

[BIODIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION](#)

Mammalian lures monitored with time-lapse cameras increase detection of pythons and other snakes

Related research ▾

Share

[Research Article](#) [Conservation Biology](#) [Ecology](#)Marina McCampbell¹, McKayla Spencer², Kristen Hart³, Gabrielle Link¹, Andrew Watson¹, Robert McCleery¹✉

Published June 24, 2024

[Read the peer review reports](#)

July 12, 2024: **Minor Correction:** The author list of the following reference is incorrect: "Walkup DK, Ryberg WA, Pierce JB, Sieth E, Childress J, East F, Pierce BL, Brown P, Fielder CM, Hibbits TJ. 2024. Limitations of invasive snake control tools in the context of a new invasion on an island with abundant prey. *NeoBiota* 90:1-33". The correct reference is: "Siers, S.R., Nafus, M.G., Caloor, J.E., Volsteadt, R.M., Grassi, M.S., Volsteadt, M., Collins, A.F., Barnhart, P.D., Huse, L.T., Yackel Adams, A.A. and Vice, D.L., 2024. Limitations of invasive snake control tools in the context of a new invasion on an island with abundant prey. *NeoBiota* 90:1-33".

Author and article information

Abstract

Background

Enhancing detection of cryptic snakes is critical for the development of conservation and management strategies; yet, finding methods that provide adequate detection remains challenging. Issues with detecting snakes can be particularly problematic for some species, like the invasive Burmese python (*Python bivittatus*) in the Florida Everglades.

Methods

Using multiple survey methods, we predicted that our ability to detect pythons, larger snakes and all other snakes would be enhanced with the use of live mammalian lures (domesticated rabbits; *Oryctolagus cuniculus*). Specifically, we used visual surveys, python detection dogs, and time-lapse game cameras to determine if domesticated rabbits were an effective lure.

Results

Time-lapse game cameras detected almost 40 times more snakes ($n = 375$, treatment = 245, control = 130) than visual surveys ($n = 10$). We recorded 21 independent detections of pythons at treatment pens (with lures) and one detection at a control pen (without lures). In addition, we found larger snakes, and all other snakes were 165% and 74% more likely to be detected at treatment pens compared to control pens, respectively. Time-lapse cameras detected almost 40 times more snakes than visual surveys; we did not detect any pythons with python detection dogs.

Conclusions

Our study presents compelling evidence that the detection of snakes is improved by coupling live mammalian lures with time-lapse game cameras. Although the identification of smaller snake species was limited, this was due to pixel resolution, which could be improved by changing the camera focal length. For larger snakes with individually distinctive patterns, this method could potentially be used to identify unique individuals and thus allow researchers to estimate population dynamics.

Cite this as

McCampbell M, Spencer M, Hart K, Link G, Watson A, McCleery R. 2024. Mammalian lures monitored with time-lapse cameras increase detection of pythons and other



1 Total citation
1 Recent citation
n/a Field Citation Ratio
n/a Relative Citation Ratio

Enter your institution

To find colleagues at PeerJ

Enter to search

expertRxiv

Connecting research experts through ideas

[View opportunities](#)

Is there any relation between protein concentration, protein carbonyl content, and GST activity?

[View Question](#)[Download](#)[Content Alert](#)

Just enter your email

Tools & info

Peer Review history
Citations in Google Scholar
Ask questions
Add links
Visitors **1,166** [click for details](#)
Views **1,137**
Downloads **84**
[Report problem with article](#)

Outline

Introduction
Materials and Methods
Results
Discussion
Conclusions
Supplemental Information

PubMed [38938602](#)

▼ Main article text

Introduction

- Snakes are reclusive and cryptic, often using areas that are hard for humans to access (e.g., fossorial, arboreal, and aquatic; Turner, 1977; Parker & Plummer, 1987; Durso, Willson & Winne, 2011). These characteristics make them difficult to detect and study (Fitch, 1987; Dorcas & Willson, 2009; Halstead, Wylie & Casazza, 2013). Our inability to detect snakes can be particularly problematic for species of conservation concern and for some invasive species, which can cause considerable ecological damage (Wiles et al., 2003; Engeman et al., 2011; Mayol et al., 2012; Reed et al., 2012; Piquet et al., 2021).
- For both native and invasive snakes, there are two broad approaches used to find and capture them: actively searching (e.g., transects and road surveys (Rodda et al., 2007)) and passive aggregation (e.g., drift fence-traps, funnel traps and cover boards (Dorcas & Willson, 2009; Fitzgerald, 2012)). There are also a number of more specialized methods used to detect snakes, including infrared cameras (Avery et al., 2014; Neuharth et al., 2020), scent-detection dogs (Vice & Engeman, 2000), scout snakes (*i.e.* radio tagged snakes tracked to breeding aggregations; Smith et al., 2016), pheromone lures (Mason & Greene, 2001), and incentivized removal programs (e.g., rewards for snake removal; Guzy et al., 2023). However, identifying a method or combination of methods that provides adequate detection of many snake species remains challenging (Durso & Seigel, 2015; Clark, Clark & Siers, 2017; Maggs et al., 2019; Boback et al., 2020).
- Efforts to detect snakes by luring them to a specific area often consider how snakes perceive their environment and search for prey. Snakes rely on thermal cues, movement (visual and vibrations), and chemical cues sensed *via* olfaction (receptors in the nose; Byerly, Robinson & Vieyra, 2010) or vomeronasal organs (receptors on the roof of mouth; Byerly, Robinson & Vieyra, 2010) to find prey (De Cock Buning, 1983; Glaudas et al., 2019). Snakes generally target areas with a relative abundance of cues (Secor, 1995; Madsen & Shine, 1996; Tutterow et al., 2021), which can be manipulated to attract them. For example, decaying rodent carcasses and chemicals have been used to lure and capture brown tree snakes (*Boiga irregularis*; Savarie & Clark, 2006).
- One infrequently used approach to increase the detection and capture of snakes is live mammalian lures, often rodents. Mammals provide a combination of thermal, movement, and olfactory and/or vomeronasal cues (Askham, 1992; Rodda et al., 1992; Reed et al., 2011; Yackel Adams et al., 2019). Using them as lures has been shown to increase the capture of brown tree snakes (Rodda et al., 1992; Engeman & Vice, 2001), but was less effective than avian lures (Yackel Adams et al., 2019). Live rodents have also been tested for ambush hunters like Burmese pythons (*Python bivittatus*) (Emer et al., 2022) who aggregated near the traps rather than entering them (Reed et al., 2011). Consequently, the failure of some mammalian lures, may be due to trap avoidance rather than lack of attraction to the bait (Reed et al., 2011; Bartoszek et al., 2021). Accordingly, there may be potential for mammalian lures to increase snake detections without increasing live capture success.
- The need to increase the detection of snakes is particularly acute in the Greater Everglades Ecosystem (hereafter ‘the Everglades’) of Florida, USA, where detecting and removing invasive Burmese pythons is a conservation priority (Guzy et al., 2023). These very large snakes have played a direct role in the precipitous decline of the region’s mammals (Dorcas et al., 2012; McCleery et al., 2015; Sovie et al., 2016), which has dramatically altered food webs (Taillie et al., 2021; McCampbell et al., 2023) and host-parasite dynamics (Miller et al., 2018, 2020; Burkett-Cadena et al., 2021). There is also a need to find efficient an effective way to detect and monitor the native snakes in the Everglades and other systems

