# The use of natural markings in studies of longfinned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*) and narwhals (*Monodon monoceros*)



Marie Auger-Méthé<sup>1</sup>, Hal Whitehead<sup>1</sup>, & Marianne Marcoux<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Natural Resource Sciences, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

### **Pilot whale photo-id** Is the current photo-id method reliable? Can we improve it?

Pilot whale (*Globicephala melas*) studies have used photoidentification<sup>1,2,3</sup>. These studies relied on the markings of the dorsal fin, which allowed the identification of only 30% of the population<sup>1</sup>. None of these investigated the reliability of the marks used.

## Methods & results

The prevalence of all mark types except the notch ( $\chi^2$ , p < 0.001) and the white scar ( $\chi^2$ , p = 0.047) were independent of a photograph's 'identifiability', as currently determined. This suggests that the currently identifiable individuals do not differ from the rest of the population in their susceptibility to factors causing marks, such as predation, and thus appear to be representative of the population.

The rate of loss was calculated for each mark type found on individuals photographed in at least two different years.

Rate of loss =	# mai whale - years of	ks lost available marks	summation of the number of years between the earliest presence of a mark and either its latest presence or its earliest absence		
The rate of loss of the marks types found on pilot whales					
		Rate of loss	wha	Whale-years of available marks	
		(per mark per ye	ear) <b>avail</b>		
Notch		0.0000)	Appear to	128	
Protrudin	a piece	0.0000	Appear to	7	
White sca	ir	0.0000	be	7	
Saddle pa	atch	0.0000	permanent	21	
Parallel linear scrape		0.7073		41	
Single linear scrape		0.9145		152	
Tooth rake		0.9024		41	
Noncircular light pat	ch	0.8871		62	
Scratch patch		1.0000		1	
Small white dot		0.8537		246	
Miscellaneous		0.4000		5	

Of the four permanent mark types, one, the notch, is used in the current photo-id method. Two others, the white scar and protruding piece, are usually found next to notches and are likely caused concurrently. Thus, they would not improve the method. Finally, the saddle patch is found in 50% of the photographs currently assessed as non-identifiable. Using this mark type would double the % of identifiable individuals.



#### Conclusion The current photo-id method appears to be reliable but using the saddle patch would double the number of identifiable individuals

### **Narwhal photo-id** Which feature is suitable for individual identification?

Photo-identification has not been developed for narwhals, in part because the features used to identify other cetaceans are not adequate for narwhal identification. Narwhals lack dorsal fins and show marked change in body pigmentation and tail morphology with age<sup>4</sup>.

## Methods & results

We are developing a computer program that uses the features and position of the notches found on the dorsal ridge to identify the individuals.



For each pair of dorsal ridges, it compares all mark points of the same category. Using the position of the compared mark points and their associated error, it calculates the fit (r). It then chooses the best fit (r) for each mark point.



To calculate the fit between the two dorsal ridges, R, it averages all the best r's from the dorsal ridges.



The photo is tentatively matched to the individual in the catalogue that results in the highest R and then confirmed by eye.

Conclusion It appears that narwhal can be identified using the notches found on their dorsal ridge.

Acknowledgements: Andrea Ottensmeyer, Canadian Marine Environment Protection Society, Canadian Whale Institute, Canadian Wildlife Federation, Capt Mark's Whale & Seal Cruise, Citlalli Alvarez, Daniela Römer, Devin Lyons, Meaghan Jankowski, Namen Inuarak, Nikon Canada, Northern Scientific Training Program, NSERC, Mamoru Yasuda, Mittimatalik HTO, Polar Sea Adventures, Whitehead lab. Reference: <sup>1</sup>Ottensmeyer & Whitehead 2003 Can J Zool: 1327 <sup>2</sup>Weilgart & Whitehead 1990 Behav Ecol Sociobiol: 399 <sup>3</sup>Cañadas and Sagarminaga 2000 Mar Mamm Sci: 513 <sup>4</sup>Hay & Mansfield 1989 *Handbook of Marine Mammals Vol. 4*: 145