International Journal of Research and Review Techniques (IJRRT), ISSN: 3006-1075
Volume 4, Issue 3, July-September, 2025, Available online at: https://ijrrt.com

Acoustic Ecology in Marine Sanctuaries: Quantifying Anthropogenic Noise Impact on Cetacean Communication Patterns

Dr. Freja Møller

Marine Research Scientist, Department of Bioscience and Ocean Engineering, Aarhus University, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Marine sanctuaries play a vital role in conserving cetacean populations and maintaining the ecological balance of marine ecosystems. However, increasing anthropogenic underwater noise generated by commercial shipping, recreational boating, offshore construction, seismic surveys, and naval activities has emerged as a significant environmental threat to marine mammals. Cetaceans, including whales, dolphins, and porpoises, depend heavily on acoustic communication for navigation, social interaction, feeding coordination, mating, and predator detection. The increasing intensity and frequency of human-generated underwater sounds can interfere with these essential acoustic functions, potentially altering communication patterns, behavioral responses, and habitat utilization. This study examines the relationship between anthropogenic noise pollution and cetacean communication patterns within marine sanctuaries through an acoustic ecology framework. It proposes an integrated methodological approach combining passive acoustic monitoring (PAM), hydrophone arrays, soundscape analysis, machine learning algorithms, and statistical modeling to quantify underwater noise exposure and evaluate its effects on cetacean vocal behavior.

Key acoustic indicators, including vocalization frequency, call duration, signal-to-noise ratio, communication range, call rates, and temporal vocal activity, are considered for assessing communication disruption. The proposed framework also investigates behavioral adaptations such as vocal adjustments, reduced calling activity, changes in calling frequency, and spatial displacement in response to elevated noise levels. Furthermore, comparative assessments of naturally quiet and noise-affected sanctuary zones can provide insights into the effectiveness of existing marine conservation measures. The study highlights the importance of establishing underwater acoustic thresholds, implementing noise management strategies, regulating vessel traffic, and developing acoustically protected marine habitats. The findings are expected to contribute to evidence-based marine conservation policies and strengthen the integration of acoustic ecology into sanctuary management. Ultimately, protecting the underwater soundscape is essential for preserving cetacean communication, supporting biodiversity, and ensuring the long-term ecological sustainability of marine sanctuaries.

Keywords: Acoustic Ecology, Anthropogenic Underwater Noise, Cetacean Communication, Passive Acoustic Monitoring, Marine Sanctuaries.

INTRODUCTION

Marine ecosystems are among the most complex and biologically diverse environments on Earth, supporting a wide range of organisms that depend on ecological interactions for their survival. Among these organisms, cetaceans, including whales, dolphins, and porpoises, occupy an important position in marine food webs and contribute significantly to ecosystem stability. Unlike many terrestrial mammals, cetaceans rely extensively on sound as their primary sensory and communication mechanism because underwater visibility is often limited. Acoustic signals enable them to perform essential biological activities, including navigation, prey detection, social coordination, reproduction, maternal communication, and predator avoidance. Consequently, the natural underwater soundscape plays a fundamental role in maintaining cetacean behavior, population connectivity, and ecological balance.

In recent decades, increasing human activities in marine environments have significantly altered natural underwater acoustic conditions. Anthropogenic noise originates from several sources, including commercial shipping, fishing vessels, recreational boating, offshore oil and gas exploration, seismic surveys, military sonar, underwater construction, and coastal industrial development. These activities generate sounds across different frequency ranges and intensities, potentially overlapping with the acoustic frequencies used by cetaceans for communication and environmental perception. Continuous low-frequency noise from large vessels, for example, can interfere with the communication signals of certain whale species, while high-intensity impulsive sounds from seismic exploration and construction activities may produce temporary or permanent auditory effects. Such disturbances can reduce communication efficiency and alter the natural acoustic characteristics of marine habitats.

PROPOSED MODELS AND METHODOLOGIES

2.1 Research Framework

The proposed research develops an integrated acoustic ecology framework to quantify the influence of anthropogenic underwater noise on cetacean communication patterns within marine sanctuaries. The framework combines underwater acoustic monitoring, biological vocalization analysis, machine learning, soundscape characterization, and statistical modeling. Its primary objective is to establish measurable relationships between human-generated underwater noise and changes in cetacean acoustic behavior.

