1 Bayesian arrival model for Atlantic 2 salmon smolt counts powered by 3 environmental covariates and expert 4 knowledge

5 Henni Pulkkinen, Panu Orell, Jaakko Erkinaro, Samu Mäntyniemi

6 H. Pulkkinen.* Natural Resources Institute Finland, Paavo Havaksen tie 3 P.O. Box 413, 90014 Oulu. Finland.
7 henni.pulkkinen@luke.fi

8 P. Orell. Natural Resources Institute Finland, Paavo Havaksen tie 3 P.O. Box 413, 90014 Oulu. Finland.
9 panu.orell@luke.fi

10 J. Erkinaro. Natural Resources Institute Finland, Paavo Havaksen tie 3 P.O. Box 413, 90014 Oulu. Finland.
11 jaakko.erkinaro@luke.fi

12 S. Mäntyniemi. Natural Resources Institute Finland, Latokartanonkaari 9, 00790 Helsinki. Finland.
13 samu.mantyniemi@luke.fi

14 Corresponding author: Henni Pulkkinen (phone: +358 40 485 0088)

15 **Abstract**

16 *Annual run size and timing of Atlantic salmon smolt migration was estimated using Bayesian model*
 17 *framework and data from six years of a video monitoring survey. The model has a modular structure.*
 18 *It separates sub-processes of departing, traveling and observing, of which the first two together*
 19 *define the arrival distribution. The sub-processes utilize biological background and expert knowledge*
 20 *about the migratory behavior of smolts and about the probability to observe them from the video*
 21 *footage under varying environmental conditions. Daily mean temperature and discharge were used*
 22 *as environmental covariates. The model framework does not require assuming a simple distributional*
 23 *shape for the arrival dynamics and thus also allows for multimodal arrival distributions. Results*
 24 *indicate that 20 % - 43% of smolts passed the Utsjoki monitoring site unobserved during the years of*
 25 *study. Predictive studies were made to estimate daily run size in cases with missing counts either at*
 26 *the beginning or in the middle of the run, indicating good predictive performance.*

27 *Keywords: salmon, arrival model, passage count, Bayesian models, environmental covariates, expert*
 28 *knowledge, biological realism, missing data, prediction*

29

30 **Introduction**

31 Migratory fish species are often monitored along their migration routes at different life stages to
 32 collect fishery-independent data for stock assessment. Monitoring methods include e.g. counting
 33 fences, video, sonar and snorkeling counts, and common to all is that they rarely provide perfect
 34 information about the number of individuals passing the system (Dempson et al. 1991;
 35 Romakkaniemi et al. 2000; Orell et al. 2007; 2011). Part of the fish run may be missed because of
 36 difficult environmental conditions or device failures, there may be double counting, or the data

37 achieved may be otherwise partial or biased (e.g. Holmes et al. 2006). Thus, the assumptions made
38 when interpreting the data can have a great influence on the estimated stock abundance.

39 Increasing the information beyond the actual monitoring data collected can improve the
40 trustworthiness of stock assessments (Kuparinen et al. 2012): such information can be based on the
41 resources available in other fields of biological research such as ecology or life history theory, but
42 also on the physical and technical details of the observation processes. Methods of Bayesian
43 inference enable both estimation of uncertainty and combination of various sources of information.
44 Statistical methods are often used, however, without considering the biological realism and just
45 focusing on statistical data analysis. Such a procedure easily leads to awkward model assumptions
46 that cannot be biologically interpreted and the potential effects of those modelling decisions may
47 pass undiscussed. We echo the idea of Kuparinen et al. (2012) and Mäntyniemi et al. (2015) in
48 asserting that biological plausibility has the priority over measures of statistical fit and information
49 theoretic parsimony when it comes to assessing the performance of stock assessment models.

50 During the course of time, various methods have been used to estimate run dynamics and passage
51 counts at point census stations. The simplest methods are based on “connect-the-dots” type of
52 linear interpolation (Gewin and WanHatten 2005, Johnson et al. 2007) but such approach requires
53 an observation before and after the missing time point and thus missing tails cannot be estimated. If
54 it is assumed that a proportion passing the site on a given date is constant over the years then
55 estimation of missing tails is possible using the methods proposed by e.g. Van Alen (2000) but
56 considering the variability, for example, in annual environmental conditions (e.g. Erkinaro et al.
57 1998; Orell et al. 2007; Otero et al. 2014), such assumption is problematic.

58 Hilborn et al. (1999) used a maximum likelihood method to estimate number of salmon with ground-
59 based stream survey, accounting also for estimate of uncertainty. Su et al. (2001) continued their
60 work with hierarchical Bayesian approach enabling learning from years with more data to those with
61 missing data. Furthermore, Sethi and Bradley (2016) introduced a Bayesian approach to estimate

62 missing passage at weirs with run curve model to account for arrival dynamics and process variation
 63 model to describe the observed data. While these studies attempt to account for uncertainty, they
 64 do not discuss their model assumptions against biological knowledge. This together with
 65 consideration of difference between the observation and model prediction as “noise” instead of
 66 proportion unobserved (as e.g. in Sethi and Bradley 2016), may cast some doubt on the biological
 67 meaningfulness of the results.

68 In our study, a Bayesian model framework was introduced for estimating the annual number of
 69 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) smolts passing the video monitoring site at a subarctic River Utsjoki, a
 70 tributary of the large River Teno in northern Finland (cf. Erkinaro et al. 2019). The framework
 71 consists of sub-processes of departing, travelling and observing. When combined, the processes of
 72 departing and travelling form the arrival distribution that describes the timing of the smolt run.
 73 Environmental covariates were used as a source of information in the sub-processes and expert
 74 knowledge is utilized in providing biologically meaningful model structures and prior distributions.
 75 Hierarchical structure was assumed over the study years making it possible to learn from the
 76 processes, borrowing strength from data rich years of study to those with missing data. Predictive
 77 studies illustrate the model performance in cases with missing data either at the beginning or in the
 78 middle of the run. We show that a biologically meaningful passage model can be built without
 79 assuming any specific shape for the arrival distribution. Furthermore, we claim that existing expert
 80 knowledge about the observability of smolts is a key source of information in estimating the total
 81 uncertainty about the annual total passage especially when environmental conditions have a great
 82 influence on the probability to observe individuals passing the survey site. Eventually, the resulting
 83 estimates describe the logical inference about the smolt passage that is formed by carefully
 84 analyzing the structure of the problem and interpreting observed data in the light of expert’s existing
 85 knowledge about migratory behavior and accuracy of video counting.

86 **Materials and Methods**

87

88 *Data*

89 River Utsjoki (drainage area 1652 km²) is a tributary of the large River Teno system at the
 90 northernmost border between Finland and Norway. Salmon production areas extend c. 60 km
 91 upstream in the Utsjoki mainstem as well as c. 30 km along two major tributaries (see Borgstrøm et
 92 al. 2010). Each spring, the monitoring system of 8 video cameras is set on the river bed at the main
 93 channel under a bridge close to the tributary outlet (Figure 1). The video footage of these cameras
 94 provides data on both smolts descending and adults ascending the river during the course of
 95 summer. Most of the individuals migrate via the main channel, but occasional video monitoring in
 96 the side channels has indicated that a few percentages of the smolts would pass through the sides.
 97 The installation and use of cameras is described in detail by Davidsen et al. (2005) and Orell et al.
 98 (2007). The camera technology and operation have been similar throughout the monitoring years
 99 (2002 - present), but some updates have been done to the data recording system, without affecting
 100 comparability of the data. In this study we analyze the smolt count data at the main channel from
 101 years 2005-2009 and 2014. These years were chosen to demonstrate the highly variable
 102 environmental conditions, especially the strongly varying discharge (Figure 2). The smolt data are
 103 aggregated in daily counts of individuals over 61 days of June-July.

