al. (2019)	Hierarchical Bayesian and spatial linear models	Discusses observational and geographic bias	INLA R (vegan, fossil)		Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) https://www.gbif.org/occurrence/download/0028634-18110811510221
Lyon et al. (2019)	Bayesian hierarchical model and state-space Cormack-Jolly-Seber model	Uses a state-space Cormack-Jolly-Seber approach to model population size of Murray cod and gold perch.	JAGS, R	Captured 7,312 Murray cod and 3,743 golden perch (2007-2013) from electrofishing census and tagging on 3,829 Murray cod and 3,316 golden perch with PIT and external tags and 689 Murray cod and 466 golden perch with radio tags. Anglers reported 1,338 tagged Murray cod and 275 golden perch.	
Outhwaite et al. (2019)	Bayesian occupancy model	Occupancy and species trends for bryophytes, lichens, and invertebrates in the UK.		5,293 UK bryophytes, lichens, and invertebrates (1970-2015)	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Viljugrein et al. (2019)	Hierarchical change-in-ratio model, Stochastic scenario tree	Models relationship between diagnostic test sensitivity, sample quality and disease progression. Studies chronic wasting disease (CWD) infections in European reindeer populations.	R (fitdistrplus, R2Jags)	Citizen (hunters) collected heads for brain tissue extraction by experts	
Patten et al. (2019)	Bayesian occupancy model	Breeding thresholds in opportunistic Odonata records	R (unmarked, rjags, segmented), ArcMap	Citizen scientist image accompanied submissions from two online portals (2013 - 2017)	Odonata Central https://www.odonatacentral.org/ , iNaturalist https://www.inaturalist.org/
Farhadinia et al. (2018)	Bayesian hierarchical and Bayesian occupancy models	Estimates of the occupancy and detection probabilities of Persian leopard species in remote landscapes	R (R2jags), JAGS	data collected from 80 sites on 2013 on Northeastern Iran.	Platform
Morii et al. (2018)	Bayesian and PCA regression models	Zero-inflated negative binomial model the frequencies of slug <i>Limax maximus</i> in Japan	R, Stan	Data collected from one participant from 2015-2016	
Bradter et al. (2018)	Bayesian site-occupancy-detection model. Logistic regression	Assesses habitat suitability models (HSMs) of Siberian jay (<i>Perisoreus infaustus</i>) in Sweden	R (multispeciesPP), JAGS	questionnaire answers from 60 subjects carried out from 2000-2013	
Reich et al. (2018)	Bayesian species occupancy models	Two-stage optimal survey design by minimization of the misclassification errors. Accounts for spatial variation.	R (mgcv)	Data from brown-headed nuthatch (<i>Sitta pusilla</i>) species collected in the Southeast United States	eBird
Petracca et al. (2018)	Bayesian hierarchical occupancy model	Assesses the occurrence jaguars (<i>Panthera onca</i>) in Central America. Accounts for spatial and temporal dependence	R, jagsUI, JAGS	3863 interviews from 2009-2014	
Coron et al. (2018)	Bayesian abundance model	Estimates the abundance of birds correcting the bias introduced in the opportunistic data	R (rjags)	species of bird in Aquitaine (France)	
Zipkin and Saunders (2018)	Bayesian population model	Review integrative population models via data integration approach		-	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Shima et al. (2018)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Assessing the impact of gender, age, weight, season, rainfall, traffic volumes, etc. on road kill risk of Lumholtz's tree kangaroo	R (R2WinBUGS)	Citizen sightings (1998-2000) and road-kill data (2012-2017), Atherton Tablelands, Australia	Tree Kangaroo Mammal Group (data set)
Mair et al. (2017)	Bayesian species distribution model	Models the occurrence of <i>Phellinus ferugineofuscus</i> fungus used to forecast national forest projections in Sweden using presence and/or presence-absence data.	OpenBUGS, R (R2OpenBUGS, BRugs)	2000-2013	Swedish Lifewatch project www.analysisportal.se
Dennis et al. (2017)	Bayesian occupancy model	Compares Bayesian and frequentist occupancy models for presence-only data	R, Sparta	UK Butterflies for the New Millennium database containing more than 11 million species occurrence.	
