ORIGINAL ARTICLE

bio**TROPICA** · ASSOCIATION FOR TROPICAL BIOLOGY AND CONSERVATION · WILEY

A bird's-eye view: Evaluating drone imagery for the detection and monitoring of endangered and invasive day geckos

Nicolas Dubos[1,2] | Xavier Porcel[2] | Markus A. Roesch[2,3,4] | Juan Claudin[5] | Romain Pinel[6] | Jean-Michel Probst[5] | Gregory Deso[7]

[1]The Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Sde-Boqer Campus, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Be'er Sheva, Israel

[2]CIBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, InBIO Laboratório Associado, Universidade do Porto, Vairão, Portugal

[3]BIOPOLIS Program in Genomics, Biodiversity and Land Planning, CIBIO, Vairão, Portugal

[4]Association Nature Océan Indien, La Réunion, France

[5]Association Nature and Patrimoine, La Réunion, France

[6]GEOLAB SARL, Sainte-Marie, France

[7]Association herpétologique de Provence Alpes Méditerranée (AHPAM), Orange, France

Correspondence
Nicolas Dubos, The Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Sde-Boqer Campus, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Midreshet Ben-Gurion, 8499000 Be'er Sheva Israel.
Email: dubos.research@gmail.com

Associate Editor: Jennifer Powers
Handling Editor: Jennifer Powers

Abstract

Species monitoring can be strongly limited by terrain accessibility, impeding our understanding of species ecology and thus challenging their conservation. This is particularly true for species living in the canopy, on cliffs or in dense vegetation. Remote sensing imagery may fill this gap by offering a cost-effective monitoring approach allowing to improve species detection in inaccessible areas. We investigated the applicability of drone-based monitoring for a Critically Endangered insular gecko (*Phelsuma inexpectata*) and two invasive alien gecko species representing a risk for the former (*P. grandis* and *P. laticauda*). We determined the approach distance before inducing behavioural response caused by the drone's presence. All three study species showed no escape behaviour to the drone's presence until very close distances (mean distance for *P. inexpectata*: 33.8 cm; *P. grandis*: 21.9 cm; *P. laticauda*: 26.4 cm). We then performed horizontal and vertical approaches with the drone, taking photos every meter starting at 10 m away from the canopy edge to determine an optimal distance for detection while ensuring species-level identification. We examined a total of 328 photos. We found a bimodality in the number of detected geckos for two species, with different individuals recorded between short and intermediate distances. Therefore, we recommend taking photos at two distances of 2–2.5 and 5 m away from the canopy, ideally facing away from the sun and in low wind conditions. We encourage the application of our methodology for *Phelsuma* spp., but also for other species of similar size and ecology to improve detection in inaccessible areas.

KEYWORDS
approach distance, invasive alien species, *Phelsuma*, photo-identification, remote sensing, Reunion Island

Résumé

Le suivi des espèces est fortement limité par l'accessibilité au terrain, ce qui freine notre compréhension de leur écologie et leur conservation. Ceci s'applique particulièrement aux espèces vivant dans la canopée, sur les falaises ou dans la

végétation dense. La télédétection ouvre la possibilité de combler ces lacunes tout en améliorant la détectabilité de ces espèces dans les endroits inaccessibles. Nous avons exploré la faisabilité du suivi par drone d'un gecko insulaire en danger critique d'extinction (*Phelsuma inexpectata*) et deux autres invasifs qui représentent un risque pour ce dernier (*P. grandis* et *P. laticauda*). Nous avons déterminé la distance d'approche maximale avant d'observer une réaction à la présence du drone. Les trois espèces étudiées n'ont montré aucune réponse avant de très courtes distances (*P. inexpectata*: 33.8 cm; *P. grandis*: 21.9 cm; *P. laticauda*: 26.4 cm en moyenne). Nous avons ensuite effectué des approches horizontales et verticales avec le drone, prenant une photo chaque mètre entre 1 et 10 m du bords de la canopée afin de déterminer la distance optimale pour une identification d'espèce fiable. Nous avons examiné un total de 328 photos et trouvé une bimodalité dans le nombre de geckos détectés pour deux espèces, avec différents individus identifiés entre les plans rapprochés et les plans à distances intermédiaires. Nous recommandons la prise de deux photos, respectivement à des distances de 2–2.5 et 5 m de la canopée, idéalement dos au soleil et sous vent faible. Nous encourageons l'application de notre méthode pour toutes espèces de *Phelsuma*, mais aussi d'autres espèces de taille et d'écologie similaire afin d'améliorer la détection dans les endroits inaccessibles.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Population assessment of endangered and rare species is often limited by a multitude of factors, including funding, observer experience, species detectability, and terrain accessibility. Consequently, species living in complex habitats or with dynamic habitat use are poorly understood and their conservation becomes challenging. The development of novel cost-effective methods for cryptic or threatened species monitoring is a priority for their conservation (Monks et al., 2022).