104 The datasets on environmental covariates, air temperature and discharge, are aggregated into daily
 105 averages. Both covariates are measured near the video site, but conditions may differ between the
 106 video site and upper parts of the river where some of the smolts begin their migration from. These
 107 datasets are, however, considered as reasonable proxies for the environmental conditions affecting
 108 the migration behavior of smolts.

Data from the first 23 days of June in 2005 are missing because the high level of water delayed the installation of the monitoring system. Thus, the missing counts are predicted for those dates. Predictive studies were performed by treating data in 2007 and 2014 as partly missing: For 2007 the first 17% of the run strength and for 2014 the peak ± 2 days count was removed from the analysis. These years were chosen to the predictive study as the environmental conditions in those years fell in between the extreme conditions of the overall study years. To evaluate the predictive performance of the model, the model predicted counts for the dates treated as missing were compared with the observed data.

Expert elicitation as a source of informative priors

Model structure and informative priors were elicited from an expert, who is most familiar with the behavior of salmon smolts and the video monitoring system at Utsjoki. In addition, the expert has comprehensive personal experience on studying smolt migration in other tributaries of the River Teno catchment, as well on other salmon rivers in northern Fennoscandia. The expert also has extensive knowledge about various visual monitoring methods like video monitoring and snorkelling, and has studied their possibilities and restrictions.

The expert was asked to base his views on his overall biological knowledge about the behavior of the smolts: when do the smolts potentially make their decision to depart given the temperature, how long their travelling may take from the nearest and furthest locations of origin, and how the environmental conditions affect the proportion of smolts that may pass the video site unobserved. Extra care was taken to ensure that the expert would express his views based on knowledge independent of the data that would be analysed in the model since the avoidance of double usage of the same data is vital for reliable estimation of total uncertainty.

Elicitation was carried out iteratively, first by asking preliminary questions on e.g. the biological process in question, and then providing graphical illustration of the parameters as a function of

environmental conditions (as in Figures 7-9). Prior distributions were adjusted until the expert agreed that the illustration is in line with his views. The questions were not defined – or the answers translated – directly to inform about prior distributions of specific parameters as the marginal distributions often lack good real-life interpretation. Instead, the focus was on the visual form of the joint distributions of each sub-process as a function of an environmental covariate, as will later be shown in figures 7-9. The marginal distributions of parameters related to each sub-process were adjusted until the joint distribution corresponded roughly the view of the expert. The direct questions mainly addressed the mean values of the sub-processes and the levels of environmental covariate at which significant changes in the process were expected to take place. Questions elicited from the expert are listed in table 1.

Probability model of the problem

The model is constructed by thinking of four steps, described in detail in the following sections:

- 1) Process of departing, in which the smolts make the decision to depart while daily temperature affects the probability to depart in a given day;
- 2) Process of travelling, in which the smolt's travel time (in days) from the place of departure to the video site is modeled with daily discharge as a covariate;
- 3) Arrival distribution, which links together the processes of departing and travelling into a timing of the smolt run;
- 4) Observation process, in which the discharge influences visibility and the probability that an individual smolt passing the site is observed from the video footage.

Process of departing

An individual smolt's probability to begin the migration in day i of year y given that the smolt has not departed yet is considered to depend on the temperature on that day. We assume a logit-normally linear relationship for the smolt's probability to depart ($p_{i,y}$) and temperature $t_{i,y}$:

$$(1) \text{logit}(p_{i,y}) \sim N(\alpha^P + \beta^P t_{i,y}, s^P)$$

Informative prior distributions are given to parameters α^P , β^P and s^P according to expert view (see tables 1 and 2).

The daily probabilities of departing (given those individuals have not departed yet; $p_{i,y}$) can be transformed into expected proportions of the total smolt run that depart each day ($P_{i,y}$) as

$$(2) P_{1,y} = p_{1,y}$$

$$(3) P_{i,y} = (1 - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} p_{k,y}) p_{i,y}$$

$$(4) P_{61,y} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{60} p_{i,y}$$

Process of travelling

According to the expert view, each smolt should arrive at the video site within 14 days after departing. Thus we assume that the smolts that depart on day i pass the video site in one of the next 14 days according to discretized distribution function of lognormal distribution (Schwarz & Dempson 1994, Mäntyniemi & Romakkaniemi 2002):

$$(5) Q_{i,j,y}^D = \phi\left(\frac{\log(j-i+0.5-M_{i,y})}{S}\right) - I_{i,j}\phi\left(\frac{\log(j-i+0.5-M_{i,y})}{S}\right).$$

Here ϕ is the cumulative density function of the standard normal distribution, $M_{i,y}$ is the mean of $\log(\text{travel time})$ to video site of smolts that depart on day i , and S is the standard deviation of

log(travel time). Thus, $Q_{i,j,y}^D$ is the conditional probability that a smolt that departed on day i will arrive on day j , when j goes from i to $i + 13$.

To ensure that all smolts arrive within 14 days of departing, $Q_{i,j,y}^D$'s are standardized:

$$(6) \quad q_{i,j,y}^D = Q_{i,j,y}^D / \sum_{j=i}^{(i+13)} (Q_{i,j,y}^D),$$

and thus $\sum_{j=i}^{(i+13)} (q_{i,j,y}^D) = 1$.

It is further considered that increasing discharge increases the speed at which the smolts travel, shortening their travel time. The expected travel time on real scale $\mu_{j,y}^D = \exp(M_{i,y} + 0.5 S^2)$ is assumed to follow a lognormal distribution with expected value $\gamma_{i,y}$ and coefficient of variation cv^D and it is assumed to depend on the discharge on the day of departure ($f_{i,y}$):

$$(7) \quad \gamma_{i,y} = \exp(\alpha^D + \beta^D \cdot f_{i,y}).$$

Again, informative prior distributions are given for parameters α^D , β^D and $cv^{\mu D}$ according to expert view (see tables 1 and 2).

Arrival distribution

By combining the processes of departing and travelling, we achieve joint probabilities that a smolt departs on day i and passes the video site on day j :

$$(8) \quad q_{i,j,y}^J = q_{i,j,y}^D P_{i,y}.$$

The expected proportions of smolts (out of the total run size) passing the video site each day can then be found by marginalizing over the day of departure:

$$(9) \mu_{j,y}^N = \begin{cases} \sum q_{j,1:j,y}^J, & j \leq 14 \\ \sum q_{j,(i-13):j,y}^J, & j > 14. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we give a uniform prior distribution on log scale for the total annual size of the smolt run passing the video site:

$$(10) \quad \log(N_y^{tot}) \sim Unif(7,15).$$

Parameterisation on the log-scale allows for a wide, minimally informative prior distribution for the annual run size. One could also use a more biologically realistic option for estimating the annual abundance based on adult escapement or on expert evaluated smolt production capacity of the river (e.g. Uusitalo et al. 2005). Because the results of this analysis are going to be used in the future research as building block of a sequential modelling framework for the total life cycle of Utsjoki salmon (similarly as in Michielsens et al. 2008), a minimally informative prior distribution for annual production is needed. This ensures that the information flowing from the full life cycle model will be used only once.