Fournier et al. (2017)	Bayesian species distribution model	Estimates the origins of species using stable isotopes from capture data while being informed by a species distribution model obtained from CS data. environmental variables	ARCMAP	Live traps 2005 - 2009 and eBird reports (n = 3,632) from 2002 to 2012 of the Virginia rail <i>Rallus limicola</i>	eBird
Eritja et al. (2017)	Bayesian logistic regression	Asian tiger mosquito (<i>Aedes albopictus</i>) alert probability (proxy for prevalence) in vehicles in Spain.	R (rstanarm), Stan	Expert validated citizen science reports of <i>Aedes albopictus</i> in vehicles in Spain (2014-2016)	Mosquito Alert mobile app, http://www.mosquitoalert.com/
Faulkner et al. (2017)	Extension of Dirichlet process mixture model	Hebridean Mink Project, which was set up with the objective of removing mink from North Uist, Benbecula and South Uist, while also trying to reduce the density from South Harris. Estimates source locations of invasions directly from spatial point pattern data without the need to specify dispersal parameters.	R (rgeo)	Trapping data from 2001-2005 with 409 captures. Citizen sightings from 2002-2005 with 125 sightings.	Hebridean Mink Project
Granroth-Wilding et al. (2017)	Bayesian pedigree reconstruction	Establishing pack dynamics of grey wolf (<i>Canis Lupus</i>) population in south-west Finland.	R (MasterBayes, pegas, adegenet, pedigree)	Local hunters and nature enthusiasts collected non-invasive samples (2013-2016). Samples processed in laboratories by experts.	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Hill and Lloyd (2017)	N-mixture models in hierarchical Bayesian framework	Predict population size (abundance) and spatial and temporal patterns of Bicknell's Thrush (<i>Catherus bicknelli</i>).	JAGS, R (unmarked), ArcGIS	14,552 five minute points counts at 747 locations by citizen scientists on hiking trails	Mountain Birdwatch (MBW) monitoring scheme
Hof et al. (2017)	Capture-mark-recapture (CMR), Bayesian growth models	Citizen-science population abundance and growth rate estimates for green sea turtles foraging in the northern Great Barrier Reef, Australia	R (Rmark)	Capture Mark Recapture of Green Seas Turtles in the Northern Great Barrier Reef, Australia. 2003-2014, citizen (volunteers) teams lead by experts tagged 1316 turtles.	
Mang et al. (2017)	Hierarchical Bayesian approach	Models the spatio-temporal heterogeneity in detection patterns of invasive ragweed (<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>)		Historical records in Austria (opportunistic data)	
Steger et al. (2017)	Hierarchical Bayesian Abundance	Assessing the reliability of citizen science data for mammals in the East African drylands.	R	Volunteer citizen scientists from tourist lodges tagged and recorded wildlife counts that were modelled against expert sampling.	
Arab et al. (2016)	Hierarchical Bayesian spatio-temporal model	It models spring arrival day in two species of migratory birds (Ruby-throated Hummingbird <i>Archilochus colubris</i> and Purple Martin <i>Progne subis</i>). It accounts for sampling effort, measurement error and a conditional Autoregressive (CAR) prior is used to model the mean	OpenBUGS	Eastern North America from 2001 to 2010	hummingbirds.net and https://www.learner.org/jnorth/ database and Purple Martin Conservation Association www.purplemartin.org
Siddharthan et al. (2016)	Naive Bayes classifier	Bayesian online updating model for consensus voting. Compares efficiency the consensus labels obtained from Naive Bayes with the majority vote algorithm	Weka	classification of images from bumblebees in the United Kingdom (22 species). 8,844 classification from 1,613 images classified and 763 users	BEEWATCH (www.abdn.ac.uk/research/beeWATCH)
Soykan et al. (2016)	Bayesian log-linear hierarchical model	Models population trends in the abundance of bird species and investigate its association with biological traits.	OpenBUGS (R2OpenBUGS)	R Birds counts by more than 70,000 observers/year in North America. 551 species recorded annually from Dec 14 - Jan 5 between 1966 - 2013	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Armstrong (2016)	Bayesian occupancy model	Models three turtle species occupancy at one reference site	OpenBUGS	One person visiting one reference site and counting the number of basking turtles	
Berberich et al. (2016)	Nest-level data-augmentation occupancy model	Uses event-specific covariates and a plot-level Bayesian and maximum-likelihood model. Compared 3 different methods for quantifying detection probability of Red Wood Ant (RWA) nests (highly visible, up to 2 metres)	JAGS, R (vegan)	60 minutes for each of 16 3600 m2 plots, classified by 8 observers (2 expert, 6 inexperienced). GPS tracked, tagged and photos. R code available Harvard Forest Data Archive.	
