

# Guidelines for the supervised learning of species interactions

Timothée Poisot<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Montréal   <sup>2</sup> Québec Centre for Biodiversity Sciences

## Correspondance to:

Timothée Poisot — [timothee.poisot@umontreal.ca](mailto:timothee.poisot@umontreal.ca)

This work is released by its authors under a CC-BY 4.0 license



Last revision: *December 12, 2021*

1. The prediction of species interaction networks is gaining momentum as a way to circumvent limitations in data volume. Yet, ecological networks are challenging to predict because they are typically small and sparse. Dealing with extreme class imbalance is a challenge for most binary classifiers, and there are currently no guidelines as to how predictive models can be trained.
2. Using simple mathematical arguments and numerical experiments in which a variety of classifiers (for supervised learning) are trained on simulated networks, we develop a series of guidelines related to the choice of measures to use for model selection, and the degree of unbiasing to apply to the training dataset.
3. Classifier accuracy and the ROC-AUC are not informative measures for the performance of interaction prediction. PR-AUC is a fairer assessment of performance. In some cases, even standard measures can lead to selecting a more biased classifier because the effect of connectance is strong. The amount of correction to apply to the training dataset depends as a function of the classifier and the network connectance.
4. These results reveal that training machines to predict networks is a challenging task, and that in virtually all cases, the composition of the training set needs to be experimented on before performing the actual training. We discuss these consequences in the context of the low volume of data.

- example on diagnostic test: rare events are hard to detect even with really good models
- summary of model challenges for networks
- Strydom et al. (2021) importance of drawing on traits + validation is challenging + comparing across space

Binary classifiers are usually assessed by measuring properties of their confusion matrix, *i.e.* the contingency table reporting true/false positive/negative hits. A confusion matrix is laid out as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{tp} & \text{fp} \\ \text{fn} & \text{tn} \end{pmatrix},$$

wherein tp is the number of interactions predicted as positive, tn is the number of non-interactions predicted as negative, fp is the number of non-interactions predicted as positive, and fn is the number of interactions predicted as negative. Almost all measures based on the confusion matrix express rates of error or success as proportions, and therefore the values of these components matter in a *relative* way. At a coarse scale, a classifier is *accurate* when the trace of the matrix divided by the sum of the matrix is close to 1, with other measures focusing on different ways in which the classifier is wrong.

The same approach is used to evaluate *e.g.* species distribution models (SDMs). Indeed, the training and evaluation of SDMs as binary classifiers suffers from the same issue of low prevalence. In a previous work, Allouche et al. (2006) suggested that  $\kappa$  was a better test of model performance than the True Skill Statistic (TSS), which we will refer to as Youden's informedness (or  $J$ ); these conclusions were later criticized by Somodi et al. (2017), who emphasized that informedness' relationship to prevalence depends on assumptions about bias in the model, and therefore recommend the use of  $\kappa$  as a validation of classification performance. Although this work offers recommendations about the comparison of models, it doesn't establish baselines or good practices for training on imbalanced ecological data. Within the context of networks, there are three specific issues that need to be addressed. First, what values of performance measures are we expecting for a classifier that has poor performance? This is particularly important as it can evaluate whether low prevalence can lull us into a false sense of predictive accuracy. Second, independently of the question of model evaluation, is low prevalence an issue for *training*, and can we remedy it? Finally, because the low amount of data on interaction makes a lot of imbalance correction methods (see *e.g.* Branco et al., 2015) hard to apply, which indicators can be optimized with the

27 least amount of positive interaction data?

28 In addition to the literature on SDMs, most of the research on machine learning application to life  
29 sciences is focused on genomics (which has very specific challenges, see a recent discussion by Whalen et  
30 al., 2021); this sub-field has generated largely different recommendations. Chicco & Jurman (2020)  
31 suggest using Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) over  $F_1$ , as a protection against over-inflation of  
32 predicted results; Delgado & Tibau (2019) advocate against the use of Cohen's  $\kappa$ , again in favor of MCC, as  
33 the relative nature of  $\kappa$  means that a worse classifier can be picked over a better one; similarly, Boughorbel  
34 et al. (2017) recommend MCC over other measures of performance for imbalanced data, as it has more  
35 desirable statistical properties. More recently, Chicco et al. (2021) temper the apparent supremacy of the  
36 MCC, by suggesting it should be replaced by Youden's informedness (also known as  $J$ , bookmaker's  
37 accuracy, and the True-Skill Statistic) when the imbalance in the dataset may not be representative  
38 (Jordano, 2016a, which is the case as networks are under-sampled; 2016b), when classifiers need to be  
39 compared across different datasets (for example when predicting a system in space, where undersampling  
40 varies locally; McLeod et al., 2021), and when comparing the results to a no-skill (baseline) classifier is  
41 important. As these conditions are likely to be met with network data, there is a need to evaluate which  
42 measures of classification accuracy respond in a desirable way.