(Durso, Willson & Winne, 2011). While the specific detection rates of native snakes in the Everglades are not currently known, they are likely to be comparable to the community of snakes found in the freshwater wetlands of South Carolina, where detection probabilities range from 3–46% (Durso, Willson & Winne, 2011). In comparison, the probability of visually detecting a marked or telemetered Burmese python is <2% and the probability of detecting any python when present is <5% (Nafus, Mazzotti & Reed, 2020; Guzy et al., 2023). These reduced detection rates are a function of Burmese pythons' crypsis and use of aquatic environments (Dorcas et al., 2017; Hunter et al., 2019). However, recent research suggests that time-lapse cameras may increase these probabilities of detection (Cove et al., 2023).

- To determine if live mammalian lures could increase detection of differ types of snakes (*i.e.*, Burmese pythons, larger native snakes, and all snakes—including larger snakes—that are not pythons) in the Everglades, we conducted a controlled experiment. We coupled three detection methods (visual surveys, python-detection dogs, and time-lapse cameras) with domesticated rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) in secure, predator-proof pens (treatment pens) and paired control pens (pens with no rabbits) to test the efficacy of mammalian lures for snake detection. Due to the combined thermal, olfactory, and movement cues the rabbits provide, we predicted that live rabbit lures would increase detections of different categories of snakes and particularly larger snakes and Burmese pythons. We also predicted that time-lapse cameras would have the best chance of detecting larger snakes like Burmese pythons (Cove et al., 2023) and would be more cost effective than other methods. Finally, we predicted that python-detection dogs would detect more pythons than humans (Guzy et al., 2023).

Materials and Methods

Study area

- We conducted this study within the Everglades of South Florida, USA (Fig. 1) from 3 May to 1 August, 2021. The Everglades is the largest sawgrass prairie on the planet and contains critical habitat for endemic and endangered animals and plants (Lodge, 2016). We tested mammalian lures in two distinct areas of the system, the C-4 Impoundment (C-4) and the Frog Pond Public Small Game Hunting Area (Frog Pond), in Miami-Dade County, Florida, USA (Fig. 1). Both sites border agricultural lands and urban development as well as Everglades National Park. Rodents were common on both sites (McCampbell et al., 2023) and the probability of large mammal presence increases roughly across a north to south gradient across the study area (Taillie et al., 2021). Burmese pythons have regularly been removed from both sites and the surrounding areas (EDDMapS, 2021). No python removal activities occurred in our study area for the duration of this study.




Figure 1: Location of study sites and individual pens in South Florida, United States.

The study sites are represented by green dots and individual pens are represented by black dots. Paired pens located in Frog Pond site (bottom right) on the L-31W levee and pens in C-4 site (top right) located along the levee and one pair in the property interior.

- C-4 is a 168 ha block of wetland surrounded by levees near the northern edge of Everglades National Park (Fig. 1). This block is dominated by marl prairie interspersed with sawgrass (*Cladium jamaicense*), hardwood hammocks, wiregrass (*Aristida stricta*), pond apple (*Annona glabra*), soft rush (*Juncus effusus*), and swamp fern (*Blechnum serrulatum*). Frog Pond is a 2,106 ha strip of wetlands on the eastern side of Everglades National Park (Fig. 1). The accessible portion of this area was adjacent to a levee (L-31W) vegetated with Carolina willow (*Salix caroliniana*), soft rush, cattails (*Typha* spp.), poisonwood (*Metopium toxiferum*), gumbo limbo (*Bursera simaruba*), and sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*).

Snake community

- Twenty-six native snake species have been recorded in Everglades National Park, adjacent to our study site (Meshaka, Loftus & Steiner, 2000). Of these, four are venomous (eastern coral snake (*Micrurus fulvius*)), Florida cottonmouth (*Agkistrodon conanti*), dusky pygmy rattlesnake (*Sistrurus miliarius*), and eastern diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus adamanteus*). The most common native species include black racer (*Coluber constrictor*), rough green snake (*Ophedrys aestivus*), eastern rat snake (*Pantherophis alleghaniensis*), eastern corn snake (*P. guttatus*), southern ringneck snake (*Diadophis punctatus*), eastern garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*), brown watersnake (*Nerodia taxispilota*), peninsula ribbon snake (*T. saurita*), Florida brown snake (*Storeria victa*), and cottonmouth (Dalrymple et al., 1991). Snakes of conservation concern include the federally threatened eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon couperi*). In addition to the Burmese python, there have been at least three other invasive snakes (Northern African rock python (*Python sebae*), Brahminy blindsnake (*Ramphotyphlops braminus*), and boa constrictor (*Boa constrictor*) recorded within <50 km² of our study sites (EDDMapS, 2021). For this study we separated snakes into three categories, pythons, larger native snakes capable of eating mammals as large as rabbits, and all snakes—including larger snakes—that are not pythons (hereafter, 'pythons', 'larger snakes', 'other snakes'). We categorized eastern diamondback rattlesnakes, cottonmouths, brown watersnakes (*Nerodia taxispilota*), eastern indigo snakes, eastern rat snakes, eastern corn snakes, and Florida kingsnakes (*Lampropeltis getula*) as larger snakes with an increased probability of being attracted to larger mammalian lures (i.e., rabbits).

Study design


- To isolate the effects of a mammalian lure, we placed six paired treatments (i.e., treatments and controls) at the Frog Pond site and three paired treatments at the smaller C-4 site (Fig. 1). We cleared most vegetation within 2 m of each pen to facilitate the detection of snakes. We placed paired pens 95–105 m apart and randomly assigned treatments. Each pair of pens was separated by >405 m. Treatment and control pens were 1 m × 1.5 m and 0.7 m tall, constructed with a wood frame and ½-inch stainless-steel mesh to exclude snakes and other predators (Fig. 2). We obtained domesticated rabbits from Rivenzale Ridge rabbit breeders in Jacksonville, Florida, USA. We chose domestic rabbits as a lure because native marsh rabbits (*Sylvilagus palustris*) are common prey for many of the region's native and invasive snakes (Allen & Neill, 1950; Chapman & Willner, 1981; McCleery et al., 2015; Guzy et al., 2023) and radio-tracking of native marsh rabbits led to python and rattlesnake detections (McCleery et al., 2015). However, these native rabbits are now exceedingly rare in the southern portion of the Everglades (Sovie et al., 2016; Taillie et al., 2021) and domesticated rabbits provide a viable and readily available alternative. We placed two rabbits in each treatment pen, separated them with a wooden partition, and provided each rabbit with a wooden box for additional cover. We visited and inspected the rabbits daily. During our daily visit we replenished the rabbits' food and filled their two water receptacles. Once a week, we scored their body condition per our approved University of Florida Institute for Animal Care and Use Committee protocols (IACUC study #201910726).