The research framework consists of five interconnected stages:

1. Underwater Acoustic Data Collection: Recording underwater sound using hydrophones and passive acoustic monitoring systems.
2. Noise Source Identification: Identifying and classifying anthropogenic noise from shipping, boating, construction, seismic surveys, and other activities.
3. Cetacean Vocalization Detection: Detecting and classifying whistles, clicks, songs, and other communication signals.
4. Impact Assessment: Evaluating changes in vocalization frequency, duration, amplitude, calling rates, and signal-to-noise ratios.
5. Predictive Modeling: Applying machine learning and statistical techniques to estimate the relationship between noise exposure and communication disruption.

2.2 Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) Model

Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) is proposed as the primary data acquisition technique for continuously recording underwater sound without physically disturbing marine organisms.

Hydrophones will be strategically deployed across selected marine sanctuary locations, including:

- Low-noise reference zones.
- Areas experiencing moderate vessel activity.
- High-noise shipping corridors.
- Important cetacean feeding and breeding habitats.

The collected acoustic signals will be analyzed to identify biological sounds and anthropogenic noise sources.
The sound pressure level can be expressed as:

$$SPL=20\log_{10}\left(\frac{P_{rms}}{P_{ref}}\right)$$

Where:

- P_{rms} = Root mean square sound pressure.
- P_{ref} = Reference sound pressure in water (1 µPa).
- SPL = Sound pressure level in decibels.

This model provides a standardized approach for comparing underwater noise intensity across different sanctuary locations.

RESULTS & ANALYSIS

3.1 Overview of Research Findings

The proposed research framework examines the influence of anthropogenic underwater noise on cetacean communication patterns within marine sanctuaries. By integrating passive acoustic monitoring (PAM), hydrophone recordings, soundscape analysis, machine learning, and statistical modeling, the study aims to identify relationships between underwater noise exposure and changes in cetacean vocal behavior.

The analysis focuses on major indicators, including underwater sound pressure levels, vocalization frequency, call duration, signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), communication activity, and temporal variations in acoustic behavior.
The expected findings suggest that increasing anthropogenic noise may reduce acoustic communication efficiency, particularly in areas experiencing intensive commercial shipping, recreational boating, and offshore construction activities.

Note: The following results are illustrative research-model outcomes, not experimentally observed measurements. Actual values must be established through field data collection and statistical validation.

3.2 Analysis of Anthropogenic Underwater Noise Levels

Anthropogenic noise intensity is expected to vary considerably across different marine sanctuary zones depending on vessel density, industrial activities, and environmental conditions.

The comparative assessment considers three categories of marine environments: low-noise zones, moderate-noise zones, and high-noise zones.

Marine Zone	Illustrative Noise Level (dB re 1 µPa)	Dominant Noise Source	Expected Impact
Low-noise zone	95	Natural environmental sounds	Minimal acoustic interference
Moderate-noise zone	115	Recreational vessels	Moderate communication masking
High-noise zone	135	Commercial shipping	High communication interference

The illustrative comparison indicates that areas with intensive vessel activity may experience substantially elevated underwater noise levels. Such increases can reduce the effective detection range of cetacean vocalizations and interfere with acoustic interactions.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN TABULAR FORM

The comparative analysis evaluates the influence of anthropogenic underwater noise on cetacean communication patterns across different marine sanctuary environments. It compares acoustic exposure levels, communication characteristics, noise detection techniques, machine learning models, and conservation approaches. The analysis aims to identify the effectiveness of different methodologies in understanding and mitigating underwater acoustic disturbances.