43 A lot of binary classifiers are built by using a regressor (whose task is to guess the value of the interaction,  
44 and can therefore return somethings considered to be a pseudo-probability); in this case, the optimal value  
45 below which predictions are assumed to be negative (*i.e.* the interaction does not exist) can be determined  
46 by picking a threshold maximizing some value on the ROC curve or the PR curve. The area under these  
47 curves (ROC-AUC and PR-AUC henceforth) give ideas on the overall goodness of the classifier. Saito &  
48 Rehmsmeier (2015) established that the ROC-AUC is biased towards over-estimating performance for  
49 imbalanced data; on the contrary, the PR-AUC is able to identify classifiers that are less able to detect  
50 positive interactions correctly, with the additional advantage of having a baseline value equal to  
51 prevalence. Therefore, it is important to assess whether these two measures return different results when  
52 applied to ecological network prediction.

53 We establish that due to the low prevalence of interactions, even poor classifiers applied to food web data  
54 will reach a high accuracy; this is because the measure is dominated by the accidental correct predictions  
55 of negatives. The  $F_1$  score and positive predictive values are less sensitive to bias, but **TODO**

## 56 Baseline values

57 Intro

## 58 Definition of the performance measures

59  $\kappa$

60  $F_\beta$

61 informedness

62 MCC

## 63 Confusion matrix with skill and bias

64 In this section, we will assume a network of connectance  $\rho$ , *i.e.* having  $\rho S^2$  interactions (where  $S$  is the  
65 species richness), and  $(1 - \rho)S^2$  non-interactions. Therefore, the vector describing the *true* state of the  
66 network is a column vector  $\mathbf{o}^T = [\rho(1 - \rho)]$  (we can safely drop the  $S^2$  terms, as we will work on the  
67 confusion matrix, which ends up expressing *relative* values).

68 In order to write the values of the confusion matrix for a hypothetical classifier, we need to define two  
69 characteristics: its skill, and its bias. Skill, here, refers to the propensity of the classifier to get the correct  
70 answer (*i.e.* to assign interactions where they are, and to not assign them where they are not). A no-skill  
71 classifier guesses at random, *i.e.* it will guess interactions with a probability  $\rho$ . The predictions of a no-skill  
72 classifier can be expressed as a row vector  $\mathbf{p} = [\rho(1 - \rho)]$ . The confusion matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  for a no-skill classifier  
73 is given by the element-wise product of these vectors  $\mathbf{o} \odot \mathbf{p}$ , *i.e.*

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho^2 & \rho(1 - \rho) \\ (1 - \rho)\rho & (1 - \rho)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

74 In order to regulate the skill of this classifier, we can define a skill matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  with diagonal elements equal  
75 to  $s$ , and off-diagonal elements equal to  $(1 - s)$ , and re-express the skill-adjusted confusion matrix as  
76  $\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{S}$ , *i.e.*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho^2 & \rho(1-\rho) \\ (1-\rho)\rho & (1-\rho)^2 \end{pmatrix} \odot \begin{pmatrix} s & (1-s) \\ (1-s) & s \end{pmatrix}.$$

77 Note that when  $s = 0$ ,  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{M}) = 0$  (the classifier is *always* wrong), when  $s = 0.5$ , the classifier is no-skill  
78 and guesses at random, and when  $s = 1$ , the classifier is perfect.