Rabbits receiving a score of two (thin) or that appeared ill were to be brought to a local veterinarian for evaluation and treatment. If their score dropped below two (very thin), the rabbit was to be removed from the study and either treated or euthanized by a veterinarian. At the end of the study 14 of the 18 rabbits were adopted as pets and the other four were returned to the breeder.



Figure 2: Control pen (without rabbits) and game cameras.

Game cameras and pen set up at C-4 site. Photo courtesy of Marina McCampbell. 13 July 2021. Kendall, Florida.

 Download full-size image

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/fig-2](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/fig-2)

Game cameras

- To detect snakes, we placed two Reconyx HyperFire 2 Professional Covert IR cameras (Reconyx, Holmen, WI) approximately 2 m from each pen, aimed at the pens horizontally (Fig. 2). We deployed cameras on a continuous time-lapse of 1-min intervals for 90 days (3 May 2021–1 August 2021). Time-lapse can be used to detect reptiles that often do not emit enough heat to trigger camera sensors (Hobbs, Brehme & Crowther, 2017) or move enough to trigger camera motion sensors (Yackel Adams et al., 2019). We changed the memory cards and batteries in each camera once per week. We manually reviewed all images for snakes, identifying them to family and lower taxonomic levels when picture quality allowed. Using [digiKam \(2020\)](#), an open-source digital photo management application, we manually reviewed images at a rate of 5,000–7,000 photos per hour and tagged the snakes identified in the photos. Four observers independently each reviewed 60,000–80,000 images every week and removed photos without vertebrates present. All photos containing snakes were reviewed and organized by the lead author prior to analyses. Unknown snake species were reviewed by two professional herpetologists. We considered detections to be independent when at least 1 h separated detections of the same species at a pen (Sollmann, 2018; Neuharth et al., 2020). Additionally, we used [CamtrapR \(Niedballa et al., 2016\)](#) to extract the metadata (e.g., species, time, date, etc.) from the tagged photos and to determine the timing and length of visits from pythons, larger snakes, and other snakes. Our camera trapping protocols were approved by the University of Florida Institute for Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC study #201910726), and our cameras were placed in areas with restricted public access mitigating the need for additional ethics clearances.

Visual surveys

- In addition to time-lapse game cameras, we conducted visual surveys for pythons, larger snakes and other snakes at each pen 5 days per week. Starting at a different pen each day, we visually surveyed in concentric circles expanding every 2 m until we reached a 10 m radius from the pen. Searches lasted approximately 8 min per pen. To prevent overlap in searching with the python detection dog team (see below) we conducted searches in the morning and early afternoon (07:00–15:00). The same two observers conducted all visual surveys for the duration of the study to reduce observer bias. Both observers

were trained in snake identification by University of Florida and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission herpetologists.

Python-detection dog surveys

- We collaborated with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission python-detection dog team to conduct canine surveys for pythons. The team consisted of one handler, two dogs, and a biologist to record data and identify snakes. The dogs were trained to specifically detect Burmese pythons, first with towels from python enclosures, then with live pythons in bags at a training facility in the Everglades. The team started surveys at the pens and searched within a 40 m radius for 5 min. They searched each pen three times per week and started their searches at a different random pen each time. Surveys were conducted in the evening (18:00–20:15) when dogs and handlers could navigate by daylight and pythons were believed to be active (Whitney et al., 2021), potentially making them more likely to be near a lure.

Statistical analyses

- First, sample size permitting, we compared the number of snakes recorded using each method (*i.e.*, camera, python-detection dogs, and visual searches), by fitting a general linear model to a Poisson distribution using the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015). Next, we compared treatments (*i.e.*, rabbit lures and controls) across the different methods and categories of snakes (pythons, larger snakes, other snakes). For larger data sets (>50 detections) we used a generalized linear mixed model using the glmmTMB package (Brooks et al., 2017). We again used a Poisson distribution and considered each pair of pens as a grouping variable for the random effect. To estimate the predicted detections for treatment and control pens, we reported the incidence rate ratios (IRR; number of events per time) by exponentiating the model coefficients to determine the magnitude of difference in detection (“incidence”) of snakes between treatments (Hilbe, 2011). We interpreted IRRs as the probability of detecting snakes at treatment vs. control pens (Hilbe, 2011). IRRs close to or equal to 1 suggest no difference in detections between treatments. IRRs exceeding or less than 1 suggest an increased or decreased probability of detections for snakes at treatment pens. We evaluated the fit of our models by plotting residuals (DHARMA; Hartig, 2021). For smaller data sets (<50), to avoid overparameterizing, we used a Chi-square test of independence to determine if detections at treatment pens differed compared with control pens. Additionally, we used time-lapse camera data to evaluate the average amount of time that pythons, larger snakes and other snakes spent at each pen, we totaled the time snakes spent at pens, calculated the median, and compared differences between treatment and control pens using a Wilcoxon rank sum test to account for nonparametric data (Leon, 1998). All analyses were performed in program R (R Core Team, 2021, version 4.0.3) and graphics were created using ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016). Data and code are available from the Figshare repository (<https://figshare.com/s/63b9b4d9236c12fd4430>).

Costs per detection

- We estimated the cost per snake detection by category (*i.e.*, pythons, large snakes, and other snakes) for methods that detected snakes by dividing the costs (in USD) by the number of snakes detected. The expenses for each method included labor costs, mileage, and equipment and supplies. We calculated labor costs at \$15 per hour and used the University of Florida’s mileage rate (\$0.445 per mile) to calculate travel expenses. We did not include housing into our calculation, as the costs vary widely and are not commonly provided as part of an employee’s compensation.

Results

- We collected a total of 3,421,440 pictures from our cameras and recorded 5,307 pictures with snakes present. After filtering for independent detections, we recorded a total of 375 snakes from 12 species and four families (Table 1). Time-lapse game cameras detected almost 40 times more snakes ($n = 375$, treatment = 245, control = 130; Fig. 3) than visual surveys ($n = 10$). The most common other species detected

at pens were black racers ($n = 84$), eastern ratsnakes ($n = 33$) and Burmese pythons ($n = 22$; Table 1). Of the 22 Burmese python detections, 21 were observed at treatment pens with rabbits (Fig. 3). We completed 63 visual surveys and detection dog surveys per pen. Across the two sites and 18 rabbit pens, the python-detection dogs did not find a python, and our visual surveys only detected 10 snakes (non-python species; treatment = 8, control = 2; Table 1).

Table 1:
Classification of 375 snakes detected by cameras and 10 snakes detected by human search (in parentheses) by treatment (control-without rabbits and treatment-with rabbits) at the C-4 site and Frog Pond site from 3 May–1 August 2021.