The annual run size is assumed to be Dirichlet-multinomially distributed over the 61 days of June-July. For computational simplicity, we follow Mäntyniemi et al. (2015) and approximate multinomial distribution as

$$(11) \quad N_{j,y} = q_{j,y}^N N_y^{tot},$$

where $q_{j,y}^N$ is the proportion of smolts passing the video site in day j and $q_{j,y}^N$'s follow a Dirichlet distribution parameterized with the expected proportions of smolts passing the video site each day $\mu_{j,y}^N$ and overdispersion η^N :

$$(12) \quad q_{1:61,y}^N \sim \text{Dirich}(\mu_{1,y}^N \eta^N, \dots, \mu_{61,y}^N \eta^N).$$

222

223 To ease the computation we approximate the Dirichlet-distribution with a set of lognormal

224 distributions (see appendix A for details).

225 The annual proportional prior distributions for the the smolt run over 61 days of June-July are

226 illustrated in figure 3. These priors are based on the model structure and data on environmental

227 covariates (daily mean air temperature and discharge).

228

229 Observation process

230 In previous sections we have covered the processes assumed to affect the timing of the smolt

231 passage at the video site. To estimate the total uncertainty in the smolt run size, the process of

232 observing smolts from the video footage needs to be included. It seems natural to assume that some

233 of the individuals pass the site unobserved, and thus this proportion must be accounted for. We

234 introduce an observation process that builds on expert view on how high the probability to observe

235 a smolt may be in excellent vs. poor conditions on visibility and how the discharge is considered to

236 affect this probability. The number of smolts observed follows a Beta-binomial distribution:

$$(13) \quad N_{j,y}^{Obs} \sim \text{Beta-bin}(\mu_{j,y}^B \eta^B, (1 - \mu_{j,y}^B) \eta^B, N_{j,y})$$

238 Here $N_{j,y}$ is the total daily number of smolts passing the video site and the probability to observe a

239 smolt follows a $\text{Beta}(\mu_{j,y}^B \eta^B, (1 - \mu_{j,y}^B) \eta^B)$ distribution, where $\mu_{j,y}^B$ is the expected probability for

240 a smolt to be observed and η^B is the overdispersion parameter. Overdispersion in this context is

241 thought to arise from the schooling behavior of smolts. Groups of smolts can be either detected or

242 missed, which increases the variance of the observation process (Mäntyniemi & Romakkaniemi

243 2002, Linden & Mäntyniemi 2011, Mäntyniemi et al. 2015). The expected value of the process is

linked to discharge following the expert view that in very good visibility (low discharge) at maximum 90% of the smolts are observed. As the discharge increases, the visibility decreases, and the volume of water to be covered by the video monitoring increases. Therefore, according to the expert, observation probability decreases gradually to a minimum of 30%. The expected probability $\mu_{i,y}^B$ is considered to follow logit-normally linear relationship on the interval [0.3,0.9]:

$$(14) \quad \mu_{j,y}^B = 0.6 \left(\frac{\exp(BB_{j,y})}{1 + \exp(BB_{j,y})} \right) + 0.3$$

$$(15) \quad BB_{j,y} \sim N(\alpha^B - \beta^B f_{j,y}, sd_{BB}^2),$$

where α^B , β^B and sd_{BB} have prior distributions according to the expert view (Tables 1 and 2).

Bayesian inference and sensitivity analysis

Bayesian analysis that is not sensitive to prior information simply cannot exist. The most influential component of the inference just gradually shifts from prior information about the parameters towards prior information about the data collection process as more data accumulates. From the inferential point of view, both extremes and anything between are equally valid: the resulting posterior shows what our logical state of mind should be after interpreting the data. Sometimes the state of mind is that we learned nothing new about all or some of the parameters.

However, a commonly held belief is that large quantities of data “override” the prior knowledge and thus decrease the sensitivity of the resulting posterior distribution to prior information. Here we show why this is not the case. The key fact is that it is not the data itself that changes the prior, or leaves it unchanged. Prior information becomes updated by interpreting data, and that interpretation is based on prior information. This can be seen from the Bayes’ rule

$$p(\theta|x) \propto p(x|\theta)p(\theta) = p(x, \theta)$$

which states that the posterior distribution of parameters (θ) is proportional to the joint probability distribution of parameters and potentially observable data (x). This distribution summarizes what is known about the entire problem before obtaining the observed data values.

All the joint probabilities $p(x, \theta)$ have a Bayesian interpretation of being measures of degree of belief. In principle, the person whose belief is being measured could state these joint probabilities directly. However, in practice most people find it easier to construct their joint beliefs by factorizing their thinking between what they knew about the parameters ($p(\theta)$) and how they would use their existing knowledge to predict data if they knew the parameter values ($p(x|\theta)$) (More elaborate factorization can also be used, as demonstrated in previous sections).

The conditional probabilities $p(x|\theta)$ describe the degrees of belief about the link between parameters and data, providing a predetermined interpretation of any potential data values. Once the values are obtained, the posterior distribution (up to a constant) is found by keeping only those joint probabilities that had been pre-assigned to values that became observed. In other words, the observed data objectively selects the subjective joint prior degrees of belief that will be kept to form the posterior distribution.

Why sensitivity analysis?

As shown above, the results of any Bayesian model are always guaranteed to be sensitive to some aspects of prior knowledge. The role of a sensitivity analysis is to provide information about the relative importance of these different pieces of prior information. Some idea of the relative roles of the information sources can be obtained simply by comparing the priors and posteriors: if the posterior distribution of a parameter is (almost) identical to its prior, then we can conclude that compared to our existing knowledge, our interpretation of the data did not provide new information. This is a case where a sensitivity analysis can reveal deeper insight on the structure of the problem: would our interpretation of data provide at least some new information if we

hypothetically had less information about the parameters to begin with? Such a question can be answered by repeating the analysis with priors that express more uncertainty than we actually have.

Sensitivity study on observability priors

Our preliminary results of the arrival model indicated that parameters α^B and β^B which describe the relationship between the observability of smolts and the discharge, did not update from their priors. In order to gain more in-depth understanding of this result, we performed a sensitivity analysis by pretending that our prior knowledge would be weaker than it actually is: parameters α^B and β^B were given more uncertain prior distributions compared to priors based on expert elicitation (Table 2). More details and results of this study can be found from Appendix B.

Details on model run

Model covering all the sub-processes was fitted using MCMC sampling with JAGS 4.2.0 software (Just Another Gibbs Sampler; Plummer 2003) and R runjags package (Denwood 2016). Model was run with 2 chains for 7 500 000 iterations which took around 20 days. Burn-in period of 500 000 iterations was removed from the beginning of the run. Convergence was diagnosed using Gelman-Rubin statistics (Gelman and Rubin 1992), ensuring that the upper limit for the potential scale reduction factor was below 1.1 for all parameters of interest. The complete JAGS code for the model structure can be found from Appendix C.

