

## Underwater photo-identification of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) off Mauritius

Sarano Véronique <sup>1</sup>, Sarano François <sup>1</sup>, Girardet Justine <sup>2</sup>, Preud'homme Axel <sup>3</sup>, Vitry Hugues <sup>3</sup>,  
Heuzey René <sup>4</sup>, Sarano Marion <sup>1</sup>, Delfour Fabienne <sup>5</sup>, Glotin Hervé <sup>6</sup>, Adam Olivier <sup>7</sup>,  
Madon Bénédicte <sup>8</sup>, Jung Jean-Luc <sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Longitude 181, Valence, France

<sup>2</sup> Université de Brest, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, ISYEB, Brest, France

<sup>3</sup> Marine Megafauna Conservation Organisation, Mauritius

<sup>4</sup> Label Bleu Production, Marseille, France

<sup>5</sup> LEEC, Sorbonne Paris Nord University, Paris, France

<sup>6</sup> Toulon University, Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LIS, DYNI Team, Marseille, France

<sup>7</sup> Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Institut Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, UMR 7190, Paris, France & Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Institut des Neurosciences Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>8</sup> UMR-AMURE, Université de Brest, Plouzané, France

\* Corresponding author : Jean-Luc Jung, email address : [jung.jeanluc@gmail.com](mailto:jung.jeanluc@gmail.com)

### Abstract :

The long-term monitoring of long-lived animals often requires individual identification. For cetaceans, this identification may be based on morphological characters observable from a boat such as shape, spots and cuts of the back, fluke and dorsal fins. However, for some species such as the sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), this approach may be challenging as individuals display a rather uniform skin pigmentation. They also do not very often show their fluke, complicating individual identification from a boat. Immature sperm whales that usually have an unharmed fluke may be excluded from photo-identification catalogues. Within the framework of the Maubydick project, focusing on the long-term monitoring of sperm-whales in Mauritius, passive underwater observation and video recording were used to identify long-lasting body markers (e.g. sex, ventral white markings, cut-outs of fins). A catalogue of 38 individuals (six adult males, 18 adult females and 14 immatures) enabled observers to record some nearly-daily, and yearly resightings.

Advantages and disadvantages of this method are presented here. Such catalogues represent a robust baseline for conducting behavioural, genetic and acoustic studies in social species. Benefits of such newly acquired knowledge are of primary importance to implement relevant conservation plans in the marine realm.

**Keywords :** Indian Ocean, Mauritius, protected species, monitoring, sperm whales, individual identification

88

## 89 INTRODUCTION

90

91

92 The long-term study of long-lived animal population often requires individual identification, e.g.  
93 for abundance estimation in mark-recapture surveys, social behaviour understanding and for  
94 conservation purposes (Hammond et al. 1990, Würsig & Jefferson 1990, Gowans & Whitehead  
95 2001, Möller et al. 2006, Calambokidis et al. 2008, Gero et al. 2014, Cantor & Whitehead 2016,  
96 Gero & Whitehead 2016, Augusto et al. 2017, Louis et al. 2017, Huisjer et al. 2020, Sarano et al.  
97 2021).

98

99 This identification may be challenging in the marine environment and cetaceans are no  
100 exception, spending only a limited amount of time at the sea surface. The individual  
101 identification is then based on a reduced number of morphological characteristics captured on  
102 photographs taken from a boat or an unmanned aerial vehicle (Verfuss et al. 2019). The main  
103 morphological characteristics that can be observed are the coloring of the back, the shape of the  
104 dorsal fin and/or the distinct markings on the trailing edge of the caudal, the latter being only  
105 visible when the animal flukes (Arnbom 1987, Sears et al. 1990, Whitehead 1990, Dufault &  
106 Whitehead 1995, Gomez-Salazar et al. 2011). Algorithms have been developed to automate the  
107 fastidious task of visual inspection of photographs in the search for potential recaptures (e.g.  
108 Whitehead 1990, Huele & Udo de Haes 1998, White et al. 1998, Huele & Ciano 1999,  
109 Beekmans et al. 2005, Hillman et al. 2010, Levenson et al. 2015).

110

111 Underwater observation may be used to gather additional information that cannot be collected  
112 from a boat alone. Underwater devices such as unmanned underwater drones, for example, may  
113 be used. When the environment permits it, human observers can also film and perform accurate  
114 underwater individual identification. Such approaches have been used successfully in humpback  
115 whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Glockner-Ferrari & Ferrari 1990), dolphins *Tursiops truncatus*  
116 (Herzing 1997), manta rays *Mobula* spp (Town et al. 2013, Marshall & Holmberg 2018) or  
117 whale sharks *Rhincodon typus* (Pierce et al. 2018) to develop catalogues of individuals. To  
118 complete underwater video and photographic data, the observers can also collect samples and  
119 outcompete methods traditionally used for studies focused on genetics (Sarano et al. 2021).

120

121 For sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), a lot has been learnt through boat-based  
122 observations (see for instance Alessi et al. 2014, Carpinelli et al. 2014, Gero et al. 2014, Cantor  
123 & Whitehead 2016, Gero & Whitehead 2016, Cantor et al. 2019, Van der Linde & Eriksson  
124 2020). Individual identification of sperm whales is in general based on mark patterns of the fluke  
125 (Arnbom 1987). Body marks can also be used (eg Alessi et al. 2014, Van der Linde & Eriksson  
126 2020). But individual identification can sometime be difficult as some individuals have a dorsal  
127 fin barely distinctive (Van der Linde & Eriksson 2020) and as sperm whales have a caudal fin of  
128 uniform color unlike humpback whales for example (Mizroch et al. 1990). Young immature  
129 individuals rarely fluke, making their identification particularly difficult (Whitehead 2006, Gero  
130 et al. 2009). Their sexing is impossible from the surface as they do not show any apparent sexual  
131 dimorphism. Adult females and large immatures have similar sizes, and may therefore be  
132 difficult to distinguish (Gero et al. 2014). The capture probability may also differ between  
133 individuals, some spending less time at the surface or having no visible distinctive signs may  
134 escape identifications (Whitehead 2006). As a result, in photo-identification (photo-ID)

135 monitoring of sperm whale populations, some individuals may remain unidentifiable from the  
136 sea surface (Whitehead 2006, Boys et al. 2019, Van der Linde and Eriksson 2020, Kobayashi et  
137 al. 2020). Underwater observation may therefore in some cases help to identify individual sperm  
138 whales, as more discriminating markers, e.g., located on the ventral part of the animals, could be  
139 observed. It would also help to infer gender with certainty.

140  
141 This paper presents the results of a study based on an underwater photo-ID and video-  
142 identification (video-ID) protocol used to monitor sperm whales in Mauritius since 2015 by the  
143 French association Longitude 181, in the framework of the Maubydick program run by the  
144 Mauritian NGO Marine Megafauna Conservation Organization. In this long-term conservation  
145 program, the social organization and the dynamics of groups of sperm whales off west Mauritius  
146 are studied using video-recorded underwater observations, genetics analysis (Sarano et al. 2021)  
147 and acoustics (Ferrari et al. 2019, 2020). A unique catalogue of 38 sperm whales based on  
148 identity cards (ID-cards) displaying long-lasting and reliable morphological markers for each  
149 individual was created. These results should be of first interest in terms of conservation of the  
150 species in the Indian Ocean.

151

152

153

## 154 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

155

156

### 157 **Field observations**

158

159 Sperm whales are common off the coast of the Mauritius Island (Mascarenes Islands, Indian  
160 Ocean). A protocol based on underwater observations through photography and video recording  
161 was implemented in 2011 for the Maubydick project led by the MMCO (Marine Megafauna  
162 Conservation Organization, Mauritius Island). In 2015, the protocol was standardized under the  
163 scientific lead of Longitude 181 association (France), and the sampling effort increased over the  
164 years since then (Table 1).

165

166 The study area is located on the west coast of the Mauritius Island, up to 15 km off the coast,  
167 between 20.465S 57.334E and 19.986S 57.605E (Sarano et al. 2021). The boat used for this  
168 survey is a 15-meter Mauritian motor vessel, chartered by MMCO and equipped for diving with  
169 a low rear platform, from which observers can immerse themselves by gently sliding into the  
170 water. All underwater observations were video-recorded, either with a Sony F55 4K, a Sony  
171 EXIR HD, a Nikon D800 Camera in Hugyfot housing or a GoPro camera Hero 4, 7 and 8.