Family	Scientific name	Common name	C-4		Frog pond	
			Control (n = 3)	Treatment (n = 3)	Control (n = 6)	Treatment (n = 6)
Pythonidae	<i>Python bivittatus</i>	Burmese python	0	14	1	7
Colubridae	<i>Coluber constrictor</i>	Black racer	7	6 (1)	37	34 (2)
Colubridae	<i>Nerodia taxispilota</i>	Brown watersnake	0	0	0	1
Colubridae	Unknown	Unknown colubridae	4	8	18 (1)	33 (1)
Elapidae	<i>Micrurus fulvius</i>	Coral snake	0	0	2	1
Colubridae	<i>Pantherophis guttatus</i>	Corn snake	1	3 (3)	2	7
Viperidae	<i>Agkistrodon conanti</i>	Cottonmouth	0	1	10	1
Viperidae	<i>Crotalus adamanteus</i>	Eastern diamondback rattlesnake	0	0	0	2
Colubridae	<i>Lampropeltis getula</i>	Florida kingsnake	1	0	0	0
Colubridae	<i>Nerodia fasciata pictiventris</i>	Florida banded watersnake	1	1	1	5
Colubridae	<i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i>	Garter snake	0	6	0	0
Colubridae	<i>Pantherophis alleghaniensis</i>	Eastern rat snake	1	15 (1)	2 (1)	15
Unknown	Unknown	Unknown snake	4	4	38	81
Total			19 (0)	58 (5)	111 (2)	187 (3)

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/table-1](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/table-1)





Figure 3: Independent detections of different categories of snake from time-lapse game cameras.

Detections are categorized by the type of snake (Burmese python = Python, large native mammal-eating snakes = Large, all non-pythons = Other) and pen treatment (Baited Treatment with rabbits = grey, Unbaited Control without rabbits = black). Field work was conducted in Greater Everglades Ecosystem from 3 May to 1 August 2021.

[Download full-size image](#)

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/fig-3](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/fig-3)

- Using a Chi-square test, due to a smaller sample size of pythons (<50), we found that pythons were significantly more likely to be detected by time-lapse cameras at treatment pens with live lures compared to control pens ($\chi^2 = 18.18$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). Pythons visited pens predominantly (>98% of pictures) from 21:00 to 8:45 h (Fig. 4) and stayed at treatment pens for a median of 20.0 min. Cameras at the control pen detected a single python present for 4 min. Time-lapse cameras at pens with rabbits were also 165% (IRR = 2.65, 95% CI [1.52–4.62]) more likely to detect larger snakes ($\beta = 0.973$, z -value = 3.42, $p < 0.001$), that spent more time at treatment pens ($W = 250$, $p < 0.036$), with a median of 8 min compared to a median of 2 min at control pens.




- Finally, timelapse-cameras at pens with rabbits were 74% (IRR = 1.74, 95% CI [1.40–2.16]) more likely to detect snakes other than pythons when compared to control pens ($\beta = 0.552$, z -value = 4.99, $p < 0.001$). Like larger snakes and pythons, other snakes spent significantly more time at treatment pens ($W = 10,575$, $p < 0.001$), with a median of 3 min compared to 1 min at control pens.
- We estimated the cost per snake detection by category (python, large, other) for both the methods that detected snakes, visual surveys and time-lapse cameras. The overall cost to conduct rabbit-lure camera surveys was \$55,242. These costs came from the labor needed to care for rabbits, monitor cameras, tag and organize photos, and drive to sites (\$17,565). Additional costs included pen construction (\$14,400), purchasing rabbits and rabbit supplies (\$2,721), cameras (\$15,260), batteries and digital storage (\$703), as well as mileage for travel to and from field sites (\$4,593). The total cost to conduct the visual surveys was \$30,954. The costs for this portion of the project included all rabbit related expenses and the labor needed to survey each pen five times per week (\$2,835). However, this portion of the project did not include the expenses of the cameras themselves nor the costs associated with storing and sorting images. For time-lapse cameras the cost per python (\$2,511), larger snakes (\$891) and other snakes (\$156) was considerably reduced when compared to the cost per detection for visual surveys (python = no detections; larger snakes = \$6,189; other snakes = \$3,095).

Discussion

- Our study presents compelling experimental evidence that live mammalian lures coupled with time-lapse cameras can improve the detection of snakes. This combination of methods increased overall snake detection by 74% at treatment pens compared to controls and greatly enhanced the detection of larger snakes and Burmese pythons. When detected by time-lapse cameras all three categories of snake spent more time at treatment than controls.
- Cameras are increasingly being used by researchers to detect squamates such as snakes and lizards (Welbourne et

al., 2017; Neuharth et al., 2020; Ryberg et al., 2021; Walkup et al., 2023), likely because of their ability to collect continuous data. This functionality can be especially useful for species that are active nocturnally, like Burmese pythons were in this study (Fig. 4). An additional advantage of time-lapse cameras is that they can provide some information on behaviors. For example, while it was not the focus of this study, we did find evidence of pythons actively investigating and climbing on pens with rabbits (Fig. 5).



- Python-detection dogs and visual surveys have had some limited success in other studies in the Everglades (Dorcas et al., 2017; Guzy et al., 2023), but we found that they were not as efficient and effective as time-lapse cameras at detecting snakes. Based on the activity periods of pythons in this study, it appears unlikely that pythons would have been actively seeking lures during the day light hours that were logistically feasible for python-detection dog and visual surveys. These approaches could possibly be more effective during the winter and spring when other research has suggested pythons are more active diurnally (Whitney et al., 2021; Cove et al., 2023). Another potential shortcoming of searching for snakes with humans and dogs in this region is that they may be constrained by seasonal flooding (Cablk et al., 2008), safety concerns (e.g., alligators, venomous snakes), and thick vegetation (Dorcas et al., 2017).
- While results clearly show the advantages of time-lapse cameras coupled with live mammalian lures, there were several constraints that limited the comparison of our different approaches to detecting snakes. First, each method searched different areas around the pens (cameras \approx 4 m, visual searches = 10 m, dogs = 40 m). Instead of focusing on a standard area, we chose to maximize what was logistically feasible and could be replicated by other researchers and managers given time, budgetary and safety constraints. For example, because detection dogs search areas more quickly than humans, we let them search a 40 m radius. Expanding visual searches to this area would have reduced the frequency of our sampling and expanding the cameras detection area to 40 m would have made the cost of cameras and picture sorting prohibitively expensive. Moreover, given that there were no detections by dogs and minimal detections from visual searches, there does not appear to be a need to adjust our data for standard, yet unrealistic sampling areas. Another issue that was difficult to avoid was temporal bias. Due to safety concerns and the terrain of our study sites, it was not advisable to have humans or dogs sampling at night. While visual searches would have likely been limited by low visibility, it is possible the dogs working under safe nocturnal conditions may have had a better chance of detecting snakes. Finally, because the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission python-detection dogs were only trained on pythons, we could not assess the ability of detection dogs to find snakes that were not pythons.