Dwyer et al. (2016)	Zero-inflated Poisson with conditional autoregressive correlation structure	Frequency of southern cassowary traffic strikes. Used traffic strike and citizen-collected sightings.	R (gstat, ape, R2WinBUGS), WinBUGS	1km-sq grid of sightings from Community for Coastal and Cassowary Conservation, 1999-2012. Traffic strikes.	
Yan et al. (2016)	Bayesian belief network	Assess ecosystem services related to water quality with Thames case study. Combines citizen science and researcher probe data.	SQL, R (gRain)	citizen science probe data (water quality essential parameters), researcher probe data (water quality essential parameters), citizen mobile data (waterbody features), water monitoring data from UK Environmental Agency, climate data from global model simulation (1993-2012)	
Espeset et al. (2016)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Investigating flight patterns of western monarch butterflies over the past 40 years in California	R (rjags)	Identification data for western monarch butterflies (1972-2014, Northern California, North America)	Art Shapiro's Butterfly Site, The Xerces Society, North American Butterfly Association, Monarch Net
Purse et al. (2015)	Bayesian spatial survival model	Time to invasion from species as a function of environmental predictors	INLA R (survival)	ladybird <i>Harmonia axyridis</i> in Great Britain	UK Ladybird Survey (UKLS) http://www.harlequin-survey.org/ http://www.ladybird-survey.org/

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Barnes et al. (2015)	Bayesian logistic regression	Populations modelling in 21 species of birds for assessing the efficacy of protected areas	R (R2JAGS, LISZT), JAGS,	Wet Tropics in Queensland, Australia	New Atlas of Australian Birds
Arab and Courter (2015)	Hierarchical Bayesian spatio-temporal model	Spring arrival dates in bird migration from Purple Martins from (1905-1940) and (2001-2010). Error processes modelled with an auto-regressive model AR(1) and a Conditional Autoregressive (CAR) prior was used for the spatial dependency	OpenBUGS	initial data was collected by competent naturalists from the North American Bird Phenology Program (NABPP) and more recently by the Purple Martin Conservation Association (www.purplemartin.org).	
Yoshikawa and Osada (2015)	Bayesian hierarchical time series model	Models the month proportion of dietary items using long term monitoring data collected by citizens. The authors found the results of the Bayesian approach to be more consistent with other studies available literature.	R, JAGS	15 bird species in Kanagawa, Japan	
Chapman et al. (2015)	Naive Bayes with discrete Fourier transform	Opportunistic data from two botanical gardens for flowering periods.	R (MCMCpack)	Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland (BSBI)	National Biodiversity Network (NBN) https://data.nbn.org.uk/
Pagel et al. (2014)	Bayesian hierarchical spatio temporal approach for modelling the abundance of species	Data integration from profesional and CS programs to achieve improved estimates.	OpenBUGS	butterfly species (<i>Pyronia tithonus</i>) from Great Britain from 1985 to 2004.	New Millennium project (BNM) https://butterfly-conservation.org/our-work/recording-and-monitoring/butterflies-for-the-new-millennium
Lottig et al. (2014)	Bayesian regression	Assesses trends in lake-water clarity using a Bayesian hierarchical modeling.	JAGS	239,741 Secchi depth measurements by citizens in the United States from 1938-2012	https://www.nalms.org/secchidipin/
Strebel et al. (2014)	Bayesian occupancy model	Penalized thin-plate splines accounting for space and time	Jags	approx 1800 skilled citizens from the Swiss citizen-science bird recording scheme IS	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Roth et al. (2014)	Bayesian site-occupancy model	Estimates the average arrival and departure dates from a single breeding season for two species of long-distance migrant songbirds and two species of butterflies	OpenBUGS, R	Simulation	
Isaac et al. (2014)	Bayesian occupancy model	Compare 11 occupancy methods in terms of the efficiency to detect trends based on different opportunistic data collection scenarios	JAGS	Simulated data with parameters obtained from previous studies.	