172

173

### 174 **Ethical and legal aspects of the observations**

175

176 According to Mauritius rules, observations were only performed during mornings (from 6.00 am  
177 to 12.00 pm). Out of respect for the cetaceans and their habitats, the observers strictly followed  
178 the ethical rules of the official Charter for responsible approach and observation of marine  
179 mammals and the Maritime zone regulations (Conduct of Marine Scientific Research/ Notice  
180 n°57 of 2017) promulgated by the Mauritius Government. This study was placed under the  
181 policies of the Mauritius Department for continental shelf, maritime zone administration and

182 exploration, with appropriate permits to conduct underwater videos, underwater observations on  
183 sperm whales and marine scientific research.

184

185

## 186 **Underwater observations**

187

188 The observation protocol was described in Sarano et al. (2021). Briefly, when a group of sperm  
189 whales was spotted from the boat, the animals were approached no closer than 100m and a small  
190 group of swimming observers, generally a scuba diver and 4 snorkelers, immersed themselves,  
191 upstream considering the movement direction of the sperm whale group. Observers were as  
192 passive as possible, typically not swimming towards the whales but waiting for the sperm whales  
193 to approach to film them. When sperm whales were static (e.g., socializing or sleeping),  
194 observers slowly and quietly approached. The scuba diver recorded videos and observations at a  
195 maximum diving depth of 40m, while the snorkelers performed observations from the surface  
196 and filmed the sperm whales at a maximum 20m depth.

197 The duration of observation varied between 20s to 10min when the animals were sleeping or  
198 socializing near the observers. The boat always stayed away and picked up the observers once  
199 the sperm whale group had moved away.

200

201

## 202 **Video processing**

203

204 The identification of morphological markers to create the catalogue of ID-cards was based on  
205 meticulous analyses of the videos using VLC player (VideoLAN Organization, France). Slow  
206 motion mode was used to get the best screenshot for each of the body marks. These pictures  
207 were then used to illustrate the morphological markers on the catalogue.

208

209

## 210 **Morphological markers**

211

212 The morphological markers retained for the ID-cards are illustrated in Figure 1. They include:  
213 sex, white spots, cuts with removal of material, scars from teeth marks (*i.e.* rake marks), shape of  
214 the fluke. Some of these marks can be observed from a boat (e.g., cuts on the caudal fin, cuts /  
215 callus on the dorsal fin), but the majority are visible only underwater (e.g., sex, cutting of the  
216 pectoral fins, clear spots of depigmentation on the ventral side, on the mandibular area and the  
217 cheeks, shape of the jaw, size of the teeth).

218

### 219 *Cutting Pattern of the fins*

220 Types of cutting pattern of the fins (small nicks, distinct nicks, waves, scallops, missing portions,  
221 holes, tooth mark scars and calluses) have already been defined (Arnbom & Whitehead 1989,  
222 Whitehead 1990).

223 The features used in this study are (for those previously defined, descriptions are those of  
224 Arnbom & Whitehead 1989 when indicated; in the other cases, descriptions have been  
225 generalized to fit to underwater observations, Figure 1 and Table 2):

226 - Small nick: small indentation in edge of fin; only distinguished when the fin was relatively  
227 close (Arnbom & Whitehead 1989)


228 - Distinct nick: larger indentation sharply cut away (Arnbom & Whitehead 1989), which can be

- 229 seen from a longer distance  
230 - Wave: shallow smooth depression, with material removal, the depth of the missing part of the  
231 fin is  $\leq 20\%$  of its width  
232 - Scallop: deep smooth depression, with removal of material, with depth of the missing part of  
233 the fin being  $\geq 20\%$  of its width  
234 - Tip-missing: when only the tip of the fin is missing (fluke and pectoral)  
235 - Missing portion: large part of the fin is sectioned (fluke and pectoral)  
236 - Hole: small perforation of the fins  
237 - Tooth mark: often seen as parallel scars  
238 - Curled: tip of the fluke curled  
239 - Callus: greyish or white deformity on the dorsal fin (Arnbom & Whitehead 1989)

240

#### 241 *Skin depigmentation marks*

242 The depigmentation of the skin in sperm whales result in white areas on the body that can be  
243 characterized according to their size (small, medium, large), their shape (spot, stripe, escutcheon)  
244 and their position on the body (caudal, genital, ventral, pectoral and mandibular areas, side and  
245 back). Finally, the presence of callus, fold or button on the dorsal fin are noted, as well as  
246 characteristics, rare but very discriminating, such as the crooked jaw or the bulge of the neck.  
247



248

249 *Figure 1: Morphological markers (sex, cutting patterns of the fins and depigmentation marks) used in this study to*  
250 *identify sperm whales.*

251

252 Temporary scratches and peeling spots were used only to help with daily recapture over a field  
253 season. These non-permanent markers were therefore, not retained in the catalog.

254

255

## 256 **Catalogue of ID-card creation**

257

258 The catalogue developed through the underwater observation protocol consists of a series of  
259 individual ID cards for each sperm whale (Supplementary Information 1 and 2). For better  
260 recognition of individuals in the field and easier use of the catalogue, the ID-cards were designed  
261 using simplified standards (see Supplementary Information 1 and 2). For each individual, the  
262 distinctive markers were indicated on the ID-card (e.g., on the caudal), and/or detailed on  
263 dedicated zoomed photos (of pectoral, spots, mouth, ...). Additional information was listed at the  
264 top of the card such as date of first observation, date of last observation, and years of successive  
265 observations. Each individual was given a name in an alphanumeric reference system to ease its  
266 identification in the field. Additional information, such as the availability of DNA samples, or  
267 information of kinship relations when known are enriched the ID-cards.

268

269 ID-cards were (and are) updated yearly with new elements in order to: (1) add new  
270 morphological markers, (2) take into account both the evolution over time of the markers, the  
271 growth and the presence of teeth, and (3) include any new information.

272

273 The number of recaptures for an individual is defined as the number of days that the individual is  
274 observed and filmed. Multiple daily resightings were ignored. This number is available for all  
275 individuals between 2011 and 2020 (Table 3).

276

277

278

## 279 **RESULTS**

280

281

282 Between 2015 and 2020, the team went out in the field on average 53 days per year (min 36d in  
283 2015 and 2020, max 81d in 2019), mainly between February and May (Table 1). In 2020, the  
284 fieldwork season was shortened due to bad weather and the Covid19 pandemic.

285

286 The ID-cards were created from about 250 hours of underwater video recording between 2015  
287 and 2020, for a total number of 317 days of observation (see Table 1). Sperm whales were  
288 observed in 83.9% of the fieldtrips.

289

290

### 291 **Catalogue of individual ID-cards**

292

293 A total of 38 ID-cards corresponding to 38 identified individuals are presented in this study: 18  
294 adult females, 14 immatures (9 males, 5 females) and 6 adult males (Table 2 and Supplementary  
295 Information 1 and 2). Table 2 presents all morphological markers identified for each of these 38  
296 individuals. They are described according to their position on the body (e.g., sex, caudal,  
297 pectoral, dorsal, back, head) and, for white marks, according to their location on the ventral parts  
298 of the animal.

299

300 Gender was the first identification criterion used in the field to identify the individuals. Then the  
301 individual-specific body markers were used to narrow down the identification at the individual



302 level. The number of body marks typically increased with age, young individuals displaying very  
303 few (e.g., Ali, Alexander, Daren, Lana) to more than 10 marks in older individuals (e.g., up to 14  
304 marks for the adult male Anjhin, Table 2). Some of these body markers were unique enough to  
305 enable direct identification of the individuals: e.g., distinct missing portions on the fluke (e.g.,  
306 Arthur, Chesna, Miss Tautou, Agatha) or on the pectoral fin (e.g., Germinie), white markers (e.g.,  
307 Adélie, Tache blanche, Issa, Joue Blanche) or arched-shaped jaw (e.g., Irène's twisted jaw). For  
308 other individuals, the observation of several body markers was required to make the  
309 identification. Overall, the body marks presented in Table 2 enabled field observers to  
310 unambiguously identify these 38 individuals.