- While using time-lapse cameras was the most cost-effective method for detecting pythons and larger snakes, this approach is constrained by the manual detection of snakes in photographs. This shortcoming can likely be addressed with the implementation of automated photo sorting programs that are commonly used for camera trapping of mammals (e.g., [Swinnen et al., 2014](#); [Price Tack et al., 2016](#)). While most programs are optimized for detecting larger mammals, there are generalized Artificial Intelligence (AI) image processors such as Megadetector v5.0 ([Beery, Morris & Yang, 2019](#)) and others ([Bolon et al., 2022](#)) that have been trained with images of reptiles. These programs automatically detect photos with animals by estimating the change in pixels between time-lapse photos ([Swinnen et al., 2014](#)) and can reduce time spent reviewing photos. These methods are most effective when deployed in areas with homogenous backgrounds that do not interfere with pixel comparisons ([Swinnen et al., 2014](#)). Image processors can struggle to identify smaller snake species (<50 cm), but this shortcoming could likely be improved by reducing the camera focal length, standardizing backgrounds, and including a scale ([McCleery et al., 2014](#)). These improved efficiencies would likely only decrease cost by 6–8% in a onetime deployment; however, after the initial purchase of cameras and rabbit pens, automating photo processing could likely reduce the cost per detection by >30%, due to reduced labor costs.
- Like the collection and processing of images, finding alternatives to live lures would greatly reduce the cost and animal husbandry needs. There are several potential options for inanimate lures that might be able to attract snakes without the welfare and monetary constraints of live lures. Some snakes rely heavily on chemical cues ([Cooper, 1991](#)) to locate prey. Accordingly, scents derived from domestic rabbits in the form of feces, urine, and hair may provide a viable alternative to live lures. As an example, [Worthington-Hill, Yarnell & Gentle \(2014\)](#) found no difference between corn snakes' attraction to a live mouse lure and the scent from soiled mouse bedding. Snakes also sense and can be attracted to heat and its infrared radiation ([Gracheva et al., 2010](#); [Bakken et al., 2018](#)). Thus, it may be possible to attract snakes from heat sources that emit heat in the range of their prey ([Bakken et al., 2018](#)). Moving and vibrating prey replicas ([Worthington-Hill, Yarnell & Gentle, 2014](#)) may also attract snakes ([Haverly & Kardong, 1996](#)), as movement and vibrations ([Young & Morain, 2002](#)) are an important means for snakes to identify prey. Finally, there is some evidence that suggests prey cues from inanimate objects are more effective snake lures when they are used together ([Shivik, 1998](#)).
- Similar to the findings in this study, live and dead lures have been an effective method for attracting arboreal ([Rodda & Fritts, 1992](#); [Rodda et al., 1999](#)) and aquatic ([Keck, 1994](#); [Winne, 2005](#)) snakes. However, looking at the efficacy of live rodent lures to capture brown tree snakes, [Walkup et al. \(2024\)](#) suggested that lures maybe less effective when prey is more abundant. While it is possible that prey abundances might alter trap efficacy, rodents, the most common prey of the of Burmese python ([Guzy et al., 2023](#)) and larger snakes in our study, are still common at both our sites ([McCampbell et al., 2023](#)). Moreover, we detected more pythons at the northern extent of our study (i.e., C4) where more larger mammals have been detected ([Taillie et al., 2021](#)).

Conclusions

- We clearly show that the detection of larger snakes can be enhanced with mammalian lures and time-lapse cameras. Unfortunately, the use of cameras and manual review of images did not allow for the physical capture of snakes. However, it may be possible to adjust the current design to facilitate capture. Future designs should consider game cameras that are connected to cellular networks ([Nazir et al., 2017](#)) and notify researchers when they are triggered by pressure plates ([Swann, Kawanishi & Palmer, 2011](#)) or AI algorithms that isolate snakes or target species ([Staab et al., 2021](#); [Roy et al., 2023](#)). Alternatively, installing funnel traps with a one-way door (i.e., [Reed et al., 2011](#)) may provide an opportunity to capture snakes that regularly investigated rabbit pens ([Fig. 5](#)). Importantly, the inability to physically

capture snakes does not preclude the ability to conduct rigorous population studies. Machine learning programs have been trained to recognize unique coloration and spot patterns of individual snakes (Yang et al., 2013; Phon-Amnuaisuk, Au & Omar, 2016). Researchers could then potentially use capture-mark-recapture datasets to estimate population parameters of larger snakes and fill critical knowledge gaps to develop more effective conservation and management strategies.

Supplemental Information

Snake3 dataset.

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-1](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-1)

 Download

Timestamp Raw Data.

The only variable listed is Time. This represents the time a picture of a python was taken on a 24:00 time scale.

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-2](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-2)

 Download

Raw Data.

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-3](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-3)

 Download

Code.

DOI: [10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-4](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17577/supp-4)

 Download

Additional Information and Declarations

Competing Interests

McKayla M. Spencer is employed by Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and Kristen Hart is employed by United States Geological Survey.

Author Contributions

[Marina McCampbell](#) performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

[McKayla Spencer](#) analyzed the data, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

[Kristen Hart](#) conceived and designed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

[Gabrielle Link](#) performed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

[Andrew Watson](#) analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

[Robert McCleery](#) conceived and designed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

Animal Ethics

The following information was supplied relating to ethical approvals (*i.e.*, approving body and any reference numbers):

The University of Florida Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee approved the study (IACUC study #201910726).

Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

The code and datasets are available in the [Supplemental Files](#) and at figshare: McCleery, Robert (2024). Mammalian lures monitored with time-lapse cameras increases detections of pythons and other snakes. figshare. Dataset. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.25834828.v1>.

Funding

Funding for this project was provided by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (grant #13416-A3044) as well as the United States Geological Survey (grant #G19AC00432). The funders had no role in study design,