Insular endemic species are particularly vulnerable to invasive alien species (IAS). The spread of IAS is generally facilitated by lack of surveillance efforts, preventing their early detection, and allowing for initial dispersal (Cuthbert et al., 2022). The rising economic costs of biological invasions encourage the settlement of preventive measures (Diagne et al., 2021). Detection and monitoring of IAS may be considerably improved with the development of cost-effective monitoring methods.

Recent technological advancements and reduced costs for electronic devices have contributed to the development of novel methods for biodiversity monitoring. Novel methodologies such as computer assisted slow-speed road cruising (Jones et al., 2022) or camera-trapping (e.g., Deso et al., 2022; Roesch et al., 2021) have already proven efficient. Drones have already been used to estimate species abundance, monitor individual behaviour and animal disturbance related to its presentations (Schad & Fischer, 2022). They were recently used for the monitoring of endangered species (Landeo-Yauri et al., 2020; Varela-Jaramillo et al., 2023), including cryptic reptiles (Monks et al., 2022), and have improved the detection of invasive reptile species living in the tree canopy (Aota et al., 2021).

The Critically Endangered Manapany day gecko, *Phelsuma inexpectata* Mertens 1966, is endemic to Reunion Island. Its distribution is restricted to a narrow strip along the southern coastline. The species frequently uses screw pine *Pandanus utilis*, where it can be locally abundant (Bour et al., 1995). Its habitat use is dynamic throughout the seasons, with a more frequent use of the canopy during winter (Choeur et al., 2023). The development of a year-round remote sensing monitoring protocol dedicated to this species may increase detection, improve the temporal resolution of surveys, help understand the species' ecology, and ultimately improve conservation management.

Among the few fragmented populations of *P. inexpectata*, several have been reported in sympatry with invasive *Phelsuma* spp., that is the Madagascar giant day gecko *P. grandis* Gray 1870 and the gold dust day gecko *P. laticauda* Boettger 1880 (Dubos, 2013; Porcel et al., 2021). A colonization of Manapany-les-Bains, the stronghold of *P. inexpectata*, by *P. grandis* has successfully been controlled by the NGO Nature Océan Indien between 2010 and 2012 and *P. grandis* has not been observed in the area ever since (M.A. Roesch, pers. obs.). Both invasive species can thrive in similar habitats to *P. inexpectata* and share resources, inducing competition (Deso et al., 2023; Hoarau et al., 2021; Porcel et al., 2022). *Phelsuma grandis* also raises concerns due to its larger size, imposing high predation risk on smaller species (Buckland et al., 2014). Both invasive species successfully established throughout the world (Dubos et al., 2014, 2023; Fieldsend et al., 2020, 2021; Fieldsend & Krysko, 2019), with strong invasion potential on tropical islands (Dubos et al., 2023). The two invasive *Phelsuma* spp. can be found in a variety of habitats including primary forests, shrub land, urban environment, and agricultural areas (D'Cruze et al., 2009; Dubos et al., 2014). Beyond promoting early detection in uninvaded areas, the

use of remote sensing may help understanding their impact on native species where they are already established.

Drone imagery offers a bird's-eye view on areas that are otherwise inaccessible or difficult to survey. It can improve species detection and thus, contribute to the monitoring and spread of IAS. It may also allow for the study of interactions between native species and IAS and to better characterize the dynamics of habitat use in areas invisible to the observer on the ground.

This study investigates the use of remote sensing-based monitoring of native and invasive *Phelsuma* spp., with the aim to improve detection probability in an otherwise inaccessible area (i.e., tree canopy), and test whether the drone can improve detection in more accessible areas (i.e., tree trunk at eye level). We (i) quantified the behavioural response of geckos to the approaching drone, (ii) determined the optimal distance for maximum detection, (iii) test whether drone-based count outperforms human visual count in easy to access sites, and (iv) investigated variation in detection relative to time of day and species-level identification. We eventually propose a standardized framework for the monitoring of *Phelsuma* spp. based on drone imagery.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Study sites and species

Our research took place at three sites on Reunion Island: (1) in the village of Manapany-les-Bains (−21.37 S; 55.58 E; conducted on November 22, 2022), at a site where only *P. inexpectata* is present; (2) in the botanical garden *Domaine du Café Grillé* (−21.37 S; 55.42 E; conducted on November 23, 2022) where *P. inexpectata* and *P. laticauda* co-occur; (3) in a public park in the city of Saint Benoît (−21.03 S; 55.72 E; conducted on November 25, 2022) occupied by *P. grandis*. In all three sites, surveys were conducted along screw pines, *Pandanus utilis*, which represent a highly favorable habitat for all three species.