311  
312

### 313 **Marker persistence over time**

314

315 All body markers used to draw the ID-cards were persistent over time, i.e., no body marker  
316 disappeared during the present study (*i.e.*, 9 years): white skin pigmentation appeared stable over  
317 time as well as markers resulting from a wound with flesh removal: *e.g.*, Eliot's clear ventral  
318 escutcheon (Figure 2), the white spot of Tache Blanche, the sectioned pectoral of Germinie or  
319 Irène's twisted jaw were recaptured on the videos, either from birth (for immature: Eliot and  
320 Tache Blanche), or since their first observations in 2011 (for adult females: Germinie and Irène).

321



322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328

322 *Figure 2: Example of recapture of a body marker over 9 years: the first 4 photos (taken from a sequence where the*  
323 *newborn Eliot turns around) show the shape of the escutcheon captured at different angles. The other photos were*  
324 *taken every year from its birth in 2011 until 2020. The escutcheon being unique, it allows the direct identification of*  
325 *this immature, while its caudal fin shows only traces of teeth and tiny notches almost indistinguishable.*  
326  
327  
328

329

## 330 **Recapture rate of females and immatures**

331

332 The primary aim of the ID-card catalogue was to enable underwater field identification of  
333 individual whales from 2015 to 2020. The ID-cards were also used to analyze field videos  
334 recorded between 2011 and 2014, as well as some older underwater photographs taken in 2007  
335 and 2009, in order to identify the individuals. The observation effort was therefore divided in 2  
336 periods, one until 2014 and the second starting in 2015 (Tables 1 and 3).

337

338 Over the period 2011-2020, 17 adult females identified were recaptured 1,542 times with an  
339 average rate of 91 recaptures per individual (min=23, max=177). One adult female, Joue  
340 Blanche, was seen only 8 times, and no more since 2015 (Table 3). Among the adult females, 2  
341 had few recaptures (Déline  $n = 31$  and Swastee  $n = 23$ ) although they were easily identified  
342 thanks to their distinct markers (for Swastee, a huge bulge on the nape; for Déline, a big cut on  
343 the caudal fin - see Supplementary Information 1 and 2). The most recaptured females were  
344 Germiné ( $n = 177$ ) and Irène ( $n=156$ ), observed during more than 50% of the days of field work.  
345 Immatures were more often recaptured, even those presenting limited distinctive markers such as  
346 Roméo, Ali or Daren (between 39% to 68% of the days of observation depending on the  
347 individual, 55% on average) than adult females (between 22% to 39%, 30% of the days of  
348 observation on average). The most recaptured immature was Arthur ( $n=184$ ).

349 During the 2015-2020 period, some individuals disappeared. They have been collated at the  
350 bottom of Table 3, i.e., 2 immature males (Maurice, 5 years-old and Baptiste, 3 weeks-old),  
351 probably dead, and a immature female (Agatha, 1 year-old) with her assigned mother Joue  
352 Blanche (observed since 2009) who both disappeared (or left the group) in April 2015.

353

354

355

## 356 **DISCUSSION**

357

358

359 This study presents an underwater observation protocol based on morphological body markers in  
360 a sperm whale population off Mauritius that led to the development of a robust catalogue of ID-  
361 cards enabling the unique identification and monitoring of 38 sperm whales.

362

363

### 364 **Advantages of underwater monitoring**

365

#### 366 *Direct gender assignation*

367 Platform-based observers (e.g., on a boat) can hardly assign gender to immatures showing no  
368 global sexual dimorphism (Arnbom & Whitehead 1989, Gero et al. 2013). Adult females and  
369 large immatures have similar sizes, and are also often classified together (Matthews et al. 2001;  
370 Gero et al. 2014). Except for adult male sperm whales, easily identifiable (Arnbom &  
371 Whitehead 1989), skin biopsies and molecular sexing are therefore necessary to determine the  
372 genders (Gero et al. 2008, 2009, 2014). Underwater observation allows to observe the genital  
373 slit, and thus to distinguish between males and females, even before they reach sexual maturity.  
374 Here gender assignment was possible for 14 immatures, some of them from the day they were  
375 born.




376

377

378 *Identification of immatures without any distinctive markers on the fluke*

379 Underwater observation provides access to a range of body markers that a platform-based  
380 observer can only occasionally see but whose utility on sperm whale individual identification has  
381 been proved (Van der Linde & Eriksson 2020). These markers are, in particular, relevant for  
382 individuals without any distinctive markers on the fluke (Figure 3) and for the very young  
383 individuals that seldom fluke. These markers are, for instance, the indentations on the pectoral  
384 fins, the shape of the jaw or the pigmentation patterns on the ventral side, the flanks and the  
385 mandibular area. The presence / pattern of colored markings is often used for humpback whales  
386 (Glockner-Ferrari & Ferrari 1990) or for dolphins (Herzing 1997). Three immatures with an  
387 intact caudal fin and therefore impossible to identify from a boat were identified this way: Zoé,  
388 Tache blanche and Eliot (Figure 3). Underwater, the observer can notice that Zoé has a distinct  
389 nick on each pectoral and is a female, Eliot, a male, has a white ventral escutcheon and Tache  
390 blanche, another male, has a white spot on the belly as well as a small nick on the right pectoral  
391 (Figure 3).  
392



393

394 *Figure 3: Differences between 3 immatures with intact caudal (from left to right): Tache Blanche has a white spot*  
395 *on the belly, a small nick on the right pectoral and is a male; Eliot has a white ventral escutcheon and is a male;*  
396 *Zoé has a nick on each pectoral and is a female.*

397

398 This underwater method provided additional information on the immatures and could therefore  
399 improve the knowledge on this cohort, *e.g.*, by allowing to determine mortality rates including  
400 calves (Gero & Whitehead 2016).  
401

401

402

### 403 *Recapture rate*

404 The recapture rate is increased by underwater observation as compared to boat-based studies.  
405 Over a period of 9 years, the method presented here has resulted in numerous recaptures for all  
406 the individuals identified (mean rate for adult females = 91, Table 3). As a comparison, another  
407 sperm whale study in Mauritius, based on boat-observations, identified 101 different sperm  
408 whales among which 32 were sighted more than once over 5 years (Huijser et al. 2020).  
409 Another 28-year study in the West Indies identified 419 individuals, of which 175 individuals  
410 were recaptured 2 to 14 times (Gero et al. 2014).

411

### 412 *Identification and behavioural observation of deeply-immersed individuals*

413 Koyabashi et al. (2020) noticed that fluking was more often observed during foraging than after  
414 social interactions, which could lower the possibility of identifying individuals socializing thanks  
415 to fluke marks. Underwater studies enable to observe and capture several behaviours and social  
416 interactions that may be difficult to record from a boat, like underwater gathering (playing,  
417 socializing, swimming together), suckling (Johnson et al. 2010) or sleeping behaviour (figure 4).

418

### 419 *Non-invasive sampling and individual acoustic signature*

420 Some studies have used sloughed skin samples released by sperm whales as a source of non-  
421 invasive sampling for DNA analysis (Richard et al. 1996). These samples were taken from the  
422 sea surface. Underwater, and as the sperm whales can be identified in the field or later on video  
423 recording, skin samples can be taken in an individual specific manner by the snorkelers, allowing  
424 individual specific genotype determination, of first use for kin relationship determination for  
425 instance (Sarano et al. 2021).

426 Moreover, this visual identification of each individual may allow to perform individual specific  
427 recording, which is the key for research on individual acoustic signature. Current work joins  
428 video and audio labels from fine acoustic localization using high velocity hydrophone array  
429 recording (Ferrari et al. 2019).

430

431


## 432 **Disadvantages and limits of the underwater approach**

433

### 434 *Ethical and legal constraints*

435 This method can only be used in areas where swim-with activities are legally allowed, ethically  
436 acceptable, and with appropriate permits from the Authorities. Our protocol implies that, once  
437 the snorkelers and scuba divers are in the water, the boat goes away. This also contributes to  
438 lower the human presence: other protocols, using on boat observations, involve that the boat  
439 follows the sperm whale until it flukes (Arnbom 1987). However, swimming regularly with  
440 marine mammals might impact their behaviour with a possible habituation or sensitization in the  
441 long term (Bejder et al. 2009): targeted animals tend to increase their avoidance behaviours  
442 (Constantine 2001, Delfour 2007, Filby et al. 2014), to change their activity budget and aerial  
443 behaviours (Peters et al. 2013) and to modify their sound productions (Scarpaci et al. 2000).  
444 However recent studies showed that the animals' responses might be species-specific (Cecchetti  
445 et al. 2019, Pagel et al. 2017). Richter et al. (2006) showed an impact of whale-watching tour  
446 boats on sperm whales' ventilation, vocalization patterns and swimming direction changes. The  
447 potential impacts of swim-with activities on sperm whales' behaviours will have to be analyzed  
448 in the next years.