data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

- Allen ER, Neill WT. 1950. The life history of the Everglades rat snake, *Elaphe obsoleta rossalleni*. *Herpetologica* 6(5):109-112
- Askham LR. 1992. Rattlesnakes.
- Avery ML, Humphrey JS, Keacher KL, Bruce WE. 2014. Detection and removal of invasive burmese pythons: methods development update.
- Bakken GS, Schraft HA, Cattell RW, Tiu DB, Clark RW. 2018. Cooler snakes respond more strongly to infrared stimuli, but we have no idea why. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 221(17):jeb182121
- Bartoszek IA, Smith BJ, Reed RN, Hart KM. 2021. Spatial ecology of invasive Burmese pythons in southwestern Florida. *Ecosphere* 12(6):e03564
- Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1):48
- Beery S, Morris D, Yang S. 2019. Efficient pipeline for camera trap image review. *ArXiv e-prints*
- Boback SM, Nafus MG, Yackel Adams AA, Reed RN. 2020. Use of visual surveys and radiotelemetry reveals sources of detection bias for a cryptic snake at low densities. *Ecosphere* 11(1):e03000
- Bolon I, Picek L, Durso AM, Alcoba G, Chappuis F, Ruiz de Castañeda R. 2022. An artificial intelligence model to identify snakes from across the world: opportunities and challenges for global health and herpetology. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 16(8):e0010647
- Brooks ME, Kristensen K, Benthem KJ, van Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ, Mächler M, Bolker BM. 2017. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. *The R Journal* 9(2):378-400
- Burkett-Cadena ND, Blosser EM, Loggins AA, Valente MC, Long MT, Campbell LP, Reeves LE, Bargielowski I, McCleery RA. 2021. Invasive Burmese pythons alter host use and virus infection in the vector of a zoonotic virus. *Communications Biology* 4(1):1-11
- Byerly T, Robinson A, Vieyra M. 2010. Do snakes use olfactory receptors in the nose to detect odors?: a prediction based on the percentage of nonfunctional olfactory receptor genes amplified in four species of snakes. *Journal of the South Carolina Academy of Science* 8(1):5
- Cablík ME, Sagebiel JC, Heaton JS, Valentin C. 2008. Olfaction-based detection distance: a quantitative analysis of how far away dogs recognize tortoise odor and follow it to source. *Sensors* 8(4):2208-2222
- Chapman JA, Willner GR. 1981. *Sylvilagus palustris*. *Mammal Species* 153:1-3
- Clark L, Clark C, Siers S. 2017. Brown tree snakes: methods and approaches for control. In: Beasley JC, Witmer GW, Pitt WC, eds. *Ecology and Management of Terrestrial Vertebrate Invasive Species in the United States* (First Edition). Boca Raton: CRC Press. 107-134
- Cooper WE. 1991. Discrimination of integumentary prey chemicals and strike-induced chemosensory searching in the ball python, *Python regius*. *Journal of Ethology* 9(1):9-23
- Cove MV, Dixon J, King K, Willson M, Hart KM. 2023. Survey optimization for invasive Burmese pythons informed by camera traps. *Wildlife Letters* 1(3):143-148
- Dalrymple GH, Steiner TM, Nodell RJ, Bernardino FS. 1991. Seasonal activity of the snakes of long pine key, everglades national park. *Copeia* 1991(2):294-302
- De Cock Buning T. 1983. Thermal sensitivity as a specialization for prey capture and feeding in snakes. *American Zoologist* 23(2):363-375
- digiKam. 2020. Professional photo management with the power of open source. digiKam v7.6.0.
- Dorcas ME, Pittman SE, Willson JD, Pittman SE, Willson JD. 2017. Burmese Pythons. In: *Ecology and Management of Terrestrial Vertebrate Invasive Species in the United States*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Durso AM, Seigel RA. 2015. A snake in the hand is worth 10,000 in the bush. *Journal of Herpetology* 49:503-506
- Dorcas ME, Willson JD. 2009. Innovative methods for studies of snake ecology and conservation. In: Mullin SJ, Ong, Seigel RA, eds. *Snakes Ecology and Conservation*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press. 5-37
- Dorcas ME, Willson JD, Reed RN, Snow RW, Rochford MR, Miller MA, Meshaka WE, Andreadis PT, Mazzotti FJ, Romagosa CM +1 more. 2012. Severe mammal declines coincide with proliferation of invasive Burmese pythons in Everglades National Park. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109(7):2418-2422
- Durso AM, Willson JD, Winne CT. 2011. Needles in haystacks: estimating detection probability and occupancy of rare and cryptic snakes. *Biological Conservation* 144(5):1508-1515
- EDDMapS. 2021. Early Detection & Distribution Mapping System. The University of Georgia-Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health.
- Emer SA, Grace MS, Mora CV, Harvey MT. 2022. Pit organ-based infrared discrimination sensitivity and signal transduction in the

Burmese python (*Python molurus bivittatus*) *Behavioural Brain Research* **429**:1139-10

Engeman R, Jacobson E, Avery ML, Meshaka WE. 2011. The aggressive invasion of exotic reptiles in Florida with a focus on prominent species: a review. *Current Zoology* **57**(5):599-612

Engeman RM, Vice DS. 2001. Objectives and integrated approaches for the control of brown tree snakes. *Integrated Pest Management Reviews* **6**(1):59-76

Fitch HS. 1987. Collecting and life-history techniques. In: Seigel RA, Collins JT, Novak SS, eds. *Snakes: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology* (Second Edition). The Blackburn Press. 143-164

Fitzgerald LA. 2012. Finding and capturing reptiles. In: McDiarmid RW, Foster MS, Guyer C, Chernoff N, Gibbons JW, eds. *Reptile Biodiversity: Standard Methods for Inventory and Monitoring*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press. 77-88

Glaudas X, Glennon KL, Martins M, Luiselli L, Fearn S, Trembath DF, Jelić D, Alexander GJ, Lancaster L. 2019. Foraging mode, relative prey size and diet breadth: a phylogenetically explicit analysis of snake feeding ecology. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **88**(5):757-767

Gracheva EO, Ingolia NT, Kelly YM, Cordero-Morales JF, Holloper G, Chesler AT, Sánchez EE, Perez JC, Weissman JS, Julius D. 2010. Molecular basis of infrared detection by snakes. *Nature* **464**(7291):1006-1011

Guzy JC, Falk BG, Smith BJ, Willson JD, Reed RN, Aumen NG, Avery ML, Bartoszek IA, Campbell E, Cherkiss MS +27 more. 2023. Burmese pythons in Florida: a synthesis of biology, impacts, and management tools. *NeoBiota* **80**:1-119

Halstead B, Wylie G, Casazza M. 2013. Efficacy of trap modifications for increasing capture rates of aquatic snakes in floating aquatic funnel traps. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology* **8**1:65-74

Hartig F. 2021. DHARMA: residual diagnostics for hierarchical (Multi-Level /Mixed) regression models. R package version 0.4.4.

Haverly JE, Kardong KV. 1996. Sensory deprivation effects on the predatory behavior of the rattlesnake, *Crotalus viridis oreganus*. *Copeia* **1996**:419-428

Hilbe JM. 2011. *Negative Binomial Regression*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hobbs MT, Brehme CS, Crowther MS. 2017. An improved camera trap for amphibians, reptiles, small mammals, and large invertebrates. *PLOS ONE* **12**(10):e0185026

Hunter ME, Meigs-Friend G, Ferrante JA, Smith BJ, Hart KM. 2019. Efficacy of eDNA as an early detection indicator for Burmese pythons in the ARM Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge in the greater Everglades ecosystem. *Ecological Indicators* **102**:617-622

Keck MB. 1994. A new technique for sampling semi-aquatic snake populations. *Herpetological Natural History* **2**:101-103

Leon AC. 1998. Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. In: Bellack AS, Hersen M, eds. *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology*. Oxford: Pergamon. 243-285

Lodge TE. 2016. *The Everglades Handbook: Understanding the Ecosystem* (Fourth Edition). Florida, US: CRC Press.