All three study species are mostly bright-green with red spots on the back, but can be distinguished through their differing patterns. *Phelsuma inexpectata* can be identified with its blue crescent-shaped pattern on the snout, a white-black-white stripe behind the eye, and a maximum total length of 12 cm. *P. grandis* is characterized by a red stripe between the snout and the eye, and is much larger (up to 30 cm total length). *P. laticauda* is characterized by three longitudinal red stripes on the back, a wider yellowish tail, and a maximum total length of 13 cm. For the approach distance analysis, we distinguished juveniles and adults when an individual was smaller (individual for which aging was uncertain were considered adult). Females can be identified on the basis of the presence of endolymphatic calcium sacs and a sexual dimorphism in *P. inexpectata*.

2.2 | Material

We used a DJI Phantom 4 Pro V2.0 drone equipped with its standard camera. The camera has a 1-inch 20M pixel sensor and a 24 mm (35 mm format equivalent) lens, corresponding to an 84° field of view. All take-offs and landings were located in secured and open areas, with restricted access to the public, and at least 10 m away from the geckos' habitat.

2.3 | Determining approach distance

We tested whether the presence of a drone would induce a behavioural response in our three study species. We first located individuals which could be approached safely by the drone until a short distance based two criteria: (1) no obstacle between the drone and the gecko and (2) little canopy cover for precise drone geolocation and maneuverability.

We stabilized the drone image at 10 m distance from the monitored individual at its height. Then, we steadily flew the drone horizontally toward the individual. We interrupted the approach either when the individual reacted to the drone's presence (i.e., when observing an escape behaviour), or when the individual was about 20 cm away from the drone propellers (for the individual's safety and material integrity). Therefore, a distance of 20 cm suggests that the individual did not respond to the drone's presence. In case of escape behaviour, we maintained the drone in its position and measured the distance between the drone's propellers and the tree trunk.

The drone may induce a different impact on the target species depending on the approach orientation (e.g., perception of avian predator and potential effect of propellers' blow). We used the aforementioned method to also evaluate the vertical approach distance for *P. inexpectata*, since this species is frequently observed on the ground (mostly on volcanic rock beaches; Deso and Probst, 2007).

2.4 | Statistical analysis

As insular species are known for having lost vigilance to predators, we expected the two invasive species to respond to the drone at longer distances than *P. inexpectata*. We tested whether the approach distance would differ between species with a linear model (LM, assuming a Gaussian distribution). We removed the data related to vertical approaches, as such data could only be acquired for *P. inexpectata*. We used the distance of approach as the response variable and the species as explanatory variable.

For *P. inexpectata*, we expected a stronger response in the vertical approach because they are known to respond to bird predators, such as the Reunion harrier *Circus maillardi* and the red-whiskered bulbul *Pycnonotus jocosus* (J.-M. Probst pers. obs.). We built a second LM with approach distance as the response variable and approach orientation as predictor. We expected differences in the response to the drone between adult and juvenile geckos, thus added to the model the maturity of individuals as a two-level factor effect (adult vs. juvenile).

2.5 | Determining optimal detection distance

We performed horizontal and vertical approaches. Horizontal approaches enabled us to compare the performance of the drone-based monitoring to human visual counts, while vertical approaches allowed us to determine whether drone-based monitoring prove efficient for species monitoring in the canopy.

For horizontal approaches, we stabilized the drone at the canopy level, that is, between 3 and 6 m above ground (depending on tree height) and at a horizontal distance of 10 m from the canopy, with the camera oriented in opposite direction to the sun when applicable. We flew the drone steadily toward the tree and took photos every meter until reaching a distance of 1 m.

During each horizontal approach, we performed a standardized point count survey (human visual counts) with two to three observers (JC, ND, XP) per site. We counted all visible geckos up to distances of 8, 6, 4, and 2 m from the observer for a duration of 1 min per distance.

For vertical approaches, we first measured the canopy height with the drone embedded barometer and GPS, then started approaching from 10 m above the canopy. We repeated the operation four times between 8:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. At the shortest distances, where the camera's field of view could not enable us to encompass the whole tree, we took multiple photos at the same distance to cover the entirety of the canopy. This resulted in an unbalanced design in our models (i.e., more replicates at short distances; see model design below), which implies that estimates were more certain at shorted distances compared to longer distances. Images were carefully examined by three observers afterwards (GD, ND, XP), with three to 5 min of effort per photo depending on image complexity.