449  
450  
451  
452



453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458

Figure 4: Different examples of behaviours and social interactions recorded underwater: **A**: gathering (note that all the individuals are recognized through body marks), **B**: suckling by the mouth (Johnson et al. 2010), **C**: sleeping, **D**: sex identification of a newborn.

459

460

461

462

463 *Water conditions*

464 In this study, the underwater visibility (around 20m) enabled to easily identify morphological  
465 markers and white spot patterns on the body. But in terms of logistics linked to climatic  
466 conditions, it is clear that this underwater method cannot be implemented everywhere, e.g., it is  
467 much more complicated to perform underwater observations in polar waters for example, which  
468 are relatively dark and where the temperature may be near 0°C. Additional equipment adapted to  
469 these conditions would then be necessary. High turbidity can also reduce the visibility to a few  
470 meters (due to high primary production or turbid rainwater coming from inland). In those cases,  
471 this underwater method cannot be implemented, and only well-marked sperm whales (i.e. with  
472 white spots or large missing portions) are identifiable.

473

474 *Identification of isolated individuals*

475 When sperm whales are not grouped underwater, the identification of individuals which are not  
476 in the range of the camera is impossible because big-lense camera cannot be used underwater.  
477 However, several immersions, in compliance with the cetacean approach charter, when possible,  
478 can permit to overcome this issue in order to identify all individuals. Otherwise, underwater  
479 observations can be supplemented by observations from the boat.

480

481

482 **Importance of underwater observations for sperm whale conservation**

483

484 Although many cetacean species are highly mobile, and show great dispersal capacities, their  
485 intraspecific diversity strongly vary, some species display local cultures and some populations  
486 may show high site fidelity (eg Gero & Whitehead 2016, Louis et al. 2017, Richard et al. 2018).  
487 Conservation priorities cannot then be defined at the species level, but rather at the population  
488 level (e.g., Clapham et al. 1999, Baker et al. 2013, Gero et al. 2016, Louis et al. 2017, Richard et  
489 al. 2018). Small-scale studies have therefore to be performed, taking into account and focusing  
490 on the local characteristics of the groups or populations. Such studies need to be able to estimate  
491 the level of differentiation of the studied group in the species, its connectivity with surrounding  
492 individuals and/or groups of the same species, the global health of the group, and its trends over  
493 years. The sperm whale is listed as vulnerable by the IUCN (Taylor et al. 2019). Whitehead  
494 (2002) estimated that sperm whale numbers have been reduced to about 32% of their original  
495 abundance by commercial whaling. The species was predicted to have recovered since the end of  
496 commercial whaling in 1986. But local trends have been shown to vary, to be locally slightly  
497 increasing (Moore & Barlow 2014) or not (Carrol et al. 2014), and to be worrying in some places  
498 (Reeves & Notarbartolo Di Sciara 2006, Gero & Whitehead 2016). Thanks to a long-term  
499 monitoring of well known social groups, Gero & Whitehead (2016) highlighted the disturbing  
500 situation for sperm whales in the West Indies. But the authors stress that these negative trends  
501 have been difficult to highlight, as immigration from surrounding regions may hide local  
502 mortality (Gero & Whitehead, 2016).

503 In the Indian Ocean, Kirkwood et al. (1980) estimated a global abundance of around 30,000  
504 sperm whales, but no recent estimation is available. Anthropoc activities are nowadays well  
505 known to negatively impact marine mammals in general (eg Jung & Madon *in press*), and sperm

506 whales in particular (Gero and Whitehead 2016). For instance, collisions with ships (Laist et al.  
507 2001) and ingestion of plastic debris (Jacobsen et al. 2010, de Stephanis et al. 2013, Unger et al.  
508 2016) have demonstrated direct lethal effects on sperm whales. Marine debris accumulation has  
509 been recently evidenced in the Indian Ocean (Duhec et al. 2015, Lavers et al. 2019), as well as  
510 the direct impact of by-catch on cetaceans (Anderson et al. 2020). The expected recovery of  
511 sperm whales in the Indian Ocean needs thus to be carefully analyzed, and long-term localized  
512 monitoring of sperm whales are therefore strongly needed.

513 In conjunction with boat-based observation, allowing to identify high number of individuals  
514 (Huisjer et al. 2020), the underwater approach presented in this study will strongly help to  
515 determine the trends of the studied sperm whale populations. First, by increasing the accuracy  
516 and the frequency of individual identification, and the number of individual recaptures. Second,  
517 by bringing the opportunity to differentiate calves one from each other. Calves are in fact  
518 particularly important, as only their precise count allows to determine the real rate of increase of  
519 the population (e.g. Gero and Whitehead 2016). Local trends of sperm whale populations will be  
520 more precisely determined, which will be of first importance to define conservation concerns,  
521 priorities, and to measure the benefits of newly implemented protection plans. Other cetaceans  
522 could obviously strongly benefit of such careful individual specific studies, in particular when  
523 local groups of small size are known, whose trends can vary depending on impact of local  
524 anthropogenic activities (e.g. Louis et al. 2017).

525

526

527

## 528 **CONCLUSION**

529

530

531 The protocol based on underwater videos has already proven to be highly robust and widely-used  
532 for other marine megafauna species (e.g., Glockner-Ferrari & Ferrari 1990, Herzing 1997,  
533 Marshall & Holmberg 2018, Pierce et al. 2018). It has been applied here for the identification of  
534 sperm whales in Mauritius, based on underwater observations. The relevance of this approach is  
535 evidenced by quasi-daily recaptures of females and immatures, over the field seasons and from  
536 one year to another. These recaptures were carried based on markers that can hardly be observed  
537 from the sea surface. The markers used proved to be stable and reliable over the 9 years of the  
538 study. This underwater observation approach using video recordings enables to identify  
539 individuals with intact caudal fins and to sex the entire group, including young and newborns,  
540 without using biopsies and molecular sexing. Like any catalogue, it requires annual updates of  
541 the ID-cards to take into account the possible evolution of morphological markers. It will also  
542 soon be extended by the ID-cards of around sixty more individuals observed off the coast of  
543 Mauritius.

544

545

546

## 547 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

548

549

550 Mauritian public authorities greatly helped the Maubydick project, in particular the Mauritian  
551 Prime Minister Office, the Marine Continental Shelf Exploration and Administration (MCSEA,  
552 Dr Réza Badal and his team), the Albion Fisheries Research Center (AFRC, Chief Scientific



553 officer Mr Satish Kadhun), the Mauritius Film Development Corporation (MFDC, Mr. Sachin  
554 Jootun et Miss Eliana Timol) and the Tourism Authority (TA, Miss Khoudijah Boodoo, ex-  
555 Director). We thank Navin Rishinand Boodhonee and the Blue water diving center (Trou aux  
556 Biches, Mauritius), as well as all the ecovolunteers of MMCO and of the program Maubydick for  
557 their valuable participation in field work. A special thanks to late Cindy Vandebrecq for her  
558 involvement in 2013-2014 work. Stéphane Granzotto, Fabrice Guérin, Bernard Kirchhofer and  
559 Vanessa Mignon participated to the video recording and photography taking.  
560 The Association Longitude 181 and Daniel Jouannet, Réseau-TERIA (Vitry sur Seine, France),  
561 supported the drawing and filling of the Identity cards.

562  
563  
564

## 565 **AUTHORISATIONS**

566  
567

568 To respect cetaceans and their habitats, the observers strictly followed the ethical rules of the  
569 official Charter for responsible approach and observation of marine mammals and the Maritimes  
570 zones regulations (Conduct of Marine Scientific Research/ Notice n°57 of 2017) promulgated by  
571 the Mauritius Government. This study was placed under the policies of the Mauritius  
572 Department for continental shelf, maritime zone administration and exploration, with appropriate  
573 permits to conduct underwater videos, underwater observations on sperm whales and marine  
574 scientific research on sperm whales.