Madsen T, Shine R. 1996. Seasonal migration of predators and prey - A study of pythons and rats in tropical Australia. *Ecology* **77**(1):149-156

Maggs G, Nicoll M, Zuel N, Murrell D, Ewen J, Tatayah V, Jones C, Norris K. 2019. Bridging the research-management gap: using knowledge exchange and stakeholder engagement to aid decision-making in invasive rat management. In: Veitch CR, Clout NM, Martin AR, Russell CJ, eds. *Island Invasives: Scaling up to Meet the Challenge, Proceedings of the International Conference on Island Invasive 2017*. Gland, Switzerland: Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission N° 62. 31-36

Mason RT, Greene MJ. 2001. Invading Pest Species and the Threat to Biodiversity: Pheromonal Control of Guam Brown Tree Snakes, *Boiga irregularis*. In: Marchlewska-Koj A, Lepri JJ, Müller-Schwarze D, eds. *Chemical Signals in Vertebrates 9*. US: Springer. 361-368

Mayol J, McMinn M, Rodriguez A, Domenech O, Oliver J. 2012. Sa Dragonera, la mayor isla Mediterranea (posiblemente) libre de roedores. *Quercus* **314**:27-33

McCleery ME, Hunter ME, Stechly JV, Leist KN, Hart K, McCleery RA. 2023. Compensatory mortality explains rodent resilience to an invasive predator. *Journal of Mammalogy* **104**(5):967-978

McCleery RA, Sovie A, Reed RN, Cunningham MW, Hunter ME, Hart KM. 2015. Marsh rabbit mortalities tie pythons to the precipitous decline of mammals in the Everglades. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **282**(1805):20150120

McCleery RA, Zweig CL, Desa MA, Hunt R, Kitchens WM, Percival HF. 2014. A novel method for camera-trapping small mammals. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* **38**(4):887-891

Meshaka WE, Loftus WF, Steiner T. 2000. The herpetofauna of everglades national park. *Florida Scientist* **63**(2):84-103

Miller MA, Kinsella JM, Snow RW, Falk BG, Reed RN, Goetz SM, Mazzotti FJ, Guyer C, Romagosa CM. 2020. Highly competent native snake hosts extend the range of an introduced parasite beyond its invasive Burmese python host. *Ecosphere* **11**(6):e03153

Miller MA, Kinsella JM, Snow RW, Hayes MM, Falk BG, Reed RN, Mazzotti FJ, Guyer C, Romagosa CM. 2018. Parasite spillover: indirect effects of invasive Burmese pythons. *Ecology and Evolution* **8**(2):830-840

Nafus MG, Mazzotti FJ, Reed RN. 2020. Estimating detection probability for Burmese pythons with few detections and zero recaptures. *Journal of Herpetology* 54(1):24-30

Nazir S, Newey S, Irvine RJ, Verdicchio F, Davidson P, Fairhurst G, Ré van der W, Song H. 2017. WiseEye: next generation expandable and programmable camera trap platform for wildlife research. *PLOS ONE* 12(1):e0169758

Neuharth DB, Ryberg WA, Adams CS, Hibbitts TJ, Walkup DK, Frizzell SL, Johnson TE, Pierce BL, Pierce JB, Rudolph DC. 2020. Searching for rare and secretive snakes: are camera-trap and box-trap methods interchangeable? *Wildlife Research* 47(6):476

Niedballa J, Sollmann R, Courtiol A, Wilting A. 2016. camtrapR: an R package for efficient camera trap data management. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 7(12):1457-1462

Parker WS, Plummer MV. 1987. *Population ecology*. In: Seigel RA, Collins JT, Novak SS, eds. *Snakes: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology*. New York, US: McGraw-Hill. 253-301

Phon-Amnuaisuk S, Au TW, Omar S. 2016. *Computational intelligence in information systems*.

Piquet JC, Warren DL, Saavedra Bolaños JF, Sánchez Rivero JM, Gallo-Barneto R, Cabrera-Pérez MÁ, Fisher RN, Fisher SR, Rochester CJ, Hinds B +2 more. 2021. Could climate change benefit invasive snakes? Modelling the potential distribution of the California Kingsnake in the Canary Islands. *Journal of Environmental Management* 294:112917

Price Tack JL, West BS, McGowan CP, Ditchkoff SS, Reeves SJ, Keever AC, Grand JB. 2016. AnimalFinder: a semi-automated system for animal detection in time-lapse camera trap images. *Ecological Informatics* 36:145-151

R Core Team. 2021. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria

Reed RN, Hart KM, Rodda GH, Mazzotti FJ, Snow RW, Cherkiss M, Rozar R, Goetz S. 2011. A field test of attractant traps for invasive Burmese pythons (*Python molurus bivittatus*) in southern Florida. *Wildlife Research* 38(2):114-121

Reed RN, Willson JD, Rodda GH, Dorcas ME. 2012. Ecological correlates of invasion impact for Burmese pythons in Florida. *Integrative Zoology* 7(3):254-270

Rodda GH, Fritts TH. 1992. Sampling techniques for an arboreal snake, *Boiga irregularis*. *Micronesica* 25(1):23-40

Rodda GH, Fritts TH, Clark CS, Gotte SW, Chiszar D. 1999. A state of the art trap for the brown tree snake. In: Rodda G, Sawai Y, Chiszar D, Tanalea H, eds. *Problem Snake Management: The Habu and the Brown Tree Snake*. NY: Cornell University Press. 268-284

Rodda GH, Rondeau RJ, Fritts TH, Maughan OE. 1992. Trapping the arboreal snake *Boiga irregularis*. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 13(1):47-56

Rodda GH, Savidge JA, Tyrrell CL, Christy MT, Ellingson AR. 2007. Size bias in visual searches and trapping of brown treesnakes on Guam. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 71(2):656-661

Roy AM, Bhaduri J, Kumar T, Raj K. 2023. WillDect-YOLO: an efficient and robust computer vision-based accurate object localization model for automated endangered wildlife detection. *Ecological Informatics* 75(3):101919

Ryberg WA, Walkup DK, Hibbitts TJ, Pittman W, Porter VH, Bowers BC, Fielder CM, Brown P, Lopez RR. 2021. Effective camera trap snake surveys at a rarely accessible longleaf pine savanna. *Herpetological Review* 52(4):719-724

Savarie PJ, Clark L. 2006. Evaluation of bait matrices and chemical lure attractants for brown tree snakes.