4.1 Comparative Analysis of Anthropogenic Noise Sources

Noise Source	Frequency Characteristics	Impact on Cetaceans	Potential Risk
Commercial Shipping	Predominantly low-frequency	Acoustic masking and communication interference	Very High
Recreational Boating	Low- to mid-frequency	Disturbance of social communication	Moderate
Seismic Surveys	Broadband impulsive sounds	Behavioral disturbance and potential auditory effects	Very High
Offshore Construction	Broadband and impulsive sounds	Disruption of communication and habitat use	High
Military Sonar	Mid- to high-frequency	Potential behavioral and auditory disturbance	High
Fishing Activities	Variable frequency	Localized acoustic interference	Moderate

4.2 Comparative Analysis of Cetacean Communication Patterns

Communication Parameter	Low-Noise Environment	Moderate-Noise Environment	High-Noise Environment
Vocalization detection	High	Moderate	Low
Signal-to-noise ratio	High	Medium	Low
Calling activity	Relatively stable	Potentially modified	Potentially suppressed or altered
Communication distance	Relatively long	Reduced	Significantly reduced
Vocalization frequency	Natural variation	Possible adjustment	Possible adjustment
Call duration	Relatively stable	Possible modification	Possible modification
Acoustic masking	Minimal	Moderate	Severe

4.3 Comparative Analysis of Machine Learning Techniques

Machine Learning Model	Primary Function	Major Advantages	Limitations
Random Forest	Noise classification	Robust and interpretable	Limited temporal modeling
Support Vector Machine	Acoustic signal classification	Effective with smaller datasets	Computationally intensive for large datasets
CNN	Spectrogram classification	Extracts complex acoustic features	Requires sufficient labeled data
LSTM	Temporal vocalization analysis	Captures sequential patterns	Training can be time-consuming
Gradient Boosting	Noise impact prediction	Strong predictive performance	Requires careful parameter tuning

CONCLUSION

The present study, titled "Acoustic Ecology in Marine Sanctuaries: Quantifying Anthropogenic Noise Impact on Cetacean Communication Patterns," highlights the growing importance of underwater soundscape preservation in marine biodiversity conservation. Cetaceans, including whales, dolphins, and porpoises, depend extensively on acoustic communication for navigation, feeding, reproduction, social interaction, and survival. However, increasing anthropogenic underwater noise generated by commercial shipping, recreational boating, offshore construction, seismic surveys, and industrial activities poses significant challenges to their natural communication systems.

The proposed research establishes an integrated acoustic ecology framework combining Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM), hydrophone-based data collection, digital signal processing, machine learning, and statistical modeling to evaluate the relationship between underwater noise exposure and cetacean vocalization patterns. Important acoustic indicators, including sound pressure levels, vocalization frequency, call duration, signal-to-noise ratio, calling rates, and communication detection ranges, provide a quantitative foundation for assessing potential acoustic disturbances.
The proposed analytical approach demonstrates how increasing underwater noise may contribute to acoustic masking, modifications in vocalization characteristics, reduced communication opportunities, and changes in habitat utilization. Machine learning techniques, particularly Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, offer promising opportunities for identifying cetacean vocalizations, classifying anthropogenic noise sources, and analyzing temporal variations in underwater acoustic environments. However, their practical effectiveness requires validation using reliable field recordings and species-specific datasets.

The study also emphasizes that conventional marine sanctuary management should extend beyond the protection of physical habitats to include the preservation of natural underwater soundscapes. Implementing acoustic quiet zones, regulating vessel speeds, controlling offshore construction noise, and establishing continuous underwater monitoring networks can contribute to reducing acoustic disturbances in ecologically sensitive marine habitats.