Results

When compared with the observed smolt counts, annual mean posterior estimates of daily run size indicate that 20 - 43 % of smolts passed the video site unobserved during the years of study (Figure 4). The highest proportion of unobserved was estimated for 2008, median being 43 % and 90 % probability interval (PI) [38 %, 47 %]. This result reflects the high level of discharge in early/mid-season in 2008 (Figure 2).

Scenarios to study predictive performance of the model ('first 17% of missing' -scenario for 2007 and 'peak day +- 2 days missing' -scenario for 2014) show that daily counts fall in the predicted 90% PI indicating good predictive performance (Figure 5, Table 3). For 2005, when the high level of water delayed the setup of the monitoring system until June 23rd, posterior mean indicates that 10% of the run was missed during this period (90 % PI being [3 %, 23 %] of the run). Because the temperature was below the average until mid-June in that year, it is not likely that the migration would have started very early in the season (Figures 2 and 5).

When comparing marginal posterior distributions with corresponding priors, 7 key parameters out of 12 updated, indicating that the learning does not take place evenly about all parameters (Table 4). The joint posterior distributions of the process of departing as a function of temperature (consisting of parameters α^P , β^P and sd^P) updates quite heavily from the prior (Figure 6). Updating takes place towards higher temperatures indicating, for example, that 50 % probability to depart is met with 50% certainty around 14 °C compared to a priori belief of this level being reached already at 11 °C.

The posterior cumulative distribution of the expected travel time to the video site (consisting of parameters α^D , β^D , cv^D and $cv^{\mu D}$) supported somewhat longer travel times than expected a priori both for low and high discharge (Figure 7). At low discharge (10m³/s), 50 % of smolts were estimated to arrive at the video site within 5 days (posterior median), whereas a priori the same proportion was considered to be met around 3.5 days. At high discharge (100m³/s), 50 % of smolts would arrive by 3 days based on the posterior and by a bit less than 2 days based on the prior. Note that posterior cumulative distributions at these specific levels of discharge were chosen for illustrative purposes and that in practice the model allows any positive value for the discharge.

Joint priors and posteriors of observability parameters α^B , β^B and sd^{BB} are close the same (Figure 8) indicating that in this case the combination of priors and our interpretation of data did not result in further learning about the process of observing. Sensitivity analysis (Appendix B) revealed that if we happened to have more uncertainty about these parameters, we would have clearly learned

something new about the role of discharge (β^B) in the observability of smolts. The parameter responsible for the baseline of the observability (α^B) was more sensitive to prior uncertainty about it: no new information after seeing the data could be obtained within the range of parameter values studied.

Discussion

In our study, an arrival model for Atlantic salmon smolts was designed by separating the processes of departing, travelling and observing. The processes of departing and travelling together form the arrival distribution, i.e. the timing of the smolt run. This modular structure enabled us to concentrate on biologically meaningful mathematical assumptions related to each sub-process instead of assuming that fish count data as such follows a specific distributional shape. The model framework aimed at high biological realism by accounting for expert knowledge in the model formulation, firstly by including choices for model structures and prior distributions, and secondly by linking environmental covariates to provide information about the timing of the migration. The estimated total uncertainty accounted for the uncertainty in the sub-processes, including the observation process in which variability in discharge is known to have a large impact on the probability to observe passing smolts.

One of the most important advantages of our approach is that the need to assume a specific parametric shape for the arrival distribution is avoided. Past studies (Hilborn et al. 1999, Su et al. 2001, Sethi and Bradley 2016) have assumed unimodal shape (e.g. normal, skew-normal, Student's t) for the arrival curve. However, when taking a look at the shape of (any) arrival time series it seems clear that such assumption is a tolerable simplification at best (see e.g. figure 5 in this paper, figure 2 in Sethi and Bradley 2016).

Instead of basing the arrival curve on a specific distributional form without biological interpretation, we have based our model structure largely on the expert knowledge. While one can state that the

expert may be wrong in his/her views, it can also be argued that replacing the available knowledge with ad-hoc but conventional choices of distribution has even less of a chance to end up with a “true” outcome. The expert elicitation requires ensuring that the experts are able to express their views about the processes independent from the data that will be analysed. This can be problematic at first as often the same experts have the best knowledge about the issues related to conditions at the study area, behavior of the species, details on the data collection and the data itself. We recommend that questions elicited should be designed (similarly as in our study) to target the sub-processes and phenomenon behind the data, not the data itself.

Fitting the elicited information together with the model structure can also be challenging. For example, when we combined the expert views on the observation process with a logistic functional form, very low uncertainty was inevitably assumed at high ($>60 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) discharge. However, such discharges usually take place only at the beginning of the season when the smolt run has not really started (Orell et al. 2007), and thus the impact of the assumption on the estimated total run size is minor. Regardless of methods chosen on which the model is built upon it is important to keep in mind that the results depend always on the combination of the objective data and subjective model choice.

Earlier studies have paid little attention to the role of observation models in estimating the total uncertainty. Hillborn et al. (1999) distinguished process and observation errors, assuming observer efficiency either as known or unchanging inside the study period. Su et al. (2001) discussed the issue of error in the observation process and mainly concluded that such error can cause convergence problems in sampling. Sethi and Bradly (2016) incorporated uncertainty only on the estimates of missing passage counts, treating the observed counts as true total number of passing without uncertainty. As they assumed normal or negative Binomial models for the observed passage counts, they in fact allowed model predicted passage counts to be either greater or smaller than the observed counts. This in turn can lead to underestimation of the missing counts. We claim that it is

necessary to consider the observed count as a minimum estimate for the true number especially if the back-and-forth movement of individuals is negligible. Along with this notion the need for a realistic observation process becomes obvious. Depending on the approach, the estimate of total annual passage can be very different. As Hilborn et al. (1999) put it, ‘when we admit uncertainty in observer efficiency we become much less certain about the actual escapement’.

The sensitivity analysis showed that in our case video counts could provide information about the effect of discharge on the observability. This can be explained by the fact that the daily video counts are thought to depend on the number of smolts migrating and their observability, both of which are thought to depend on daily varying environmental covariates. The daily number of migrating smolts is controlled by temperature and discharge -related parameters, but the model fit to observed counts can be further improved by changing the observability according to discharge. Interestingly, the sensitivity analysis showed that the interpretation of data favors the same parameter values than the expert’s prior. However, even though the signal from the data agrees with the expert’s existing knowledge, the signal is weak compared to expert’s already existing certainty. Therefore the certainty does not notably increase. The sensitivity analysis also revealed that in our case the general level of the observability of smolts is highly dependent on the existing expert knowledge: very little or no new information could be inferred from the video counts. This underlines the need for rigorous expert elicitation.

If the purpose of the model would have been to replicate the observed data set with as few parameters as possible, then the sensitivity of the results to the observability priors would be a sign of overparameterisation: these parameters could be the first to be dropped from the model. The concept of population size would probably be unnecessary too for such a purpose. However, our goal is not to find the most parsimonious model for data, which would be the purpose of information theory. Instead, we are dealing with an inverse problem: given the data and our existing knowledge about migration and observation processes, what can we realistically say about the

population size? Within this approach the sensitivity is not of consequence when it comes to simplifying the model. As shown earlier, any Bayesian model is completely made of prior knowledge and always sensitive to it in one way or another. Any model simplification should be based on biological plausibility, rather than on the ability of the model to replicate data (Kuparinen et al. 2012). Using information theoretic arguments to simplify a model meant for solving inverse problems can lead to underestimation of actual uncertainty (Kuparinen et al. 2012) which causes underestimation of the value of any new information that could be potentially gathered (Mäntyniemi et al. 2009).