Secor SM. 1995. Ecological aspects of foraging mode for the snakes *Crotalus cerastes* and *Masticophis flagellum*. *Herpetological Monographs* 9:169-186

Shivik JA. 1998. Brown tree snake response to visual and olfactory cues. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:105-111

Smith BJ, Cherkiss MS, Hart KM, Rochford MR, Selby TH, Snow RW, Mazzotti FJ. 2016. Betrayal: radio-tagged Burmese pythons reveal locations of conspecifics in Everglades National Park. *Biological Invasions* 18(11):3239-3250

Sollmann R. 2018. A gentle introduction to camera-trap data analysis. *African Journal of Ecology* 56(4):740-749

Sovie AR, McCleery RA, Fletcher RJ, Hart KM. 2016. Invasive pythons, not anthropogenic stressors, explain the distribution of a keystone species. *Biological Invasions* 18(11):3309-3318

Staab J, Udas E, Mayer M, Taubenböck H, Job H. 2021. Comparing established visitor monitoring approaches with triggered trail camera images and machine learning based computer vision. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 35(2):100387

Swann DE, Kawanishi K, Palmer J. 2011. Evaluating types and features of camera traps in ecological studies: a guide for researchers. In: O'Connell AF, Nichols JD, Karanth KU, eds. *Camera Traps in Animal Ecology: Methods and Analyses*. New York: Springer. 27-43

Swinnen KRR, Reijniers J, Breno M, Leirs H. 2014. A novel method to reduce time investment when processing videos from camera trap studies. *PLOS ONE* 9(6):e98881

Taillie PJ, Hart KM, Sovie AR, McCleery RA. 2021. Native mammals lack resilience to invasive generalist predator. *Biological Conservation* 261(1928):109290

Turner FB. 1977. The dynamics of populations of squamates and crocodylians. In: Gans C, Tinkle DW, eds. *Biology of the Reptilia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Academic Press. 157-264

Tutterow AM, Hoffman AS, Buffington JL, Truelock ZT, Peterman WE. 2021. [Prey-driven behavioral habitat use in a low-energy ambush predator](#). *Ecology and Evolution* 11(22):15601-15621

Vice DS, Engeman R. 2000. [Brown tree snake discoveries during detector dog inspections following supertyphoon paka](#). *Micronesica* 33:105-110

Walkup DK, Ryberg WA, Pierce JB, Smith E, Childress J, East F, Hibbitts TJ. 2023. [Testing the detection of large, secretive snakes using camera traps](#). *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 47(1):e1408

Walkup DK, Ryberg WA, Pierce JB, Sioto E, Childress J, East F, Pierce BL, Brown P, Fielder CM, Hibbitts TJ. 2024. [Limitations of invasive snake control tools in the context of a new invasion on an island with abundant prey](#). *NeoBiota* 90:1-33

Welbourne DJ, Paull DJ, Claridge AW, Ford F, Rowcliffe M, De Angelo C. 2017. [A frontier in the use of camera traps: surveying terrestrial squamate assemblages](#). *Ecology and Conservation* 3(3):133-145

Whitney NM, White CF, Smith BJ, Cherkiss MS, Mazzotti FJ, Hart KM. 2021. [Accelerometry to study fine-scale activity of invasive Burmese pythons \(*Python bivittatus*\) in the wild](#). *Animal Biotelemetry* 9(1):355

Wickham H. 2016. [ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis](#). New York City: Springer-Verlag New.

Wiles GJ, Bart J, Beck RE, Aguon CF. 2003. [Impacts of the brown tree snake: patterns of decline and species persistence in guam's avifauna](#). *Conservation Biology* 17(5):1350-1360

Winne CT. 2005. [Increases in capture rates of an aquatic snake \(*Seminatrix pygaea*\) using naturally baited minnow traps: evidence for aquatic funnel trapping as a measure of foraging activity](#). *Herpetological Review* 36(4):411

Worthington-Hill J, Yarnell R, Gentle L. 2014. [Eliciting a predatory response in the eastern corn snake \(*Pantherophis guttatus*\) using live and inanimate sensory stimuli: implications for managing invasive populations](#). *International Journal of Pest Management* 60(3):180-186

Yang D, Chen S, Chen Y, Yan Y. 2013. [Using head patch pattern as a reliable biometric character for noninvasive individual recognition of an endangered pitviper *Protobothrops mangshanensis*](#). *Asian Herpetological Research* 4:134-139

Yackel Adams AA, Nafus MG, Klug PE, Lardner B, Mazurek MJ, Savidge JA, Reed RN. 2019. [Contact rates with nesting birds before and after invasive snake removal: estimating the effects of trap-based control](#). *NeoBiota* 49:1-17

Young BA, Morain M. 2002. [The use of ground-borne vibrations for prey localization in the Saharan sand vipers \(*Cerastes*\)](#) *Journal of Experimental Biology* 205(5):661-665

Related research

Evaluating the utility of camera traps in field studies of predation

Christopher K. Akcali, PeerJ, 2019

A unique symbiosis between farmers and brown hyenas

Katy Williams, Farmer's Weekly, 2018

Comparison of hoop-net trapping and visual surveys to monitor abundance of the Rio Grande cooter (*Pseudemys gorzugi*)

Ivana Mali, PeerJ, 2018

Problem animal control must be based on evidence : farming for tomorrow

Roelof Bezuidenhout, Farmer's Weekly, 2015

Animal reactivity to camera traps and its effects on abundance estimate using distance sampling in the Tai National Park, Côte d'Ivoire

Noël Adiko Houa, PeerJ, 2022

Low-tech solution for predation : farming for tomorrow

Pieter Dempsey, Farmer's Weekly, 2016

Recommended survey designs for occupancy modelling using motion-activated cameras: insights from empirical wildlife data

Graeme Shannon, Jesse S. Lewis, Brian D. Gerber, PeerJ, 2014

How technology is making monitoring animal health easier

Farmer's Weekly, 2023

An Acoustic Beacon to Reduce the By-catch of Cetaceans in Fishing Nets

D. Newborough, Underwater Technology, 2000

The value of citizen science for ecological monitoring of mammals

Arielle Waldstein Parsons, PeerJ, 2018

Powered by **TREND MD**



Questions

Links

+ Ask a question

[Learn more about Q&A](#)

About us - [PeerJ team](#) | [Our publications](#) | [Benefits](#) | [Partnerships](#) | [Endorsements](#) | [Awards](#)

Academic boards - [Advisors](#) | [Editors](#) | [Subject areas](#)

Submission guides - [PeerJ – Life and Environment](#) | [PeerJ Computer Science](#) | [PeerJ Chemistry](#)

Resources - [FAQ](#) | [Careers](#) | [Press room](#) | [Terms of use](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Credits](#) | [Contact](#)

Follow us - [PeerJ blog](#) | [X](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Pinterest](#)

Spread the word - [Activities](#) | [Resources](#)

PeerJ feeds ↻ - [Atom](#) | [RSS 1.0](#) | [RSS 2.0](#) | [JSON](#)

PeerJ Computer Science feeds ↻ - [Atom](#) | [RSS 1.0](#) | [RSS 2.0](#) | [JSON](#)

Archives - [PeerJ – Life and Environment](#) | [PeerJ Computer Science](#)