575  
576  
577

## 578 **REFERENCES**

579  
580

## 581 **REFERENCES**

582  
583

- 584 Alessi, J., Aïssi, M. & Fiori, C. (2014), Photo-identification of sperm whales in the north-western Mediterranean  
585 Sea: an assessment of natural markings. *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, 24: 11-22.  
586 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2427>
- 587 Anderson, R.C., Herrera, M., Ilangakoon, A.D., Koya, K.M., Moazzam, M., Mustika, P.L. et al. (2020) Cetacean  
588 bycatch in Indian Ocean tuna gillnet fisheries. *Endangered Species Research*, 41, 39-53.  
589 <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr01008>
- 590 Arnborn, T. (1987) Individual identification of sperm whales. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 37,  
591 201-204.
- 592 Arnborn, T. & Whitehead, H. (1989) Observations on the composition and behaviour of groups of female sperm  
593 whales near the Galapagos Islands. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 67, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z89-001>
- 594 Augusto, J.F., Frasier, T.R. & Whitehead, H. (2017) Social structure of long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala*  
595 *melas*) off northern Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. *Behaviour*, 154, 509-540.  
596 <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-00003432>
- 597 Baker, C.S., Steel, D., Calambokidis, J. Falcone, E., Gonzalez-Peral, U., Barlow, J. et al. (2013) Strong maternal  
598 fidelity and natal philopatry shape genetic structure in North Pacific humpback whales. *Marine Ecology Progress*  
599 *Series*, 494, 291-306. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps10508>
- 600 Beekmans, B.W.P.M., Whitehead, H., Huele, R., Steiner, L. & Steenbeek, A. (2005) Comparison of two computer-  
601 assisted photo-identification methods applied to sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). *Aquatic Mammals*, 31,

- 602 243-247. <https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.31.2.2005.243>
- 603 Bejder, L., Samuels, A., Whitehead, H., Finn, H., & Allen, S. (2009) Impact assessment research: use and misuse of  
604 habituation, sensitisation and tolerance in describing wildlife responses to anthropogenic stimuli. *Marine*  
605 *Ecology Progress Series*, 395, 177-185.
- 606 Boys, R.M., Oliviera, C., Perez-Jorge, S., Prieto, R., Steiner, L. & Silva, M.A. (2019) Multi-state open robust design  
607 applied to opportunistic data reveals dynamics of wide-ranging taxa: the sperm whale case. *Ecosphere*, 10, 1-19.  
608 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2610>
- 609 Calambokidis, J., Falcone, E.A., Quinn, T.J., Burdin, A.M., Clapham, P.J., Ford, J.K.B. et al. (2008) SPLASH:  
610 Structure of populations, levels of abundance and status of humpback whales in the North Pacific. US  
611 Department of Commerce, Western Administrative Center, Seattle, WA
- 612 Cantor, M., Whitehead, H., Gero, S. & Rendell, L. (2016) Cultural turnover among Galápagos sperm whales. *Royal*  
613 *Society open science*, 3:160615. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160615>
- 614 Cantor, M., Gero, S., Whitehead, H. & Rendell, L. (2019) Sperm whale: the largest toothed creature on Earth. B.  
615 Würsig (ed.), *Ethology and Behavioral Ecology of Odontocetes*, in *Ethology and Behavioral Ecology of Marine*  
616 *Mammals*, Springer Nature Switzerland, 261-280. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16663-2\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16663-2_12)
- 617 Carpinelli, E., Gauffier, P., Verborgh, P., Airoidi, S., David, L., Di-Méglio, N., Cañadas, A., Frantzis, A., Rendell,  
618 L., Lewis, T. & Mussi, B. (2014) Assessing sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) movements within the  
619 western Mediterranean Sea through photo-identification. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*  
620 *Ecosystems* 24, 23-30.
- 621 Carroll, G., Hedley, S., Bannister, J., Ensor P. & Harcourt, R. (2014) No evidence for recovery in the population of  
622 sperm whale bulls off Western Australia, 30 years post-whaling. *Endangered Species Research*, 24, 33-43.  
623 <https://doi.org/10.3354/ESR00584>
- 624 Cecchetti, A., Stockin, K. A., Gordon, J., & Azevedo, J. (2019) A first assessment of operator compliance and  
625 dolphin behavioural responses during swim-with-dolphin programs for three species of Delphinids in the Azores  
626 Arquipélago. *Life and Marine Sciences*, 36, 23-37.
- 627 Clapham, P.J., Young, S.B. & Brownell, R.L. (1999) Baleen whales: conservation issues and the status of the most  
628 endangered populations. *Mammal Review*, 29, 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2907.1999.00035.x>
- 629 Constantine, R. (2001) Increased avoidance of swimmers by wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) due to  
630 long-term exposure to swim-with-dolphin tourism. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17, 689-702.
- 631 Delfour, F. (2007) Hawaiian spinner dolphins and the growing dolphin watching activity in Oahu. *Journal of the*  
632 *Marine Biological Association of the UK*, 87, 109–112.
- 633 de Stephanis, R., Giménez, J., Carpinelli, E., Gutierrez-Exposito, C., Cañadas, A. (2013) As main meal for sperm  
634 whales: Plastic debris. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 69, 206-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.01.033>
- 635 Dufault, S. & Whitehead, H. (1995) An assessment of changes with time in the marking patterns used for  
636 photoidentification of individual sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. *Marine Mammal Science*, 11, 335-343.  
637 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1995.tb00289.x>
- 638 Duhec, A.V., Jeanne, R.F., Maximenko, N. & Hafner, J. (2015) Composition and potential origin of marine debris  
639 stranded in the Western Indian Ocean on remote Alphonse Island, Seychelles. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 96, 76-  
640 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.05.042>
- 641 Ferrari, M., Glotin, H., Marxer, R., Barchasz, V., Sarano, V., Gies, V. et al. (2019) High-frequency near-field  
642 *Physeter macrocephalus* monitoring by stereo-autoencoder and 3d model of sonar organ. In *OCEANS 2019*,  
643 *IEEE*. Jun 2019, Marseille, France. hal-02313898.
- 644 Ferrari, M., Glotin, H., Oger, M., Marxer, R., Asch, M., Gies, V. & Sarano, F. (2020) 3D diarization of a sperm  
645 whale click cocktail party by an ultra-high sampling rate portable hydrophone array for assessing individual  
646 cetacean growth curves. *European Forum Acusticum*, Dec 2020, Lyon, France. hal-03078655
- 647 Filby, N. E., Stockin, K. A., & Scarpaci, C. (2014) Long-term responses of Burrnun dolphins (*Tursiops australis*)  
648 to swim-with dolphin tourism in Port Phillip Bay, Victoria, Australia: A population at risk. *Global Ecology and*  
649 *Conservation*, 2, 62-71.
- 650 Gero, S., Engelhaupt, D. & Whitehead, H. (2008) Heterogeneous associations within a sperm whale unit reflect  
651 pairwise relatedness. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 63, 143–151.
- 652 Gero, S., Engelhaupt, D., Rendell, L. & Whitehead, H. (2009) Who cares? Between-group variation in alloparental  
653 caregiving in sperm whales. *Behavioral Ecology*, 20, 838-843. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arp068>
- 654 Gero, S., Gordon, J. & Whitehead, H. (2013) Calves as social hub: dynamics of the social network within sperm  
655 whale units. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280, 20131113.