Sethi and Bradley (2016) fitted datasets in their study using several combinations of arrival and process error models. They utilized information-theoretic model selection (DIC, Spiegelhalter et al. 2002) to find out the best fitting model for each dataset. However, no discussion took place whether some of these models would be biologically more reasonable than another. We argue that the model selection should primarily be based on biological realism and in case biological model uncertainty is needed to be tackled, Bayesian model averaging (BMA, Hoeting et al. 1999) should be preferred over DIC or other information criteria.

Su et al. (2001) used hierarchical structure in their study, assuming that years in which timing of the run is well known can be used for passing information to years with missing data. We argue that learning should rather take place over the (biological) process, assuming exchangeability over year specific parameters of those processes. Our model structure can also be considered as hierarchical, although we simply assume that the underlying processes are the same from year to year allowing between- and within-years variation. If there were a need for a meta-analysis of similar studies over several stocks of the same species, exchangeability in biological parameters could be considered between the stocks. Such approach could also allow meta-analysis of data from different types of monitoring systems if detailed observation processes were tailored for each system and exchangeability was considered as reasonable assumption for the biological processes.

Our model framework could be fine-tuned and developed further. In an ideal situation, environmental covariates would be available from upstream locations from where the smolts originate. Data on air temperature would be replaced with water temperature to better explain the physiological processes the smolts encounter. The total annual estimates could be improved by including individuals that migrate via side channels. One year of video data from the side channels is available but larger set of data would be needed to evaluate the effect of varying discharge on the proportion of smolts passing via the main vs. side channels. To increase the realism even more, the schooling behavior of smolts could be accounted for in more detail than done here. Salmon smolts have a tendency to school during their migration (e.g. Bakshanskiy et al. 1988, Davidsen et al. 2005) and this creates more variation in the monitoring data compared to independent movement (Mäntyniemi and Romakkaniemi 2002, Mäntyniemi et al. 2015). Schooling behavior could also be linked with the process of travelling as the passing schools of fish have been suggested to stimulate migratory behavior in the remaining smolts (e.g. Hansen and Jonsson, 1985). Schooling also affects the observation process as schools are easier to spot than individual smolts, and on the other hand, it can be difficult to have an exact count of individuals from a large school. For Utsjoki video survey, daily average school sizes of smolts are recorded and incorporating those into the model framework is an interesting topic for future research.

Despite the above possibilities for further development of the modeling framework, we claim that our model already contains the elements of realism that are required to provide credible estimates of the total annual smolt run. This approach can be applied to similar monitoring surveys where point-checking the numbers of migrating fish (Trépanier et al. 1996), by e.g. sonar, trap, or weir is used for estimating run sizes. As far as we know, environmental covariates have not been included so far to estimate both the dynamics of passage and the observation process. Our model framework also indicated a good predictive performance for missing dates both at the beginning and in the middle of the run. Furthermore, the results from this study will act as a single step of sequential model framework that covers the total life cycle of multiple populations in the River Teno complex

(Vähä et al. 2017; Erkinaro et al. 2019), similarly as the system designed for Baltic salmon stocks (Michielsens et al. 2008).

Acknowledgements

We thank the numerous field workers enabling the yearly monitoring programme and smolt data collection at the River Utsjoki. We also acknowledge the crucial technical knowhow by Jorma Kuusela in running the annual monitoring and the instrumental role of Dr. Martin Svenning and Anders Lamberg in early phases of the River Utsjoki monitoring programme. Funding for this study was provided by the Academy of Finland (project No. 286334).

References

- Bakshanskiy, E., Nesterov, V., and Neklyodov, M. 1988. Development of schooling behaviour in juvenile Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, during seaward migration. *J. Ichthyol.* 28: 91–101.
- Borgstrøm, R., Opdahl, J., Svenning, M.-A., Lämsman, M., Orell, P., Niemelä, E., Erkinaro, J. & Dempson, J. B. 2010. Temporal changes in ascendance and is-season exploitation of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, inferred by a video camera array. *Fish. Manage. Ecol.* 17: 454-463.
- Davidson, J., Svenning, M. A., Orell, P., Yoccoz, N., Dempson, J. B., Niemelä, E., Klemetsen, A., Lamberg, A., and Erkinaro, J. 2005. Spatial and temporal migration of wild Atlantic salmon smolts determined from a video camera array in the sub-Arctic River Tana. *Fish. Res.* 74: 210-222.

484 Dempson, J. B, and Stansbury, D. E. 1991. Using partial counting fences and atwo-sample stratified
485 design for mark–recapture estimation of an Atlantic salmonsmolt population. N. Am. J. Fish.
486 Manage. 11: 27–37.
487
488 Denwood, M.J. 2016. runjags: An R Package Providing Interface Utilities, Model Templates, Parallel
489 Computing Methods and Additional Distributions for MCMC Models in JAGS. J. Stat. Softw. 71(9): 1-
490 25. doi:10.18637/jss.v071.i09.
491
492 Erkinaro, J., Julkunen, M. and Niemelä, E. 1998. Migration of juvenile Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* in
493 small tributaries of the subarctic River Teno, northern Finland. Aquaculture 168: 105-119.
494
495 Erkinaro, J., Czorlich, Y., Orell, P., Kuusela, J., Länsman, M., Falkegård, M., Pulkkinen, H., Primmer, C.
496 & Niemelä, E. 2019. Life history variation across four decades in a diverse population complex of
497 Atlantic salmon in a large subarctic river. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 76: 42-55.
498
499 Gelman, A., and Rubin, D.B. 1992. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. Stat.
500 Sci. 7: 457–511.
501
502 Hilborn, R., Bue, B.G., and Sharr, S. 1999. Estimating spawning escapements from periodic counts: a
503 comparison of methods. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 56(5): 888–896. doi:10.1139/f99-013.
504
505 Hansen, L.P., and Jonsson, B. 1985. Downstream migration of hatchery-reared smolts of Atlantic
506 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in the River Imsa. Aquaculture, 45: 237–248.
507

508 Holmes, J.A, Cronkite, G.M.W., Enzenhofer, H.J., and Mulligan, T.J. 2006. Accuracy and precision of
509 fish-count data from a “dual-frequency identification sonar” (DIDSON) imaging system. ICES J. Mar.
510 Sci. 63: 543–555. doi:10.1016/j.icesjms.2005.08.015
511
512 Kuparinen, A., Mäntyniemi, S., Hutchings, J.A., and Kuikka, S. 2012. Increasing biological realism of
513 fisheries stock assessment: towards hierarchical Bayesian methods. Environ. Rev. 20: 135–151.
514 doi:10.1139/A2012-006.
515
516 Michielsens, C.G.J., McAllister, M.K., Kuikka, S., Mäntyniemi, S., Romakkaniemi, A., Pakarinen, T.,
517 Karlsson, L., and Uusitalo, L. 2008. Combining multiple Bayesian data analyses in a sequential
518 framework for quantitative fisheries stock assessment. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 65: 962-974.
519 doi:10.1139/F08-015
520
521 Mäntyniemi, S., and Romakkaniemi, A. 2002. Bayesian mark-recapture estimation with an
522 application to a salmonid smolt population. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 59: 1748-1758. doi:10.1139/F02-
523 146.
524
525 Mäntyniemi, S.H.P., Whitlock, R.E., Perälä, T.A., Blomstedt, P.A., Vanhatalo, J.P., Rincon, M.M.,
526 Kuparinen, A.K., Pulkkinen, H.P., and Kuikka, O.S. 2015. General state-space population dynamics
527 model for Bayesian stock assessment. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 72: 2209-2222. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsv117
528
529 Mäntyniemi, S., Kuikka, S., Rahikainen, M., Kell, L.T., Kaitala, V. 2009. The value of Information in
530 fisheries management: North Sea herring as an example. ICES J. Mar. Sci. nce 66: 2278-2283.
531

