



## NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/NWC-15

### Estimation of a Decreasing Population Size Over Time

by  
Russell F. Kappenman

September 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service

This TM series is used for documentation and timely communication of preliminary results. Interim reports or special purpose information, and have not received complete formal review, editorial control, or detailed editing.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. NOAA ACCESSION NUMBER NOAA-81121401		2.		3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NUMBER PBB2 161191			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Estimation of a Decreasing Population Size Over Time				5. REPORT DATE Sept 1981			
				6. 042018			
7. AUTHOR(S) Russell F. Kappenman				8. REPORT NO. NOAA-TM-NMFS F/NWC-15			
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA 98112, Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center				10. PROJECT/TASK NO.			
				11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.			
12. SPONSORING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Same				13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED Tech. Memo.			
				14.			
15. PUBLICATION REFERENCE NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/NWC-15, September 1981. 10 p, 2 ref.							
16. ABSTRACT A technique for estimating the size of a population of animals at each of several equally spaced points in time is presented. It is assumed that there are no additions to the population over time, but loss of individuals through natural mortality, disease, predation, or cannibalism does occur. The technique is based upon the process of sampling and tagging individuals from the population periodically. (Author)							
17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS							
17A. DESCRIPTORS *Aquaculture, *Sampling, Population, Marking							
17B. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN-ENDED TERMS Population size							
17C. COSATI FIELD/GROUP 6F, 8A							
18. AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Released for distribution:  <i>James S. Brown</i>				19. SECURITY CLASS (This report) UNCLASSIFIED		21. NO. OF PAGES 11 p.	
				20. SECURITY CLASS (This report) UNCLASSIFIED		22. PRICE	

ESTIMATION OF A DECREASING POPULATION SIZE OVER TIME

**by**

Russell F. Kappenman

Fisheries Data and Management Systems Division  
Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
2725 Montlake Boulevard East  
Seattle, Washington 98112

September 1981

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## ABSTRACT

A technique for estimating the size of a population of animals at each of several equally spaced points in time is presented. It is assumed that there are no additions to the population over time, but loss of individuals through natural mortality, disease, predation, or cannibalism does occur. The technique is based upon the process of sampling and tagging individuals from the population periodically.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Estimation Procedure . . . . .	2
Determination of Tagging Numbers and Sample Sizes . . . . .	5
Literature Cited . . . . .	7

## INTRODUCTION

The culture of aquatic animals in enclosed areas is being practiced for some species and investigated for others in this country. Populations of fish or crustacea are put in enclosures, such as raceways and ponds, which allow neither migration nor immigration. The animals are raised until they are ready for consumption or introduction to a new environment.

Typically, the populations are enormously large (thousands or tens of thousands of animals are often involved) and it is important to monitor population size over time. For many culturings, the population size cannot increase during confinement but decreases because of natural mortality, disease, predation, or cannibalism. Actual counting of the number of animals present in a given enclosure at a given point in time is often impractical or impossible. Thus a scheme for estimating, with given precision, the number of animals present in a large population at various points in time is of interest.

The purpose of this paper is to present one such scheme. We assume that 1) the initial population size (i.e., the number of animals put in the enclosure) is known; 2) estimates of population size at the end of several consecutive equal time intervals are desired; 3) the animals in the population may be tagged in such a way that if one is drawn from the population at any time during the course of the culture, whether or not it has been tagged previously can be determined; 4) sampling animals from and tagging and returning animals to the population can be performed at those points in time for which population size is to be estimated; 5) the population size can only decrease over time; with loss probability constant from one time interval to the next; and 6) loss probability is the same for tagged and untagged animals. We do not assume that a tag placed on an animal at one point in time can be distinguished from a tag placed at

another point in time. In the applications for which this procedure was developed only one type of tag has been devised.

In the next section, a tagging and sampling procedure for estimating population size over time is described and an estimator of population size at any given point in time is derived, under the assumptions just listed. In the last section, we address the problem of determining sample sizes and tagging numbers.

#### THE ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

Suppose that a population of  $N$  animals, where  $N$  is known, is stocked in an enclosure. We want to estimate, at each of several equally spaced time points, the population size. There are no additions to the population, but the size of it can decrease over time. Assume that the survival proportion,  $S$ , is constant from one time interval to the next.

In order to estimate the population size at the various time points, we proceed as follows. At stocking,  $t_0$  of the  $N$  animals are tagged. Then at the end of the  $i$ -th interval of time, select at random  $n_i$  animals, count the number,  $x_i$ , of these which have tags, tag  $t_i$  ( $\leq n_i - x_i$ ) untagged animals, and return all sampled animals to the population.

Now consider estimation of the population size at the  $m$ -th time point. The population size and the number of tags present in the population at the  $i$ -th point in time, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , are, respectively,

$$N_i(S) = NS^i$$

and



$$x_i(S) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} t_j S^{i-j}.$$

The distribution of  $x_i$  is hypergeometric with parameters  $N_i(S)$ ,  $X_i(S)$ , and  $n_i$ , for  $i=1, \dots, m$ . The logarithm of the product of the density functions of  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-1}$ , and  $x_m$  is the sum of a quantity, which is not a function of  $S$ , and

$$L(S) = \sum_{i=1}^m \{h[N_i(S)-X_i(S)] + h[X_i(S)] + h[N_i(S)-n_i] - h[N_i(S)-X_i(S)-n_i+x_i] - h[X_i(S)-x_i] - h[N_i(S)]\}$$

where

$$h[y] = \ln y! = \ln \Gamma(y+1),$$

Note that for large  $z$ , one might use the approximation

$$\ln \Gamma(z) = (z-\frac{1}{2})\ln z - z + \frac{1}{2}\ln(2\pi) + (1/12z) - (1/360z^3) + (1/1260z^5) - (1/1680z^7) + (1/1188z^9).$$

See Abramowitz and Stegun (1964).