- 656 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1113>
- 657 Gero, S., Milligan, M., Rinaldi, C., Pernell, F., Gordon, J., Carlson, C. et al. (2014) Behavior and social structure of  
658 the sperm whales of Dominica, West Indies. *Marine Mammal Science*, 30, 905–922.  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mms.12086>
- 660 Gero, S. & Whitehead, H. (2016) Critical decline of the Eastern Caribbean sperm whale population. *PloS ONE*, 11,  
661 e0162019. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162019>
- 662 Glockner-Ferrari, D.A. & Ferrari, M.J. (1990) Reproduction in the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in  
663 Hawaiian waters, 1975-1988: the life history, reproductive rates, and behaviour of known individuals identified  
664 through surface and underwater photography. Report of the International Whaling Commission, Special Issue,  
665 12, 161-169.
- 666 Gomez-Salazar, C., Trujillo, F. & Whitehead, H. (2011) Photo-identification; a reliable and non-invasive tool for  
667 studying pink river dolphins (*Inia geoffrensis*) *Aquatic Mammals*, 37, 472-485.  
668 <https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.37.4.2011.472>
- 669 Gowans, S. & Whitehead, H. (2001) Photographic identification of northern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon*  
670 *ampullatus*): Sources of heterogeneity from natural marks. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17: 76-93.  
671 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2001.tb00981.x>
- 672 Hammond, P.S., Mizroch, S.A. & Donovan, G.P. (1990) Individual recognition of cetaceans: Use of photo-  
673 identification and other techniques to estimate population parameters. Report of the International Whaling  
674 Commission, Special Issue 12, 3-17.
- 675 Herzing, D.L. (1997) Underwater observations of benthic-feeding bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) near  
676 Grand Bahama Island, Bahamas. *Marine Mammal Science*, 13, 498-504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1997.tb00658.x>
- 678 Hillman, G.R., Würsig, B., Gailey, G.A., Kehtarnavaz, N., Drobyshevsky, A., Araabi, B.N. et al. (2010) Computer-  
679 assisted photo-identification of individual marine vertebrates: A multi-species system. *Aquatic Mammals*, 29,  
680 117-123.
- 681 Huele, R. & Udo de Haes, H. (1998) Identification of individual sperm whales by wavelet transform of the trailing  
682 edge of the flukes. *Marine Mammal Science*, 14, 143-145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1998.tb00697.x>
- 683 Huele, R. & Ciano, J.N. (1999) Using wavelet transforms to match photographs of individual sperm whales  
684 identified by the contour of the trailing edge of the fluke. In: Huijsmans D.P., Smeulders A.W.M. (eds) *Visual*  
685 *Information and Information Systems. VISUAL 1999. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 1614. Springer,  
686 Berlin, Heidelberg
- 687 Huijser, L.A., Estrade, V., Webster, I., Mouysset, L., Cadinouche, A. & Dulau-Drouot, V. (2020) Vocal repertoires  
688 and insights into social structure of sperm whales (*Physeter Macrocephalus*) in Mauritius, southwestern Indian  
689 Ocean. *Marine Mammal Science*, 36, 638-657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mms.12673>
- 690 Jacobsen, J. K., Massey, L. & Gulland, F. (2010) Fatal ingestion of floating net debris by two sperm whales  
691 (*Physeter macrocephalus*). *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 60, 765–767. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.03.008
- 692 Johnson, G., Frantzis, A., Johnson, C., Alexiadou, V., Ridgway, S. & Madsen, P.T. (2010) Evidence that sperm  
693 whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) calves suckle through their mouth. *Marine Mammal Science*, 26, 990–996.
- 694 Jung, J.-L. & Madon, B. (2021) Protection des mammifères marins face aux activités humaines et nouvelles  
695 connaissances issues des études de l'ADN, in Actes du colloque « Le transport maritime et la protection de la  
696 biodiversité », Brest, 12 et 13 décembre 2019. Nicolas Boillet & Betty Queffelec Eds, Edition Pedone, Paris  
697 France, In press [In French].
- 698 Kirkwood, G.P., Allen, K.R. & Bannister, J.L (1980) Revised abundance indices for sperm whales off Albany,  
699 Western Australia. Reports to the International Whaling Commission, Special issue 2, 89–91.
- 700 Kobayashi, H., Whitehead, H. & Amano, M. (2020) Long-term associations among male sperm whales (*Physeter*  
701 *macrocephalus*). *PLoS ONE*, 15, e0244204. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244204>
- 702 Laist, D.W., Knowlton, A.R., Mead, J.G., Collet, A.S. & Podesta, M. (2001) Collisions between ships and whales.  
703 *Marine Mammal Science*, 17, 35-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2001.tb00980.x>
- 704 Lavers, J.L., Dicks, L., Dicks, M.R. & Finger, A. (2019) Significant plastic accumulation on the Cocos (Keeling)  
705 Islands, Australia. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 7102. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-43375-4>
- 706 Levenson, J., Gero, S., Van Oast, J. & Holmberg, J. (2015) Flukebook: a cloud-based photo-identification analysis  
707 tools for marine mammal research. Available at: <https://www.flukebook.org> [Accessed 22 July 2020]
- 708 Louis, M., Buanic, M., Lefeuvre, C., Le Nilliot, P., Ridoux, V. & Spitz, J. (2017) Strong bonds and small home  
709 range in a resident bottlenose dolphin community in a marine protected area (Brittany, France, Northeast

- 710 Atlantic). *Marine Mammal Science*, 33, 1194-1203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mms.12419>
- 711 Marshall, A.D. & Holmberg, J. (2018) MantaMatcher Photo-identification Library Available at: <https://www.mantamatcher.org> [Accessed 22 July 2020]
- 712
- 713 Matthews, J.N., Steiner, L. & Gordon, J. (2001) Mark-recapture analysis of sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)  
714 photo-id data from the Azores (1987-1995). *Journal of Cetacean research and Management*, 3, 219-226.
- 715 Mizroch, S.A., Beard, J. & Lynde, M. (1990) Computer assisted photo-identification of humpback whales. Reports  
716 to the International Whaling Commission, Special issue 12, 63-70.
- 717 Möller, L.M., Beheregaray, L.B., Allen, S.J. & Harcourt, R.G. (2006) Association patterns and kinship in female  
718 Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) of southeastern Australia. *Behavioral Ecology and*  
719 *Sociobiology*, 61, 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-006-0241-x>
- 720 Moore, J.E. & Barlow, J.P. (2014) Improved abundance and trends estimates for sperm whales in the eastern North  
721 Pacific from Bayesian hierarchical modelling. *Endangered Species Research*, 25, 141-150.  
722 <https://doi.org/10.3354/ESR00633>
- 723 Pagel, C.D., Scheer, M., & Lück, M. (2017) Swim encounters with killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) off Northern  
724 Norway: interactive behaviours directed towards human divers and snorkelers obtained from opportunistic  
725 underwater video recordings. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 16, 190-200.
- 726 Peters, K.A., Parra, G.J., Skuza, P.P. & Möller, L.M. (2013) First insights into the effects of swim-with-dolphin  
727 tourism on the behavior, response and group structure of southern Australian bottlenose dolphins. *Marine*  
728 *Mammal Science*, 29, 484–497.
- 729 Pierce, S.J., Holmberg, J., Kock, A.A. & Marshall, A.D. (2018) Photographic identification of sharks. In *Shark*  
730 *research: Emerging technologies and applications for the field and laboratories*. Carrier JC, Heithaus MR,  
731 Simpfendorfer CA (eds.). CRC Press.
- 732 Reeves, R.R. & Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G. (2006) The status and distribution of cetaceans in the Black Sea and  
733 Mediterranean Sea. IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation, Malaga, Spain. [Accessed 22 July 2020]
- 734 Richter, C., Dawson, S. & Sooten, E. (2006) Impacts of commercial whale watching on male sperm whales at  
735 Kaikoura, New Zealand. *Marine Mammal Science*, 22, 46-63.
- 736 Richard, K.R., Dillon, M.C., Whitehead, H. & Wright, J.M. (1996) Patterns of kinship in groups of free-living sperm  
737 whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) revealed by multiple molecular genetic analyses. *Proceedings of the National*  
738 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 93, 8792–8795. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.16.8792>
- 739 Richard, G., Titova, O.V., Fedutin, I.D., Steel, D., Meschersky, I.G., Hautin, M. et al. (2018) Cultural transmission  
740 of fine-scale fidelity to feeding sites may shape humpback whale genetic diversity in Russian Pacific waters.  
741 *Journal of Heredity*, 109:724–734. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esy033>
- 742 Sarano, F., Girardet, J., Sarano, V., Vitry, H., Preud'homme, A., Heuzey, R., Garcia-Cegarra, A. M., Madon, B.,  
743 Delfour, F., Glotin, H., Adam, O., & Jung, J-L. (2021) Kin relationships in cultural species of the marine realm:  
744 case study of a matrilineal social group of sperm whales off Mauritius island, Indian Ocean. *Royal Society Open*  
745 *Science*, 8: 201794. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201794>
- 746 Scarpaci, C., Bigger, S.W., Corkeron, P.J. & Nugegoda, D. (2000). Bottlenose dolphins, (*Tursiops truncatus*),  
747 increase whistling in the presence of “swim-with-dolphin” tour operators. *Journal of Cetacean Research and*  
748 *Management*, 2, 183–186.
- 749 Sears, R., Williamson, J.M., Wenzel, F.W., Bérubé, M., Gendron, D. & Jones, P. (1990) Photographic identification  
750 of the blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada. Report of the International  
751 Whaling Commission, Special Issue 12, 335-342.
- 752 Taylor, B.L., Baird, R., Barlow, J., Dawson, S.M., Ford, J., Mead, J.G. et al. (2019) *Physeter macrocephalus*  
753 (amended version of 2008 assessment). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T41755A160983555.  
754 <https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T41755A160983555.en>.
- 755 Town, C., Marshall, A. & Sethasathien N. (2013) Manta Matcher: automated photographic identification of manta  
756 rays using keypoint features. *Ecology and Evolution* 3, 1902-1914.
- 757 Unger, B., Bravo Rebolledo, E.L., Deaville, R., Groñe, A., Ijsseldijk, L.L., Leopold, M.F. et al. (2016) Large  
758 amounts of plastic debris found in sperm whales stranded along the North Sea coast in early 2016. *Marine*  
759 *Pollution Bulletin*, 112, 134-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.08.027>
- 760 Van der Linde, M.L. & Eriksson, I.K. (2020) An assessment of sperm whale occurrence and social structure off Sao  
761 Miguel Island, Azores using fluke and dorsal identifications photographs. *Marine Mammal Science*, 36, 47-65.  
762 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mms.12617>
- 763 Verfuss, U.K., Aniceto, A.S., Harris, D.V., Gillespie, D., Fielding, S., Jiménez, G. et al. (2019) A review of