532 Orell, P., Erkinaro, J., Svenning, M., Davidsen, J., and Niemelä, E. 2007. Synchrony in the
533 downstream migration of smolts and upstream migration of adult Atlantic salmon in the sub-Arctic
534 River Utsjoki. J. Fish. Biol. 71: 1735–1750.
535

536 Orell, P., Erkinaro, J., and Karppinen, P. 2011. Accuracy of snorkelling counts in assessing spawning
537 stock of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, as verified by radio-tagged fish and underwater video
538 monitoring. Fish. Manag. Ecol. 18: 392–399.
539

540 Otero, J., L'Abée-Lund, J.H., Castro-Santos, T., Leonardsson, K., Storvik, G.O., Jonsson, B., Dempson,
541 B., Russell, I.C., Jensen, A.J., Baglinière, J.-L., Dionne, M., Armstrong, J.D., Romakkaniemi, A., Letcher,
542 B.H., Kocik, J.F., Erkinaro, J., Poole, R., Rogan, G., Lundqvist, H., MacLean, J.C., Jokikokko, E.,
543 Arnekleiv, J.V., Kennedy, R.J., Niemelä, E., Caballero, P., Music, P.A., Antonsson, T., Gudjonsson, S.,
544 Veselov, A.E. Lamberg, A., Groom, S., Taylor, B.H., Taberner, M., Dillane, M., Arnason, F., Horton, G.,
545 Hvidsten, N.A., Jonsson, I.R., Jonsson, N., McKelvey, S., Næsje, T., Skaala, Ø., Smith, G.W., Sægvog, H.,
546 Stenseth, N.C. and Vøllestad, L.A. 2014. Basin-scale phenology and effects of climate variability on
547 global timing of initial seaward migration of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Glob. Change Biol. 20: 61-
548 75.
549

550 Plummer, M. 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs sampling.
551 *In* proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical Computing (DSC 2003),
552 20-22 March, Vienna, Austria. ISSN 1609-395X.
553

554 Romakkaniemi, A., Lilja, J., Nykänen, M., Marjomäki, T.J. and Jurvelius, J. 2000. Spawning run of
555 Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the River Tornionjoki monitored by horizontal split-beam
556 echosounding. Aquat. Living Resour. 13: 349-354.
557

558 Schwarz, C., and Dempson, J. 1994. Mark-recapture estimation of a salmon smolt population.
559 Biometrics. 50: 98-108.
560

561 Sethi, A.S., and Bradley, C. 2016. Statistical arrival models to estimate missed passage counts at
562 fish weirs. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 73: 1251–1260. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2015-0318.
563

564 Spiegelhalter, D.J., Best, N.G., Carlin, B.P., and van der Linde, A. 2002. Bayesian measures of model
565 complexity and fit (with discussion). J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. 64: 583–639.
566

567 Su, Z., Adkison, M.D., and Van Alen, B.W. 2001. A hierarchical Bayesian model for estimating
568 historical salmon escapement and escapement timing. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 58: 1648–1662.
569 doi:10.1139/f01-099.
570

571 Trépanier, S., Rodríguez, M. A. and Magnan, P. 1996. Spawning migrations in landlocked Atlantic
572 salmon: time series modelling of river discharge and water temperature effects. J. Fish Biol. 48: 925–
573 936.
574

575 Laura Uusitalo, Sakari Kuikka, Atso Romakkaniemi; Estimation of Atlantic salmon smolt carrying
576 capacity of rivers using expert knowledge, ICES Journal of Marine Science, Volume 62, Issue 4, 1
577 January 2005, Pages 708–722, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icesjms.2005.02.005>
578

579 Vähä, J.P., Erkinaro, J., Falkegård, M., Orell, P. & Niemelä, E. 2017. Genetic stock identification of
580 Atlantic salmon and its evaluation in a large population complex. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 74: 327–
581 338.
582

583 Table 1. Questions elicited from the expert

Question	Expert view
<i>Process of departing</i>	
- At what range of temperature (air temperature at Utsjoki logger) first smolts are considered to begin their migration?	6-8 °C
- What level of temperature would be considered so high that the process of migration not be influenced by further increase in temperature (i.e. logit curve levels out)?	12 °C
<i>Process of travelling</i>	
- What is the the maximum travel time (in days) in which a smolt can be considered to arrive at the video site?	14 days
- What is the minimum travel time in which a smolt can be considered to arrive at the video site?	1-2 days
<i>Process of observing</i>	
- What is the upper (/lower) limit for the expected probability at which an average smolt is considered to be observed in best (/worst) possible environmental conditions, i.e. at minimum (/maximum) discharge?	0.9 (0.3)
- What is the level of discharge below which the visibility is considered optimal?	20 m ³ /s
- At optimal visibility, what is the range of probability at which the fish are considered to be observed with around 90% of certainty?	0.75-0.9
- What is the level of discharge at which the visibility is considered to be poor?	50-60 m ³ /s
- At poor visibility, what I the range of probability at which the fish are considered to be observed with around 90% of certainty?	0.3-0.6

584

585

586

587 Table 2: List of symbols, descriptions and prior distributions

Symbol	Description	Prior distribution
$\log N_y^{tot}$	Total annual run size on log-scale	Uniform(7,15)
N_y^{tot}	Total annual run size on real scale	-
$N_{j,y}$	Daily number of smolts passing the video site	-
$q_{j,y}^N$	Daily proportion of smolts passing the video site	-
$\mu_{j,y}^N$	Expected proportion of smolts passing the video site	-
η^N	Overdispersion of the arrival process	Uniform(0.001,100000)
$p_{i,y}$	Probability to depart (if haven't departed yet)	-
$P_{i,y}$	Proportion of smolts departing each day	-
α^P	Intercept for probability to depart given temperature	N(-20,1)
β^P	Regression coefficient for probability to depart given temperature	logN(0.6,0.1)
s^P	Standard deviation of probability to depart	logN(0,1)
$Q_{i,j,y}^D$	Unstandardised proportion for travel time	-
$q_{i,j,y}^D$	Standardised proportion for travel time	-
$M_{i,y}$	Mean of log(travel time)	-
S	Standard deviation of log(travel time)	-
$\mu_{i,y}^D$	Expected travel time	-

$\gamma_{i,y}$	Expected value of expected travel time	-
cv^D	Coefficient of variation of log(travel time)	Uniform(0.001,2)
α^D	Intercept for the expected value of expected travel time given flow	logN(0.52,0.07)
β^D	Regression coefficient for the expected value of expected travel time given flow	logN(-4.6,0.04)
$cv^{\mu D}$	Coefficient of variation of expected travel time	Uniform(0.001,1)
$q_{i,j,y}^J$	Probability that a smolt departs on day i and passes the video site on day j	-
$\mu_{j,y}^B$	Expected probability to observe a smolt (M2)	-
η^B	Overdispersion of the observation process	Uniform(5,1000)
α^B	Intercept for probability to be observed	N(2.9,0.02)
β^B	Regression coefficient for probability to be observed	logN(-2.6,0.001)
sd_{BB}	Standard deviation of expected probability to be observed	logN(-0.23, 0.005)
<i>Data</i>		
$t_{i,y}$	Mean daily air temperature	-
$f_{j,y}$	Mean daily discharge	-
$N_{j,y}^{Obs}$	Daily smolt count	-

588

589

590

591

Table 3. Results from the predictive study in 2005 (real missing data), 2007 ('first 17% missed' - scenario) and 2014 ('peak of the migration +2 days missing' -scenario). For posterior distributions, mean values and 90% probability intervals are illustrated.

