A NONLINEAR MODEL FOR ROCKY SHORE BIOACOUSTIC SIGNATURE OFF CABO FRIO ISLAND

Fabio C. Xavier^{*1}



Leandro Calado¹, Nilce G. Silveira¹, Rafael G. Menezes¹, Eduardo B. F. Netto¹, Alexandre D. Kassuga¹, Sergio M. Jesus².

¹Admiral Paulo Moreira Marine Research Institute (IEAPM) & Federal Fluminense University (UFF), Arraial do Cabo – RJ, Brazil, e-mail: fabiofcx@gmail.com

²University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal, e-mail: sjesus@ualg.pt

INTRODUCTION

Different marine habitats have distinct acoustic signatures (Radford et al., 2014). These signatures are composed by anthropogenic, natural and biological sounds. In coastal zones, the acoustic signature has a stronger influence of benthic organisms that form the bioacoustic chorus (Butler et al., 2017), that we will term as the Rocky Shore Bioacoustic Signature (RSBS). However, RSBS patterns can be influenced by circadian and lunar cycles, wind, tide, temperature, luminosity and others. Yet, to better understand the influence of abiotic and biotic factors in the RSBS pattern it is very important to model, identify and quantify contributions of each these factors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION



GOALS

Evaluating the relationship between RSBS and abiotic/biotic factors and to propose a nonlinear model for RSBS, based on data collected off Cabo Frio Island, Brazil.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area sustains a unique environment due to strong upwelling occurrence and other hydrodynamic characteristics (Ferreira, 2003; Calado et al., 2018) (Figure 2).

BRAZIL

Figure 3 – Spearman correlation: band B (left) and C (right).

-B/C is more influenced by

T and SR;

-SR influences more band

B than **C**;

- Band **C** is more influenced

by abiotic factors;





 $\mathbf{B} = 0.2055^{*}\mathbf{T} - 0.1996^{*}\log(\mathbf{SR}) + 0.0640^{*}\mathbf{TD} - 0.0282^{*}\mathbf{WS} + 0.0293^{*}\mathbf{R} + 73.3478$



Figure 1 – Hydrophones relative position and some RSBS contributors.

Acquisition system

- 1 regular tetraedron (1m);
- 4 hydrophones TP-1 (MarSensing);
- Sensitivity: -175 dB ref 1V/microPa;
- 24 bits, Fs of 52734 Hz;
- Duty cycle of 20%.
- Temperature (T) and luminosity (L): 1 each 10 min (Hobo pendant).



Figure 2 – Study area and acquisition system location (blue circle).

$C = 0.2506^{T} - 0.1220^{H}\log(SR) + 0.3182^{T}D - 0.0640^{H}WS + 0.0323^{H}R + 61.5666^{H}$



Figure 4 - RSBS data (top), RSBS model (center) and RSBS difference between data and mode (bottom): band B (left) and band C (right).

Regression analysis revealed that temperature and light (solar radiation) explain approximately [B: 40%, C: 50%] of the RSBS variance, while other abiotic factors explain just [B: 2.5%, C: 5%], approximately. Another important result was the nonlinear relationship between light (solar radiation) and RSBS.

RSBS modelling (@ 82 days)

- Two frequency bands: B (1.5-8kHz) and C (8-24kHz);
- Meteorological dataset (INMET):
- [solar radiation (SR), wind speed (WS), rain(R)];
- Tide (TD);
- Spearman correlation;
- Nonlinear multiple regression.

 $RSBS = a^{T} + b^{*}log(SR) + c^{T}D + d^{W}S + e^{R} + k$

CONCLUSIONS

This puts in evidence that the biorhythm can be one of the principal of contributors for RSBS, increasing in twilight. This model may help to understand RSBS pattern and its variations, and help for developing bioacoustic inversion applications as abiotic data measuring, population density of benthic organisms and marine health monitoring.

REFERENCES



CNPg

- Calado, L., Rodríguez, O. C., Codato, G. and Xavier, F.C. (2018). "Upwelling regime off the Cabo Frio region in Brazil and impact on acoustic propagation" The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America **143** (3), EL174-EL180.
- Simmonds, J. and MacLennan, D. N. (2008). Fisheries acoustics: theory and practice (John Wiley & Sons).
- Butler, J., Butler, M. J., and Gaff, H. (2017). "Snap, crackle, and pop: Acoustic-based model estimation of snapping shrimp populations in healthy and degraded hard-bottom habitats" Ecological indicators 77, 377-385.
- Ferreira, C. E. L (2003). "Non-indigenous corals at marginal sites" Coral Reefs 22(4), 498–498.