2.6 | Statistical analysis

We used a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM; R package mgcv version 1.8-42; Wood, 2011) assuming a Poisson distribution with gecko count as the response variable and drone distance as spline effect to examine variation in gecko detection on images. For both drone image and human visual counts, we first performed the analysis for all species combined. Models included a species and an observer categorical fixed effect, and a sampling session (i.e., one approach) random effect (mostly to account for differences in sun exposure at different time of day). We then repeated the analysis for each species individually, accounting for the effect of observer (fixed effect), and a sampling session (random effect). We added a site effect for *P. inexpectata*, because this species was observed at two sites.

We compared the number of geckos detected between drone-based and human-based counts with a similar model design (Poisson GAMM with a spline effect of distance, with the aforementioned adjustment variables), but merging both data and adding a drone versus human factorial effect.

2.7 | Assessing time of day effect on detection and distance on species-level identification

We examined whether there was an optimal time of day to maximize detection during the four drone sessions performed between 8:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. described above. We used a generalized additive model (GAM; Poisson family), with gecko count as the response variable and time of day as spline effect. We accounted for differences in species abundance with a species adjustment variable (three-level fixed effect).

Eventually, we assessed the maximum distance for a species-level identification—at the site where two different species could be observed—using a GAMM (Poisson family) to predict the effect of distance (spline effect) on unidentified species count as a response variable. We added an observer effect as a fixed effect and sampling session as a random effect. All analyses were performed under R version 4.1.3 (R Core Team, 2022).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Determining approach distance

We measured the approach distance before escape behaviour for 26 individuals (*P. inexpectata* n = 11; *P. grandis* n = 8; *P. laticauda* n = 7), including 19 adults and 7 juveniles. Interestingly, we found overall very little effect of the drone's presence on all three study species (Figure 1). The approach distance to *P. inexpectata* was significantly different from zero (mean ± SE = 33.8 ± 5.4 cm; p = 0.02), while it did not significantly differ for the two IAS (*P.*


FIGURE 1 Approach distance before the drone induced behavioural response for three *Phelsuma* species (the native *P. inexpectata* on the left and two invasive species on the right; total = 26). Boxes represent the first and third quartiles, the horizontal bar represents the median and the points represent outliers. We show jittered data points.

grandis mean ± SE = 21.9 ± 4.7 cm; *p* = 0.70; *P. laticauda* mean distance ± SE = 26.4 ± 5.0 cm; *p* = 0.22).

We found a significant difference between horizontal and vertical approach distances for *P. inexpectata* (Table 1). As expected, the approach distance was longer when approaching vertically (+37.3 cm). We found no statistical effect of maturity (age class adult vs. juveniles).

3.2 | Determining optimal detection distance

We produced and examined a total of 328 drone photos. We counted between 0 and 6 *P. inexpectata* per sampling unit (mean ± SD = 0.70 ± 1.20 at given distance, sampling session, site, and observer group; Figure 2) on the drone images. With human visual counts we counted between 0 and 9 individuals per sampling unit (mean ± SD = 2.33 ± 2.37). For *P. laticauda*, we counted between 0 and 6 (mean ± SD = 0.57 ± 1.00) individuals per sampling units with drones, and between 4 and 19 (mean ± SD = 10.40 ± 4.49) with human visual counts. For *P. grandis*, we counted between 0 and 1 (mean ± SD = 0.09 ± 0.29) individuals per sampling units with drones and between 0 and 3 (mean ± SD = 0.93 ± 1.03) with human visual counts. The overall higher detection rate with human visual counts was statistically significant (*Human visual count* intercept ± SE = 2.22 ± 0.55, *p* < 0.0001).

The field of view strongly differed between short and long distances (e.g., 2 m vs. 5 m). We found that different individuals may be detected within the same sampling session depending on the angle and field of view, assuming that individuals were different based on their different location within short time intervals, and difference in size or sex.

We identified two modalities in gecko detection with drones with all species combined (Figure 3). The highest detection rates were at 2.5 and 5.5 m distance. The detection of *P. inexpectata* increased until reaching a first plateau near 5 m, then further increased between 4 and 2 m before reaching a second plateau (Figure 4). The highest detection rate was between 2 and 6 m for *P. laticauda*. Detection decreased linearly with the distance for *P. grandis*. Detection with the human visual counts approach decreased linearly with distance in all three species (Figure 4). The standard errors were narrower between 1 and 2 m, presumably as a result of our larger number of replicates at short distances.

TABLE 1 Model estimates for the effect of approach orientation and maturity on the approach distance before behavioural response to the drone's presence for *Phelsuma inexpectata*. The significant effect is shown in bold.