Year	Sum of missing counts	% of missing counts out of total observed	Number of predicted missing	% of predicted missing out of total
2005	NA	NA	2122 (457,5159)	10% (3%,23%)
2007	2539	17%	3346 (723,8546)	15% (4%,33%)
2014	4085	21%	4677 (2580,7367)	18% (11%,26%)

Table 4. Prior and posterior means and 5 % and 95 % quantiles of key parameters

Variable	Prior			Posterior		
	mean	5%	95%	mean	5%	95%
α^P	-20.0	-21.6	-18.3	-19.9	-21.3	-18.5
β^P	1.92	1.09	3.09	1.37	1.25	1.49
s^P	1.65	0.20	5.15	2.89	2.36	3.54
α^D	1.74	1.09	2.61	2.63	2.21	3.09
β^D	0.010	0.007	0.014	0.010	0.007	0.013
cv^D	1.00	0.11	1.90	1.54	1.01	1.95
$cv^{\mu D}$	0.50	0.05	0.95	0.22	0.02	0.55
α^B	2.90	2.69	3.11	2.91	2.70	3.11
β^B	0.074	0.070	0.078	0.074	0.070	0.078
sd_{BB}	0.80	0.71	0.89	0.81	0.72	0.90
η^B	505	56	951	408	15	933
η^N	50092	5008	95069	289	208	403

604

606 Figure 1: Setup of the video monitoring system at the river bed in Utsjoki. Graph (A) illustrates the
607 profile of the bridge and river bed and graph (B) the river bed in the main channel. Arrows in graph
608 (B) illustrate the position and direction of each of the 8 cameras. Field of view (FoV) of the cameras
609 are: horizontal 78 degrees; vertical 58 degrees.

610

611

612

613 Figure 2. Data on daily mean air temperature and mean discharge at Utsjoki on study years 2005-

614 2009 and 2014.

615

616

617

618 Figure 3. Annual prior distributions for the timing of the smolt run given the environmental

619 covariates (daily mean air temperature and discharge).

Figure 4. Annual number of smolts passing the video site. Posterior distributions are illustrated with boxplots: middle line is median of the distribution, box covers 50% and whiskers 90% of the probability mass. Count data are illustrated with dots.

629

630

631 Figure 5. Daily number of smolts that pass the video site in 2005-2009 and 2014. Posterior

632 distributions are illustrated with boxplots: middle line is median of the distribution, box covers 50%

633 and whiskers 90% of the probability mass. Count data are illustrated with dots. Data points included

634 in the study are marked with black and the ones excluded (counts treated as missing) marked with

635 grey.

636

637

638 Figure 6. Probability that a smolt begins the migration at given temperature. Priors and posteriors
639 are illustrated with grey and black boxplots, respectively. Middle line in the box illustrates median of
640 the distribution, whereas box covers 50% and whiskers 90% of the probability mass.

Figure 7. Cumulative distribution of expected travel time in days from the point of departure to the video site. Above: Cumulative distribution at low discharge ($10 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$). Below: Cumulative distribution at high discharge ($100 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$). Priors and posteriors are illustrated with grey and black boxplots, respectively. Middle line in the box illustrates median of the distribution, whereas box covers 50% and whiskers 90% of the probability mass.

Figure 8. The expected observation probability at given discharge. Priors and posteriors are illustrated with grey and black boxplots, respectively. Middle line in the box illustrates median of the distribution, whereas box covers 50% and whiskers 90% of the probability mass.

Appendix A: Lognormal approximation for Dirichlet-distribution

Let's consider a set of Dirichlet-distributed parameters:

$$(A.1) \quad \mathbf{q}_{1:n} \sim \text{Dirich}(\mu_1\eta, \dots, \mu_n\eta),$$

Where μ_i is the expected probability for slot i and η is the overdispersion parameter. Such Dirichlet-distribution can be approximated with a set of lognormally distributed z_i by assuming

664 (A.2) $q_{1:n} = z_i / \sum_i z_i$

665 (A.3) $z_i \sim \log N(M_i, T_i)$

666 (A.4) $M_i = \log(\mu_i) - \frac{0.5}{T_i}$ and

667 (A.5) $T_i = \log\left(\frac{1}{\mu_i \eta} + 1\right).$

668

669 **Appendix B: Sensitivity study on priors of the observation process**

670 The expert elicited priors for the parameters of the observation process (Figure 8) did not update
 671 when the model was fitted to video counts. In order to study reasons behind this finding we made
 672 another run with the model with more uncertain prior distributions for parameters α^B and β^B .
 673 Parameter α^B was set to follow $N(2.9, 1)$ and parameter β^B $\log N(-2.6, 1)$ distribution, respectively.
 674 Other prior distributions and model assumptions remained the same as described in the methods
 675 section. Model was run 5 100 000 iterations at which point all parameters of interest had converged
 676 according to Gelman-Rubin shrink factor.

677 Unlike in the model run with expert elicited priors, the sensitivity model run with wider prior
 678 distributions resulted with update for observability parameters (Figure B1). Parameter α^B updates
 679 only slightly, and most of the learning takes place for parameter β^B . In comparison, in the model run
 680 with expert elicited priors, posteriors of these parameters were identical to the prior distributions
 681 (Figure 8 in Results section). The joint distributions of priors/posteriors of parameters α^B , β^B and
 682 sd^{BB} as a function of discharge (Figure B2) show that learning takes place mainly at the lower ends
 683 of the observation probability.

684 Joint posteriors from the model run with expert elicited priors and sensitivity model run are
 685 compared in figure B3. The difference in the joint posteriors mainly takes place as increased

uncertainty on higher probabilities to observe smolts, whereas the lower limits of the distributions are relatively close between the models.