REFERENCES

1. André, M., van der Schaar, M., Zaugg, S., Houégnigan, L., Sánchez, A. M., & Castell, J. V. (2011). Listening to the deep: Live monitoring of ocean noise and cetacean acoustic signals. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 63(1–4), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.04.038
2. Clark, C. W., Ellison, W. T., Southall, B. L., Hatch, L., Van Parijs, S. M., Frankel, A., & Ponirakis, D. (2009). Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: Intuitions, analysis, and implication. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395, 201–222. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08402
3. Duarte, C. M., Chapuis, L., Collin, S. P., Costa, D. P., Devassy, R. P., Eguiluz, V. M., Erbe, C., Gordon, T. A. C., Halpern, B. S., Harding, H. R., Havlik, M. N., Meekan, M., Merchant, N. D., Miksis-Olds, J. L., Parsons, M., Predragovic, M., Radford, A. N., Radford, C. A., Simpson, S. D., & Slabbekoorn, H. (2021). The soundscape of the Anthropocene ocean. Science, 371(6529), eaba4658. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba4658
4. Erbe, C., Reichmuth, C., Cunningham, K., Lucke, K., & Dooling, R. (2016). Communication masking in marine mammals: A review and research strategy. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 103(1–2), 15–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.007
5. Gibb, R., Browning, E., Glover-Kapfer, P., & Jones, K. E. (2019). Emerging opportunities and challenges for passive acoustics in ecological assessment and monitoring. Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 10(2), 169–185. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13101
6. Guan, S., & Brookens, T. (2023). An overview of research efforts to understand the effects of underwater sound on cetaceans. Water Biology and Security, 2(2), Article 100141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watbs.2023.100141

7. Hatch, L. T., Clark, C. W., Van Parijs, S. M., Frankel, A. S., & Ponirakis, D. W. (2012). Quantifying loss of acoustic communication space for right whales in and around a US National Marine Sanctuary. Conservation Biology, 26(6), 983–994. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2012.01908.x
8. Hildebrand, J. A. (2009). Anthropogenic and natural sources of ambient noise in the ocean. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395, 5–20. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08353
9. Jensen, F. H., Bejder, L., Wahlberg, M., Aguilar Soto, N., Johnson, M., & Madsen, P. T. (2009). Vessel noise effects on delphinid communication. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395, 161–175. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08204
10. Liu, M., Dong, L., Lin, M., & Li, S. (2017). Broadband ship noise and its potential impacts on Indo-Pacific humpback dolphins: Implications for conservation and management. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 142(5), 2766. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.5009444
11. Matthews, L. P., & Parks, S. E. (2021). An overview of North Atlantic right whale acoustic behavior, hearing capabilities, and responses to sound. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 173, Article 113043. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.113043
12. McDonald, M. A., Hildebrand, J. A., & Wiggins, S. M. (2006). Increases in deep ocean ambient noise in the Northeast Pacific west of San Nicolas Island, California. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 120(2), 711–718. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2216565
13. Melcón, M. L., Cummins, A. J., Kerosky, S. M., Roche, L. K., Wiggins, S. M., & Hildebrand, J. A. (2012). Blue whales respond to anthropogenic noise. PLOS ONE, 7(2), Article e32681. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032681
14. Mellinger, D. K., Stafford, K. M., Moore, S. E., Dziak, R. P., & Matsumoto, H. (2007). An overview of fixed passive acoustic observation methods for cetaceans. Oceanography, 20(4), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2007.03
15. Nowacek, D. P., Thorne, L. H., Johnston, D. W., & Tyack, P. L. (2007). Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. Mammal Review, 37(2), 81–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2007.00104.x
16. Parks, S. E., Clark, C. W., & Tyack, P. L. (2007). Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: The potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122(6), 3725–3731. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2799907
17. Putland, R. L., Merchant, N. D., Farcas, A., & Radford, C. A. (2018). Vessel noise cuts down communication space for vocalizing fish and marine mammals. Global Change Biology, 24(4), 1708–1721. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13996
18. Richardson, W. J., Greene, C. R., Jr., Malme, C. I., & Thomson, D. H. (1995). Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press.
19. Southall, B. L., Bowles, A. E., Ellison, W. T., Finneran, J. J., Gentry, R. L., Greene, C. R., Jr., Kastak, D., Ketten, D. R., Miller, J. H., Nachtigall, P. E., Richardson, W. J., Thomas, J. A., & Tyack, P. L. (2007). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals, 33(4), 411–521. https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.33.4.2007.411
20. Southall, B. L., Finneran, J. J., Reichmuth, C., Nachtigall, P. E., Ketten, D. R., Bowles, A. E., Ellison, W. T., Nowacek, D. P., & Tyack, P. L. (2019). Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Updated scientific recommendations for residual hearing effects. Aquatic Mammals, 45(2), 125–232. https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.45.2.2019.125