- 764 unmanned vehicles for the detection and monitoring of marine Fauna. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 140, 17-29.  
765 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.01.009>
- 766 White, R.J., Prentice, H.C. & Verwijst, T. (1988) Automated image acquisition and morphometric description.  
767 *Canadian Journal of Botany* 66, 450-459. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b88-070>
- 768 Whitehead, H. (1990) Computer assisted individual identification of sperm whale flukes. Report of the International  
769 Whaling Commission, Special Issue 12, 71-77.
- 770 Whitehead, H. (2002) Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales.  
771 *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 242: 295-304. <https://doi:10.3354/meps242295>
- 772 Whitehead, H. (2006) Direct estimation of within-group heterogeneity in photo-identification of sperm whales.  
773 *Marine Mammal Science*, 17, 718-728. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2001.tb01295.x>
- 774 Wursig, B. & Jefferson, T.A. (1990) Methods of photo-identification for small cetaceans. Reports of the  
775 International Whaling Commission, Special issue 12, 43-52
- 776



**Table 1: Number of days of field work**

The number of days of field work per year is indicated, as well as days with and without observation of sperm whales (in number of days and in percentage of days of field work). The protocol based on underwater observations was implemented in 2011 and standardized in 2015.

Years	2011-2014 field work				2015-2020 Field work						Total numbers of field work days and of observations	
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2011-2020	2015-2020
Numbers of days of field work	13d	5d	10d	12d	36d	40d	54d	70d	81d	36d	357d	317d
Days with no observations (numbers, percentage)	2	1	0	0	7d, 19.4%	6d, 15.0%	4d, 7.4%	6d, 8.6%	13d, 16.1%	15d, 41.7%	54d, 15.1%	51d, 16.1%
Days with observation of sperm whales (numbers, percentage)	11	4	10	12	29d, 80.6%	34d, 85%	50d, 92.6%	64d, 91.4%	68d, 83.9%	21d, 58.3%	303d, 84.9%	266d, 83.9%

**Table 2: Marks used to identify specifically all the individual sperm whales represented in this study**

A: Adult, I: Immature

Name	Sex	Age class	First obs	Last obs	Annual recap. since	Tail Fin					Pectoral fins		Dorsal fin	White marks	Other marks
						Shape	Left tip	Right tip	Left Lobe	Right lobe	Left	Right			
<b>Adélie</b>	F	A	2011-05-20	2020-03-19	2011	Convex	-	-	Wave	Wave	Wave	Scallops	Small nick	Pectoral, medium	-
<b>Aïko</b>	F	A	2008-09-25	2020-03-12	2011	Straight	-	Tip-missing	Wave	Scallops	-	2 Distinct nicks	-	Mandibular, large	-
<b>Caroline</b>	F	A	2012-10-06	2020-02-27	2012	Straight	-	<b>Tip-missing</b>	<b>Scallop</b>	Scallop	2 small nicks	-	Button	-	-
<b>Claire</b>	F	A	2011-05-17	2020-03-12	2014	Straight	-	-	Waves	Waves	<b>Wave</b>	<b>2 Spikes</b>	-	-	Body color very pale
<b>Déline</b>	F	A	2009-02-25	2019-04-29	2016	Straight	Missing portion	Tip-missing	Wave	Scallop	Tip-missing	-	White callus	-	-
<b>Delphine</b>	F	A	2011-05-11	2020-03-18	2011	Straight	Missing portion	Missing portion	Wave	Wave	Tip-missing	Tip-missing	-	Ventral, small	-
<b>Dos Calleux</b>	F	A	2008-05-12	2020-03-12	2015	Straight	-	-	<b>Small nick</b>	2 distinct nicks	-	2 small nicks	Small nick +Callosity lower part	-	-
<b>Emy</b>	F	A	2007-06-24	2020-03-19	2011	Convex	Missing portion	Tip-missing	Scallop	Waves	Wave	Missing portion	Callus+scallop	Mandibular, large	-
<b>Germine</b>	F	A	2009-06-13	2020-03-12	2011	Convex	-	-	Scallop	Distinct nicks	Missing portion	-	-	Ventral escutcheon	-
<b>Irène Gueule Tordue</b>	F	A	2009-01-18	2020-03-12	2011	Straight	Tip-missing	-	Distinct nick	Small nick	-	-	Callus	-	arched-shaped jaw

<b>Issa</b>	F	A	2009-02-25	2020-03-12	2013	Convex	Tip-missing	Tip-missing	<b>Spike</b>	<b>Distinct nick</b>	-	<b>1 Spike</b>	-	Ventral, medium; Genital, small	-
<b>Joue Blanche</b>	F	A	2009-01-27	2015-04-25	2011-2015	Convex	-	Tip-missing	<b>Small nick</b>	Wave + distinct nicks	-	-	-	Left cheek medium	-
<b>Lucy</b>	F	A	2009-06-13	2020-03-12	2011	Straight	-	5 Distinct nicks	<b>Wave</b>	Small nick	Small nick	-	Callus	Mandibular	Body color very dark
<b>Mina</b>	F	A	2009-06-13	2020-03-12	2011	Concave	-	Distinct nick	-	2 scallops	-	-	-	Mandibular <b>small</b>	-
<b>Mystère</b>	F	A	2011-06-22	2020-02-17	2015	Straight	Tip-missing	-	Wave	Distinct nicks	-	-	2 small nicks	Genital, small	<b>Scar, cheek</b>
<b>Swastee</b>	F	A	2011-03-24	2019-04-26	2016-2019	Straight	Tip-missing	Tip-missing	Wave + <b>spike</b>	Wave + Hole	-	-	Callus	-	Huge bulge on the nape
<b>Vanessa</b>	F	A	2012-01-12	2020-03-18	2014	Straight	Tip-missing	Tip-missing	<b>Scallop</b>	Wave	-	-	White callus	Ventral, medium	-
<b>Yukimi</b>	F	A	2011-03-14	2020-03-10	2015	Convex	Distinct <b>nicks</b>	Distinct nick	Wave	Wave	<b>2 Small nicks</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Agatha</b>	F	I	2014-03-24	2015-04-17	2014-2015	Straight	Tooth marks	Missing portion	- !	- !	-	-	-	-	Tooth marks, head
<b>Alexander</b>	M	I	2019-03-05	2020-03-18	2019	Straight	-	-	-	<b>2 Small nicks</b>	-	-	-	-	Scar, mandibular
<b>Ali</b>	M	I	2018-02-02	2020-03-12	2018	Straight	-	Tooth marks	-	-	-	-	-	Mandibular, white mark black mottled. <b>Caudal, white marks</b>	-
<b>Arthur</b>	M	I	2013-04-05	2020-03-12	2013	Straight	Missing portion	-	Distinct nick	Scallop	-	Distinct nick	Bear ear shaped	<b>Ventral escutcheon,</b>	-
<b>Baptiste</b>	M	I	2017-03-11	2017-03-24	2017-2017	Straight	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Back, medium	-