Figure B4 illustrates the impact the prior choice on observability has on the posterior estimates on the annual total number of smolts. The posteriors are close the same at the upper end of the distributions, whereas at the lower ends of the distributions the estimates of the sensitivity model support smaller annual abundances than the estimates from the run with expert elicited priors (Figure B4). We learn that with the current model structure, the video survey provides mainly information about the minimum level of observability (through realized discharges), but that expert knowledge is vital in understanding the maximum limits of observability. Posterior distributions of parameters related to processes of departing and travelling were identical with the estimates of the model run with expert elicited priors on observation process (Figures 6 and 7 in the Results section). Scatter plots of the posterior samples between the annual total number of smolts and parameters of the observation process, α^B and β^B (Figures B5 and B6), give us more insight on the model behavior. The interpretation of these parameters is that the α^B sets up the base level for the observation probability and β^B defines on how quickly the probability decreases as the discharge increases. The posteriors on total smolt abundance seem to be more sensitive on the choice of prior on α^B than for choice of prior on β^B , this can be seen especially from the samples of the sensitivity model run (Figures B5 and B6). On the other hand, observed data has more power to update parameter β^B than α^B (Figure B1). Correlation between α^B and β^B balances the joint distribution in the sensitivity model run, as with high values of α^B values of $-\beta^B$ decrease (Figure B7).

Figure B1. Marginal densities of parameters α^B and β^B in the sensitivity model run. Prior distributions are illustrated with dotted and posterior distributions with solid lines.

Figure B2. The expected observation probability at given discharge in sensitivity model run. Priors and posteriors are illustrated with grey and black boxplots, respectively.

713

714 Figure B3. The expected observation posterior probability at given discharge in model run with

715 expert elicited priors (grey box plots) and sensitivity model run (black boxplots).

716

Figure B4. Posterior estimates of annual number of smolts passing the video site based on model run with expert elicited priors (grey boxplots) and priors from sensitivity analysis (white boxplots). Middle line is the median of the distribution; box covers 50% and whiskers 90% of the probability mass. Count data are illustrated with dots.

Figure B5. Scatter plots of sampled posterior values between annual total number of smolts (in thousands) and parameter α^B of the observation process. Dark grey dots illustrate the posterior samples from the sensitivity analysis, whereas light grey dots illustrate the posterior samples from the analysis with expert elicited priors.

730

731 Figure B6. Scatter plots of sampled posterior values between annual total number of smolts (in
732 thousands) and parameter β^B of the observation process. Dark grey dots illustrate the posterior
733 samples from the sensitivity analysis, whereas light grey dots illustrate the posterior samples from
734 the analysis with expert elicited priors.

Figure B7. Scatter plots of sampled posterior of parameters α^B and β^B of the observation process. Dark grey dots illustrate the posterior samples from the sensitivity analysis, whereas light grey dots illustrate the posterior samples from the analysis with expert elicited priors.

Appendix C: JAGS code for the arrival model

```
model{
  # Process of departing
  # =====
  for(y in 1:nYears){
    for(i in 1:nDays){
      # p: probability to start migration at day t, if haven't done so earlier
      # t: daily mean temperature
      logit(p[i,y])<-p2[i,y]
      p2[i,y]~dnorm(aP+bP*t[i,y],1/pow(sdP,2))
    }
  }
}
```

```

751   }
752   }
753   # P: expected proportion of smolts departing at day i
754   for(y in 1:nYears){
755     P[1,y]<-p[1,y]
756     for(i in 2:(nDays-1)){
757       P[i,y]<-(1-sum(P[1:(i-1),y]))*p[i,y]
758     }
759     P[nDays,y]<-1-sum(P[1:60,y])
760   }
761
762   aP~dnorm(-20,1)
763   bP~dlnorm(0.6,10)
764   sdP~dlnorm(0,1)
765
766   # Process of travelling
767   # =====
768   # qD: probability that a smolt that departs at day i passes the video site at day j
769   for(y in 1:nYears){
770     for(i in 1:nDays){
771       # i: day of departure
772       # j: day of passing the video site
773       # f: daily mean discharge
774       # j==i
775       qDx[i,i,y]<-phi((log(0.5)-MD[i,y])/SD)
776       # j>i
777       for(j in (i+1):(i+13)){
778         qDx[i,j,y]<-phi((log(j-i+0.5)-MD[i,y])/SD)-phi((log(j-i-0.5)-MD[i,y])/SD)
779       }

```

```

780   for(j in i:(i+13)){
781     qD[i,j,y]<-qDx[i,j,y]/(sum(qDx[i:(i+13),y])+0.0001)
782   }
783   MD[i,y]<-log(muD[i,y])-0.5/TD
784   muD[i,y]~dlnorm(log(exp(aD-bD*f[i,y]))-0.5/TmuD, TmuD)
785   }
786 }
787 SD<-1/sqrt(TD)
788 TmuD<-1/log(cvmuD*cvmuD+1)
789 TD<-1/log(cvD*cvD+1)
790
791 aD~dlnorm(0.52,14)
792 bD~dlnorm(-4.6,25)
793 cvmuD~dunif(0.001,1)
794 cvD~dunif(0.001,2)
795
796 # Arrival distribution
797 # =====
798 # Joint distribution of qD and P: prob that a smolt departing day i arrives day j
799 for(y in 1:nYears){
800   for(i in 1:nDays){ # day of departure
801     for(j in i:(i+13)){ # day of passing the video site
802       qJ[j,i,y]<-qD[i,j,y]*P[i,y]
803     }
804   }
805
806   # Expected proportion of smolts passing the video site each day
807   for(j in 1:14){
808     muqN[j,y]<-sum(qJ[j,1:j,y])+0.0001 # small constant added for numerical stability

```

```

809   }
810   for(j in 15:nDays){
811     muqN[j,y]<-sum(qJ[j,(j-13):j,y])+0.0001
812   }
813 }
814
815 for(y in 1:nYears){
816   Ntot[y]<-exp(LNtot[y]) # total run size in year y
817   LNtot[y]~dunif(7,15)
818
819   for(j in 1:(nDays-1)){
820     N[j,y]<-round(qN[j,y]*Ntot[y]) # daily number of fish passing
821   }
822   N[nDays,y]<-round(Ntot[y]*(1-sum(qN[1:(nDays-1),y])))
823
824   # qN: daily proportion of smolts
825   # dirichlet-distribution approximated with lognormal
826   qN[1:nDays,y]<-zN[1:nDays,y]/sum(zN[1:nDays,y])
827
828   for(i in 1:nDays){
829     zN[j,y]~dlnorm(MN[j,y], TauN[j,y])
830   }
831
832   alphaN[1:nDays,y]<-muqN[1:nDays,y]*eta_alphaN
833   MN[1:nDays,y]<-log(muqN[1:nDays,y])-0.5/TauN[1:nDays,y]
834   TauN[1:nDays,y]<-1/log((1/alphaN[1:nDays,y])+1)
835 }
836
837 eta_alphaN~dunif(0.001,100000)

```



```

838
839   # Observation process
840   # =====
841   for(y in 1:nYears){
842     for(j in 1:nDays){
843       # Nobs: Observed number of smolts
844       Nobs[j,y]~dbetabin(100,10,N[j,y]) # M1
845       Nobs[j,y]~dbetabin(muB[j,y]*etaB,(1-muB[j,y])*etaB,N[j,y]) #M2
846
847       muB[j,y]<-0.6*(exp(BB[j,y])/(1+exp(BB[j,y]))) + 0.3
848       BB[j,y]~dnorm(aB-bB*f[j,y],1/pow(sdBB,2))
849
850     }
851   }
852   # priors for observation process M2
853   aB~dnorm(2.9,60)
854   bB~dnorm(-2.6,984)
855   sdBB~dnorm(-0.23,210)
856   etaB~dunif(5,1000)
857 }
858

```