A possible estimate of  $S$  is the value of  $S$  which maximizes  $L(S)$ . This value may be found by using a simple computer search and, depending on how the  $t_i$ 's are determined, is either a maximum likelihood or pseudomaximum **likelihood** estimate for  $S$ . The corresponding estimate of population size at the  $m$ -th time point is  $N$  times the  $m$ -th power of the estimate of  $S$ .

An example, suppose  $N = 100,000$ ,  $m = 6$ ,  $t_0 = 3500$ ,  $n_i = 3500$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, 6$ ,  $x_1 = 154$ ,  $x_2 = 240$ ,  $x_3 = 374$ ,  $x_4 = 531$ ,  $x_5 = 665$ ,  $x_6 = 821$ , and  $t_i = n_i - x_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, 5$ . The following table gives the values of  $L(S)$  for a range of values of  $S$ :

$S$	0.90	0.91	0.92	0.93	0.94
$L(S)$	-7802.51	-7799.62	-7798.55	-7799.12,	-7801.15

It is clear that the pseudomaximum likelihood estimate of  $S$  is 0.92 and an estimate of the population size at the end of the sixth time interval is  $100,000(0.92)^6 = 60,635$ .

If  $x_i/X_i(S)$ ,  $[n_i - x_i]/[N_i(s) - x_i(s)]$ , and  $n_i/N_i(S)$  are small (say, less than 0.1), then the distribution of  $x_i$  may be approximated by the binomial distribution whose parameters are  $n_i$  and

$$g_i(S) = X_i(S)/N_i(S) \\ = \left[ \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (t_j/S^j) \right] / N.$$

See Parzen (1960). When these quantities are small for  $i=1, 2, \dots, m$ , the value of  $S$  which maximizes  $L(S)$  may be adequately approximated by the value of  $S$  which maximizes

$$L_1(S) = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \ln g_i(S) + (n_i - x_i) \ln[1 - g_i(S)].$$

Again a simple search procedure can be used to find this value or one can apply a numerical procedure, such as the Newton-Raphson one, to solve the equation

$$\frac{dL_1(S)}{dS} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{g_i'(S)[x_i - n_i g_i(S)]}{g_i(S)[1 - g_i(S)]} = 0$$

for  $S$ . Here

$$g_i'(S) = -\left[ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (j t_j / S^{j+1}) \right] / N,$$

for  $i=1, \dots, m$ .

#### DETERMINATION OF TAGGING NUMBERS AND SAMPLE SIZES

This work was motivated by the following posed problem. One hundred thousand shrimp were to be raised for 6 months in a closed raceway. Estimates of population size at monthly intervals were desired. The investigators wanted an estimate, for population size at the end of 6 months, which was within 10% of the actual population size at that time, with about 95% confidence;

The investigators had the capability of inserting a magnetic wire tag internally in each shrimp and determining whether or not a given shrimp was tagged. They were unable to tag shrimp in more than one way. So a tag inserted at one point in time could not be distinguished from a tag inserted at another point in time.

The design of the investigation required guidelines for the number of taggings and the sample sizes. It was decided that if the required sample sizes were not too large, all untagged shrimp in each sample would be tagged before the sampled animals were returned to the population.

If it is possible to tag all untagged animals in each sample', then a sampling and tagging plan only requires values for  $t_0$ , the number of animals tagged at stocking, and the  $n_i$ 's, the sample sizes for the time, points. The values of these needed to insure that the estimate of population size at the  $m$ -th time point has a certain precision may be obtained by simulation if one has at least a rough idea of what proportion of the original population will survive to the  $m$ -th time point.

Let  $S$  be the  $m$ -th root of this proportion. For large populations and fixed  $t_0, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ , and  $n_m$ , the distribution of  $x_i$  is approximately binomial with parameters  $n_i$  and  $g_i(S)$ . A simulated value for  $x_i$  can be found by counting the number of independent uniform  $(0, 1)$  random variates, out of  $n_i$ , that do not exceed  $g_i(S)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . The uniform random variates can be generated with a computer. Once the  $m$   $x_i$ 's are generated, one can compute an estimate of  $S$  and an estimate of the population size at the  $m$ -th time point. The latter estimate can then be compared to the actual population size at the  $m$ -th time point to determine whether or not it is "close enough." For fixed  $t_0, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ , and  $n_m$ , the whole process may be repeated over and over, a large number of times. When this is done, one is able to estimate the percentage of the time that the estimate of population size is close enough to actual population size, for the fixed  $t_0, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{m-1}$ , and  $n_m$ . Trial and error of these fixed values enables one to arrive at values which insure that the estimate based on them has the desired precision.

An example, for the posed problem,  $N = 100,000$  and the investigators expected about 80% of the population to survive for 6 months. Thus we set  $S = (0.80)^{1/6} = 0.96$ . It was found that when  $t_0 = n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_6 = 3500$ , the estimate of population size at the end of 6 months was within 10% of the actual population size (80,000) 938 times out of 1000 simulations. Thus we are roughly 94% confident that if 100,000 animals are stocked, if 80,000 animals survive for 6 months, if 3,500 animals are tagged at stocking, if 3,500 animals are sampled monthly, if all untagged animals in each sample are tagged, if all sampled animals are returned to the population, and if the estimation procedure of the preceding section is used, then our estimate of population size is within 10% of the actual population size at the end of 6 months.

#### LITERATURE CITED

Abramowitz, M., and I. Stegun.

1964. Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables. U.S. Dep. Commer., Natl. Bur. Stand., App. Math. Ser. 55, 1,046 p.

Parzen, E.

1960. Modern probability theory and its applications. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 464 p.