	Estimate	SE	*p*
Intercept (adult, horizontal)	20.75	17.24	0.26
Maturity (juvenile)	−20.75	29.87	0.51
Orientation (vertical)	**58.05**	**23.14**	**0.03**

3.3 | Determine time of day effect on detection and distance on species-level identification

The number of geckos detected was stable throughout the morning but became more variable at around 11:00 a.m., and eventually decreased linearly after 12:00 p.m. (Figure 5). Species-level identification was low at a distance between 10 and 6 m, then the rate of unidentified species decreased as the drone approached (Figure 5).

4 | DISCUSSION

Drone imagery is a promising avenue for the monitoring of *Phelsuma* species. Our three study species showed very little behavioural response to the drone's presence, and drone images enabled us to detect many individuals in the canopy, which otherwise remained undetected by eye (e.g., Figure 2c). Approach distances were unexpectedly short, even shorter than previously found in New Zealand's lizards, with 33.8 cm in average for *P. inexpectata* versus approximately 59 cm for the jeweled geckos *Naultinus gemmeus* and 107 cm

FIGURE 2 Drone images of *Phelsuma inexpectata* (a) and *P. laticauda* (b) on horizontal approach, and *P. inexpectata* (c) on vertical approach. Individuals are highlighted with red rectangles.

FIGURE 3 Effect of distance on gecko detection (predicted values obtained from GAMMs, three *Phelsuma* species combined) with two methods of observation (left: drone imagery; right: human visual counts). Dotted lines represent standard errors.


FIGURE 4 Effect of distance on gecko detection for three *Phelsuma* species (predicted values obtained from GAMMs) with two methods of observation (left: drone imagery; right: human visual counts). Dotted lines represent standard errors.

for the grand skinks *Oligosoma grande* (Monks et al., 2022). This allowed for short-distance photo taking and high-resolution imagery. In accordance with Varela-Jamarillo et al. (2023), geckos were less disturbed by the drone than by human presence at the same distance, suggesting that our approach is non-invasive. We showed that *P. inexpectata* was more sensitive to vertical approaching. This is possibly

FIGURE 5 Variation in the number of geckos detected depending on time of day (left panel) and variation in the number of unidentified species through distance (right panel). Dotted lines represent standard errors.

due to the conservation of anti-avian predator behaviour for bird species which were among the few native predators before human settlement in Reunion Island. Overall, all three species showed little behavioural response and allowed close drone encounters. The native *P. inexpectata* reacted more than the two exotic ones. This might be unexpected because oceanic island species have lost anti-predator behaviours (Blumstein & Daniel, 2005), and Madagascar is considered a continental island (Andreone et al., 2021). The weaker response of both Malagasy species to the drone may be explained by an adaptation to a multitude of different predators in complex habitats, while *P. inexpectata* was only (or mostly) exposed to avian predation which may induce stronger responses. Further study on the life history of *P. inexpectata* is needed to better understand its behaviour. Regardless, this suggest that our method can be applied to other *Phelsuma* species (e.g., the more cryptic *P. borbonica* in Reunion Island), both in oceanic islands and continental systems, and more broadly to other arboreal reptiles such as *Naultinus* spp. in New Zealand (Lettink & Monks, 2016) or *Anolis* spp. in the Caribbean and the Pacific (Aota et al., 2021).

When considering horizontal approaches, human visual counts resulted in the detection of more individuals than using the drone. This is presumably due to the presence of three observers who were not constrained by a fixed field of view (contrarily to the drone) and our choice of study site, with very accessible trees and good visibility on the tree trunks (which constitute important supports for thermoregulation in *Phelsuma* geckos). However, the use of vertical drone imagery was highly complementary to the visual counts, as we detected individuals on *Pandanus* leaves in the canopy which remained undetected by human observers and with the drone on horizontal approaches. The combination of human- and vertical drone-based surveys may therefore prove useful, even in accessible areas, to improve detectability or to study the habitat use dynamics of the species (e.g., species-specific daily vertical migration, seasonal variation in perch height; Augros et al., 2018; Choeur et al., 2023). On the other hand, horizontal drone-based surveys may not outperform human-based surveys in accessible areas and possibly reduce detection rates. We assume that the benefit of horizontal drone monitoring might become clearer in less accessible areas such as cliffs and shrublands and may outperform visual counts (Monks et al., 2022; Varela-Jaramillo et al., 2023). *Phelsuma inexpectata* is distributed along the coastline, inhabiting steep slopes, and cliffs. A comprehensive survey performed throughout the whole distribution of *P.*

inexpectata showed important spatial gaps in sample sites due to accessibility (Dubos, 2010), which could be filled with our approach. Future sampling effort may be oriented toward these remnant natural habitats and other unprospected areas to identify potential new populations. Similarly for the two invasive species, which are more likely to disperse through the dense vegetation, drone-based surveys may improve the current knowledge of their distribution and help monitor their spread (Aota et al., 2021). At one of our study sites (the botanical garden *Domaine du Café Grillé*), *P. laticauda*, and *P. inexpectata* co-occur. This area and its surroundings were predicted as hosting the most suitable climate in the future for the endemic *P. inexpectata* (Dubos et al., 2022). On the other hand, climate change is predicted to benefit *P. laticauda* (Dubos et al., 2023), which emphasizes the need to pursue the sampling effort at this site in order to better understand the impact of the invasive *P. laticauda* on the Critically Endangered *P. inexpectata* and plan efficient intervention if needed.