<b>Chesna</b>	F	I	2018-03-02	2020-03-18	2018	Straight	-	Missing portion	-	Tooth marks	-	Distinct nick	Furrow left side	-	-
<b>Daren</b>	M	I	2018-04-18	2020-03-12	2018	Straight	- !	-	<b>Hole</b>	-	-	-	Furrow left side	-	-
<b>Eliot</b>	M	I	2011-03-14	2020-03-19	2011	Straight	Small nick	Tooth marks	-	Small nick + thooth marks	-	-	-	<b>Ventral, escutcheon</b>	-
<b>Lana</b>	F	I	2019-02-21	2020-03-12	2019	Straight	-	-	-	-	-	-	Bear ear shaped	-	<b>Hole head</b>
<b>Maurice</b>	M	I	2011-03--	2016-02-24	2011-2016	Concave	-	-	Small nick	Wave	-	-	-	Genital, small	-
<b>Miss Tautou</b>	F	I	2016-02-24	2020-03-12	2016	Straight	Missing portion	-	-	-	-	<b>Scallop</b>	Tooth marks	Ventral, stripes	-
<b>Roméo</b>	M	I	2013-03-13	2020-03-12	2013	Straight	-	-	Small nick	Scallop	-	-	High + callus	-	-
<b>Tache Blanche</b>	M	I	2011-06--	2020-03-19	2011	Concave	-	-	Small nick	-	-	Small nick	-	Genital, medium	-
<b>Zoé</b>	F	I	2013-12-16	2020-03-18	2013	Concave	-	-	-	Hole	Distinct nick	2 distinct nicks	-	-	-
<b>Aman</b>	M	A	2018-07-18	2018-07-18	1 obs	Straight	Curled	Curled	Wave	Curled + waves	- !	-	-	Genital, Escutcheon	Back, stripes
<b>Anjhin</b>	M	A	2017-04-17	2017-05-05	2017-2017	Straight	Curled	Curled + Distinct nick	<b>Waves</b>	<b>Scallop</b>	-	-	White marks	Pectoral, stripes; Ventral, stripes; Escutcheon (ventral, genital, sides) large	-

<b>Jonas</b>	M	A	2018-07-18	2019-06-07	2018-2019	Straight	-	-	Wave	<b>Waves</b>	<b>Waves</b>	<b>Waves</b>	-	Pectoral, Large. Escutcheon (ventral, genital, sides) large	-
<b>Noé</b>	M	A	2018-04-16	2018-04-18	2018-2018	Straight	Curled	-	Wave + distinct nick	-	<b>Small nick</b>	- !	-	Genital, <b>medium</b>	-
<b>Reza</b>	M	A	2019-03-14	2019-03-28	2019-2019	Straight	-	-	-	Distinct nicks	-	<b>Waves</b>	-	Genital, large. Caudal, small	-
<b>Vasilily</b>	M	A	2018-07-02	2018-07-02	1 obs	Straight	Missing portion	Missing portion	Distinct nick	<b>Waves</b>	-	-	-	Escutcheon pectoral, large	-



**Table 3: Numbers of days of observation per individual and percentage of days of observation per individual and per number of days of field work with sperm whale observation**

**1st obs:** date of the first observation of each individual; **N:** number of days of observation of each individual per year; **%:** number of days of observation of each individual per number of days of field work with sperm whales observation; **Total 11-20:** total number of observations of the individual during 2011-2020 period; **Total 15-20:** total number of observations of the individual during 2015-2020 period. **Average:** average of % of observation per categories. For the missing individuals, days of last observations are indicated.

Adult females	1st OBS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		Total 2015-2020	Total 2011-2020
		N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Adélie	2011	4	0	4	3	11	0.38	13	0.38	22	0.44	20	0.31	24	0.35	5	0.24	95	106
Aïko	2008	3	1	4	2	13	0.45	14	0.41	12	0.24	16	0.25	26	0.38	8	0.38	89	99
Caroline	2012	0	1	3	1	3	0.10	12	0.35	18	0.36	18	0.28	18	0.26	4	0.19	73	78
Claire	2011	1	1	0	1	6	0.21	13	0.38	12	0.24	15	0.23	15	0.22	5	0.24	66	69
Déline	2009	3	0	1	1	3	0.10	8	0.24	8	0.16	6	0.09	1	0.01	0	0.00	26	31
Delphine	2011	3	1	4	4	9	0.31	18	0.53	29	0.58	35	0.55	19	0.28	4	0.19	114	126
Dos Calleux	2008	1	0	0	0	2	0.07	7	0.21	20	0.40	14	0.22	15	0.22	8	0.38	66	67
Emy	2007	5	2	1	1	7	0.24	16	0.47	21	0.42	22	0.34	19	0.28	3	0.14	88	97
Germine	2009	10	5	4	4	23	0.79	21	0.62	31	0.62	32	0.50	36	0.53	11	0.52	154	177
Irène	2009	9	3	3	5	9	0.31	24	0.71	30	0.60	26	0.41	38	0.56	9	0.43	136	156
Issa	2009	1	0	1	3	3	0.10	13	0.38	10	0.20	14	0.22	14	0.21	5	0.24	59	64
Lucy	2009	4	1	3	3	11	0.38	23	0.68	18	0.36	27	0.42	21	0.31	4	0.19	104	115
Mina	2009	2	0	1	3	5	0.17	13	0.38	16	0.32	31	0.48	18	0.26	3	0.14	86	92
Mystère	2011	3	1	0	2	6	0.21	8	0.24	11	0.22	21	0.33	17	0.25	2	0.10	65	71
Swastee	2011	1	0	0	1	3	0.10	2	0.06	6	0.12	4	0.06	6	0.09	0	0.00	21	23
Vanessa	2012	0	1	1	4	5	0.17	11	0.32	26	0.52	33	0.52	14	0.21	3	0.14	92	98
Yukimi	2011	3	0	1	1	1	0.03	12	0.35	5	0.10	17	0.27	30	0.44	3	0.14	68	73
<b>Averages</b>							<b>0.24</b>		<b>0.39</b>		<b>0.35</b>		<b>0.32</b>		<b>0.29</b>		<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.30</b>	
Immatures	1st OBS	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Alexander	2019													38	0.56	7	0.33	45	45
Ali	2018											47	0.73	45	0.66	11	0.52	103	103
Arthur	2013			3	6	21	0.72	29	0.85	30	0.60	41	0.64	43	0.63	11	0.52	175	184
Chesna	2018											39	0.61	31	0.46	6	0.29	76	76
Daren	2018											14	0.22	46	0.68	11	0.52	71	71
Eliot	2011	6	4	5	6	16	0.55	21	0.62	30	0.60	41	0.64	32	0.47	6	0.29	146	167
Lana	2019											43	0.63	6	0.29	49	49		
Miss Tautou	2016							25	0.74	34	0.68	35	0.55	44	0.65	11	0.52	149	149
Roméo	2013			2	5	19	0.66	28	0.82	24	0.48	35	0.55	41	0.60	8	0.38	155	162
Tache Blanche	2011	3	3	5	5	11	0.38	15	0.44	25	0.50	41	0.64	32	0.47	7	0.33	131	147
Zoé	2013			1	4	12	0.41	21	0.62	23	0.46	31	0.48	27	0.40	6	0.29	120	125
<b>Averages</b>							<b>0.54</b>		<b>0.68</b>		<b>0.55</b>		<b>0.56</b>		<b>0.56</b>		<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.55</b>	
Missing individuals	1st OBS	N	N	N	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	Last Obs							
Joue Blanche	2009	0	2	0	3	3	0.10	-	-	-	-	2015-04-25				3		8	
Agatha (Juv)	2014				5	13	0.45	-	-	-	-	2015-04-17				13		18	
Baptiste (Juv)	2017									9	0.18	2017-03-24				9		9	
Maurice (Juv)	2011	1	4	3	6	15	0.52	1	0.03	-	-	2016-02-24				16		29	