Beck et al. (2014)	Jolly-Seber mark-recapture model	Implemented a population dynamics model considering recruitment and losses from individuals identified in images	WinBUGS	opportunistic encounters reported by citizens and whale watching communities in UK and Irish waters between 1992 and 2011	
van Strien et al. (2013a)	Bayesian hierarchical occupancy model	Estimation of the annual occupancy probability. Accounts for changes in space and time and corrects geographical and observation effort biases.	R (Rjags)	Butterfly (1990–2010) and dragonfly (1999–2011) species in the Netherlands obtained from databases such as National Database Flora and Fauna, Dutch Butterfly Monitoring Scheme, and Dutch Dragonfly Monitoring Scheme.	
Cheney et al. (2013)	Bayesian distribution model	Hierarchical log-linear approach for modelling bottlenose dolphins (<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>) in Scotland using data integration from multiple sources	WinBUGS	species identified from images from general population and wildlife tours (2006 - 2007) along with multiple professional data sources	
Wilson et al. (2013)	Bayesian hierarchical model. Log linear model	It models the abundance of Western Grebes in the Salish Sea. Species counts are described using a Poisson distribution and includes covariates to account for the sampling effort and and population effects.	WinBUGS	Audubon Christmas Bird Count data (36 years) with almost 2.5 million records	

Author(s)	Method	Description	Software / package	Data	Platform/ Project
Penone et al. (2013)	Bayesian model averaging (BMA) for general linearized models	Detect widely known patterns of anthropogenic effects on Bush-Crickets.	R (spdep), ArcGIS, Syrinx	Citizen collect data, expert classified data.	French Museum of Natural History http://vigienature.mnhn.fr
van Strien et al. (2013b)	Bayesian occupancy model with hierarchically coupled submodels for occupancy and detection	Damsel fly (<i>Caloteryx splendens</i>) opportunistic data from 5 countries to estimate the annual number of occupied sites per country. Countries are weighted by number of sites surveyed and range of species per country, this adjusts for unequal geographical distributions.	JAGS, WinBUGS	Opportunistic data - from many sources, no standardised sampling design. 1990-2008, Ireland, Great Britain, Netherlands, Belgium, France.	Many
Meiman et al. (2012)	Bayesian hierarchical model	Prediction of saltmarsh sparrow distribution and nesting activity using multiple Bayesian hierarchical models	WinBUGS	Marsh classification data (2006-2008), saltmarsh sparrow presence data (2006-2008), Connecticut, North America	
Snäll et al. (2011)	Bayesian hierarchical regression model	Poisson log-linear model for modelling the species abundance with autoregressive component for temporal dependency. Compares abundance trends obtained from a professional and citizen science dataset using presence-only data. A mechanistic weighting is used to account for survey effort	OpenBUGS	Species Gateway and the Swedish Bird Survey from 2001-2009 in Sweden	http://www.artportalen.se
Szabo et al. (2010)	Bayesian logistic regression model for List Length Analysis	Models the presence/absence of 269 species as a function of the year and the length of the list	WinBUGS	bird lists collected by Birds Queensland over 40 years around Brisbane, Australia	
Kadoya and Washitani (2010)	Bayesian ecological-niche model	Using spatio-temporal presence/absence data to predict control of the near-future spread of the bumblebee	R, ArcGIS	Presence/absence data for <i>B. terrestris</i> (1992-2010, Hokkaido, Japan)	<i>B. terrestris</i> monitoring program




FIGURE 10 Reported software utilized across the reviewed papers.