4.1 | Methodological recommendations

Drone-based monitoring should be carried out at the height corresponding to the upper part of the canopy when wind conditions are favorable. When applicable, the camera should be orientated in opposite direction to the sun to avoid backlight and because geckos are frequently observed on sun spots for thermoregulation. We found a bimodality in detection rates with all species combined (but not in species-specific models, presumably because larger sample size allowed higher degrees of freedom for the spline effect). This bimodality was observable in the median number of *P. laticauda* and for the maximum number of *P. inexpectata* (not the median, presumably because of zero-inflation in our count data), but not for *P. grandis*, certainly because we did not detect a sufficient number of individuals in this species (Figure S1). We noticed that different individuals could be identified between modalities (based on aging and sexing). Therefore, we recommend taking two photos, respectively at a distance of 2–2.5 and 5 m (both horizontally and vertically in inaccessible areas, vertically only along with human visual counts in accessible areas). For large trees at short distances (2–2.5 m), multiple photos may be taken in order to cover the whole canopy. Photographs at 5 m distance offer a fair trade-off between field of view (encompassing more vegetation) and image resolution for species-level

identification. Photographs taken at 2 m were highly complementary because they benefit from a higher resolution and a sufficiently different angle to allow the detection of different individuals, which provides a nearly-independent replicate and more accurate species (and potentially individual) identification. Photographs taken at shorter distances may provide too narrow field of view, hence the fewer geckos detected in the present study. These distance recommendations stand for a medium size drone and a camera with similar specifications to those used in this study (1-inch 20M pixel sensor and 24 mm lens), and may be adjusted should the drone and camera differ much from these characteristics.

4.2 | Concluding remarks

Remote sensing-based surveys do not improve detection in accessible areas when performed horizontally, but offer the opportunity to improve detection in inaccessible areas, as well as complementing surveys in accessible areas when performed vertically. This opens the possibility to develop automated surveys, which would reduce expenses while increasing the temporal resolution of *Phelsuma* spp. monitoring, and eventually develop automated artificial intelligence-based gecko detection. The use of deep learning techniques has already proven efficient in the monitoring of invasive arboreal lizards of similar size to our *Phelsuma* spp. (i.e., *Anolis carolinensis*; Aota et al., 2021) and may be also developed for our context. This offers the opportunity to develop proactive surveillance programs, hence improve the chances of early detection and eventually help in the reduction of the impact of invasive species.

We showed that species-level identification was reliable within 5 m distance from the geckos. In our case, we were not able to perform individual-level identification for these species with the current resolution of our drone camera. However, individual-level identification was already possible with standard mid-range drone camera lenses for larger species (e.g., photo-identification of Galàpagos marine iguanas; Varela-Jaramillo et al., 2023) and even for jeweled geckos, which are about the size of our smaller study species (Monk et al., 2022). This offers the possibility to integrate drone-based counts in studies that take into account imperfect detection aimed at estimating population size. Further improvement of mid-range drone camera lenses in the future might allow for higher resolution imagery and thus, individual identification for a broader range of species.

The habitat use of *P. inexpectata* is dynamic, with more frequent use of the canopy during winter (Choeur et al., 2023). Our survey was carried out in summer, and we therefore expect better detection rates during winter. Future surveys should be performed throughout the year for a better understanding of habitat use dynamics of the species. This aspect also needs to be explored for the two invasive species using the same methodology. This will enable researchers and operators to increase the spatial coverage and the cost-effectiveness of surveillance efforts. We encourage the application of our methodology for *Phelsuma* spp. monitoring, but also any arboreal species of similar size, either endangered, or invasive ones throughout the world.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Nicolas Dubos conceptualized the manuscript, performed the analyses, and wrote the first draft. Nicolas Dubos and Gregory Deso administered the project. Nicolas Dubos, Xavier Porcel, and Romain Pinel designed the field sampling strategies, provided the material, and piloted the drone. All authors collected the data, reviewed, and edited the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Figshare at https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.22581595.v1.

ORCID

Nicolas Dubos https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1224-2598
Markus A. Roesch https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9861-290X

REFERENCES

Andreone, F., Carpenter, A., Crottini, A., D'Cruze, N., Dubos, N., Edmonds, D., Garcia, G., Luedtke, J., Megson, S., Rabemananjara, F., Randrianantoandro, C., Randrianavelona, R., Robinson, J., Vallan, D., & Rosa, G. M. (2021). Amphibian conservation in Madagascar: Old and novel threats for a peculiar fauna. In H. Heatwole & M.-O. Rödel (Eds.), *Amphibian biology. Status and threats of Afrotropical amphibians: Sub-Saharan Africa, Madagascar, Western Indian Ocean Islands* vol. 11 (pp. 147–186), Chimaira. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352157113

Aota, T., Ashizawa, K., Mori, H., Toda, M., & Chiba, S. (2021). Detection of *Anolis carolinensis* using drone images and a deep neural network: An effective tool for controlling invasive species. *Biological Invasions*, 23, 1321–1327. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-020-02434-y

Augros, S., Scherz, M. D., Wang-claypool, C. Y., Montfort, L., Glaw, F., & Hawlitschek, O. (2018). Comparative perch heights and habitat plant usage of day geckos (Phelsuma) in the Comoros archipelago (Squamata: Gekkonidae). *Salamandra*, 54, 1–4.

Blumstein, D. T., & Daniel, J. C. (2005). The loss of anti-predator behaviour following isolation on islands. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 272, 1663–1668.

Bour, R., Probst, J., & Ribes, S. (1995). *Phelsuma inexpectata* Mertens, 1966, le lézard vert de Manapany-les-Bains (La Réunion): données chorologiques et écologiques (Reptilia, Gekkonidae). *Dumerilia*, 2, 99–124.

Buckland, S., Cole, N. C., Aguirre-Gutiérrez, J., Gallagher, L. E., Henshaw, S. M., Besnard, A., Tucker, R. M., Bachraz, V., Ruhomaun, K., & Harris, S. (2014). Ecological effects of the invasive giant Madagascar day gecko on endemic Mauritian geckos: Applications of binomial-mixture and species distribution models. *PLoS One*, 9, e88798.

Choeur, A., Clémencet, J., Le Corre, M., Roesch, M. A., & Sanchez, M. (2023). Intra-annual variations of microhabitat use and movements of a critically endangered arboreal day gecko endemic to Reunion Island: Implications for conservation. *Amphibia-Reptilia*, 44, 139–152.

Cuthbert, R. N., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E. J., Turbelin, A., Ahmed, D. A., Albert, C., Bodey, T. W., Briski, E., Essl, F., Haubrock, P. J., Gozlan, R. E., Kirichenko, N., Kourantidou, M., Kramer, A. M., & Courchamp, F. (2022). Biological invasion costs reveal insufficient proactive management worldwide. *Science Total Environment*, 819, 153404.

D'Cruze, N., Sabel, J., Dawson, J., & Kumar, S. (2009). The influence of habitat type and structure on the abundance of *Phelsuma madagascariensis grandis* (Gekkoninae) in northern Madagascar. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology*, 4, 55–61.

Deso, G., Crouzet, A., & Bonnet, X. (2022). Food supplementation of the Montpellier snake *Malpolon monspessulanus* in the wild. *Herpetological Bulletin*, 160, 23–24.

Deso, G., Roesch, M. A., Porcel, X., Claudin, J., Probst, J., Luspot, J.-M., & Dubos, N. (2023). *Interactions between the endemic gecko Phelsuma inexpectata and the introduced Phelsuma laticauda: Understanding the drivers of invasion on Reunion Island*. Herpetol.

Deso, G., & Probst, J. M. (2007). Observation d' un nouvel environnement chez le Gecko vert de Manapany Phelsuma inexpectata Mertens, 1966 (Sauria : Gekkonidae). *Bull. Phaethon*, 25, 37–42.

Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Vaissière, A. C., Gozlan, R. E., Roiz, D., Jarić, I., Salles, J. M., Bradshaw, C. J. A., & Courchamp, F. (2021). High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Nature*, 592, 571–576.

Dubos, N. (2010). Analyse des habitats et déclin du Gecko vert de Manapany, *Phelsuma inexpectata* Mertens, 1966 sur l'île de La Réunion: implications pour sa conservation. *Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle*. Master's thesis, 147–186.

Dubos, N. (2013). New locality record for *Phelsuma grandis* (Sauria: Gekkonidae) in Reunion, in sympatry with the critically endangered Phelsuma inexpectata. *Herpetology Notes*, 6, 309–311.

Dubos, N., Fieldsend, T. W., Roesch, M. A., Stephane, A., Aurélien, B., Arthur, C., Ineich, I., Kenneth, K., Boris, L., Malone, S. L., Probst, J., Raxworthy, C. J., & Crottini, A. (2023). Choice of climate data influences predictions of current and future global invasion risks for two Phelsuma geckos. *Biol. Invasions*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-023-03082-8

Dubos, N., Montfort, F., Grinand, C., Nourtier, M., Deso, G., Probst, J.-M., Razafimanahaka, J. H., Andriantsimanarilafy, R. R., Rakotondrasoa, E. F., Razafindraibe, P., Jenkins, R., & Crottini, A. (2022). Are narrow-ranging species doomed to extinction? Projected dramatic decline in future climate suitability of two highly threatened species. *Perspectives Ecology Conservation*, 20, 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2021.10.002

Dubos, N., Piludu, N., Andriantsimanarilafy, R. R., Randrianantoandro, J. C., & Andreone, F. (2014). New findings of *Phelsuma grandis* and *P. laticauda* (Sauria: Gekkonidae) at the southern edge of the range of the endangered *Phelsuma serraticauda* in eastern Madagascar. *Herpetol Notes*, 7, 21–23.

Fieldsend, T. W., Borgia, A., & Krysko, K. L. (2020). *Phelsuma laticauda* (Gold Dust Day Gecko): Geographic distribution. *Herpetological Review*, 51, 77.

Fieldsend, T. W., Dubos, N., Krysko, K. L., Raxworthy, C. J., & Malone, S. L. (2021). In situ adaptation and ecological release facilitate the occupied niche expansion of a non-native reptile. *Ecology and Evolution*, 11, 9410–9422.

Fieldsend, T. W., & Krysko, K. L. (2019). Madagascar Giant day gecko (*Phelsuma grandis*) established in homestead, Miami-Dade County, Florida, USA. *Reptiles & Amphibians*, 26, 159–160.

Hoarau, G., Crestey, N., Porcel, X., Luspot, W., Deso, G., Dubos, N., & Probst, J.-M. (2021). Interactions alimentaires du Gecko vert poussière d'or *Phelsuma laticauda* (Boettger, 1880) et du Gecko vert de Manapany *Phelsuma inexpectata* Mertens 1966 sur des fleurs exotiques (Île de La Réunion). *Bull Phaethon*, 53, 89–91.

Jones, L. L. C., Rorabaugh, J. C., Winsor, H., Murphy, J. C., & Rupel, K. (2022). Efficacy of low-speed road cruising for lizard detection at two sites in Arizona, USA. *Herpecological Conservation and Biology*, 17, 278–289.

Landeo-Yauri, S. S., Ramos, E. A., Castelblanco-Martínez, D. N., Niño-Torres, C. A., & Searle, L. (2020). Using small drones to photo-identify Antillean manatees: A novel method for monitoring an endangered marine mammal in the Caribbean Sea. *Endangered Species Research*, 41, 79–90.

Lettink, M., & Monks, J. M. (2016). Survey and monitoring methods for New Zealand lizards. *Journal of the Royal Society New Zealand*, 46, 16–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2015.1108343

Monks, J. M., Wills, H. P., & Knox, C. D. (2022). Testing drones as a tool for surveying lizards. *Drones*, 6, 199.

Porcel, X., Deso, G., Probst, J., & Dubos, N. (2021). Sympatrie entre le Gecko vert de Manapany *Phelsuma inexpectata* endémique de la Réunion et le Gecko vert poussière d' or *P. laticauda* introduits au Domaine du café grillé: peuvent-ils cohabiter? *Bulletin Phaethon*, 53, 36–38.

Porcel, X., Luspot, W., & Probst, J.-M. (2022). Nectarivorie: le gecko de Manapany *Phelsuma inexpectata* Mertens, 1966 et le gecko vert poussière d' or *Phelsuma laticauda* (Boettger, 1880) Sur les hampes florales du palmier de mac Arthur Ptychosperma macarthurii (H. Wendl. ex H.J. Veitch) H. Wendl. e. Données. *Nature Animal*, 28, 47–49.

R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing Available at: https://www.r-project.org/

Roesch, M. A., Hansen, D. M., & Cole, N. C. (2021). Understanding demographic limiting factors to species recovery: Nest-site suitability and breeding ecology of *Phelsuma guentheri* on Round Island, Mauritius. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 30, e01761. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01761

Schad, L., & Fischer, J. (2022). Opportunities and risks in the use of drones for studying animal behaviour. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 2022, 1–9.

Varela-Jaramillo, A., Rivas-Torres, G., Guayasamin, J. M., Steinfartz, S., & MacLeod, A. (2023). A pilot study to estimate the population size of endangered Galápagos marine iguanas using drones. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 20, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-022-00478-5

Wood, S. N. (2011). Fast stable REML and ML estimation of semiparametric GLMs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73, 3–36.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.