79 The second element we can adjust in this hypothetical classifier is its bias, specifically its tendency to  
80 over-predict interactions. Like above, we can do so by defining a bias matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ , where interactions are  
81 over-predicted with probability  $b$ , and express the final classifier confusion matrix as  $\mathbf{M} \odot \mathbf{S} \odot \mathbf{B}$ , *i.e.*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho^2 & \rho(1-\rho) \\ (1-\rho)\rho & (1-\rho)^2 \end{pmatrix} \odot \begin{pmatrix} s & (1-s) \\ (1-s) & s \end{pmatrix} \odot \begin{pmatrix} b & b \\ (1-b) & (1-b) \end{pmatrix}.$$

82 The final expression for the confusion matrix in which we can regulate the skill and the bias is

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} s \times b \times \rho^2 & (1-s) \times b \times \rho(1-\rho) \\ (1-s) \times (1-b) \times (1-\rho)\rho & s \times (1-b) \times (1-\rho)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

83 In all further simulations, the confusion matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  is transformed so that it sums to 1.

## 84 **What are the baseline values of performance measures?**

85 In this section, we will change the values of  $b$ ,  $s$ , and  $\rho$ , and report how the main measures discussed in  
86 the introduction (MCC,  $F_1$ ,  $\kappa$ , and informedness) are responding to issues with the classifier. Before we do  
87 so, it is important to explain why we will not focus on accuracy too much. Accuracy is the number of  
88 correct predictions ( $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{C})$ ) divided by the sum of the confusion matrix. For a no-skill, no-bias classifier,  
89 accuracy is equal to  $\rho^2 + (1-\rho)^2$ ; for  $\rho = 0.05$ , this is  $\approx 0.90$ , and for  $\rho = 0.01$ , this is equal to  $\approx 0.98$ . In  
90 other words, the values of accuracy are expected to be so high that they are not really informative (this is  
91 simply explained by the fact that for  $\rho$  small,  $\rho^2 \ll (1-\rho)^2$ ). More concerning is the fact that introducing  
92 bias changes the response of accuracy in unexpected ways. Assuming a no-skill classifier, the numerator  
93 of accuracy becomes  $b\rho^2 + (1-b)(1-\rho)^2$ , which increases when  $b$  is low, which specifically means that at  
94 equal skill, a classifier that under-predicts interactions will have higher accuracy than an un-biased

classifier. These issues are absent from balanced accuracy, but should nevertheless lead us to not report accuracy as the primary measure of network prediction success; moving forward, we will focus on other measures.

In order to examine how MCC,  $F_1$ ,  $\kappa$ , and informedness change w.r.t. the imbalance, skill, and bias, we performed a grid exploration of the values of  $\text{logit}(s)$  and  $\text{logit}(b)$  linearly from  $-10$  to  $10$ , of  $\rho$  linearly in  $[0, 0.5]$ , which is within the range of usually observed connectance values for empirical food webs. Note that at this point, there is no food web model to speak of; rather, the confusion matrix we discuss can be obtained for any classification task. Based on the previous discussion, the desirable properties for a measure of classifier success should be: an increase with classifier skill, especially at low bias; a hump-shaped response to bias, especially at high skill, and ideally center around  $\text{logit}(b) = 0$ ; an increase with prevalence up until equiprevalence is reached.

[Figure 1 about here.]

In fig. 1, we show that none of the four measures satisfy all the considerations at once:  $F_1$  increases with skill, and increases monotonously with bias; this is because  $F_1$  does not account for true negatives, and the increase in positive detection masks the over-prediction of interactions. Informedness varies with skill, reaching 0 for a no-skill classifier, but is entirely unsensitive to bias. Both MCC and  $\kappa$  have the same behavior, whereby they increase with skill.  $\kappa$  peaks at increasing values of bias for increasing skill, *i.e.* is likely to lead to the selection of a classifier that over-predicts interactions. By contract, MCC peaks at the same value, regardless of skill, but this value is not  $\text{logit}(b) = 0$ : unless at very high classifier skill, MCC risks leading to a model that over-predicts interactions. In fig. 2, we show that all measures except  $F_1$  give a value of 0 for a no-skill classifier, and are forced towards their correct maximal value when skill changes (*i.e.* a more connected networks will have higher values for a skilled classifier, and lower values for a classifier making mostly mistakes).

[Figure 2 about here.]

These two analyses point to the following recommendations: MCC is indeed more appropriate than  $\kappa$ , as although sensitive to bias, it is sensitive in a consistent way. Informedness is appropriate at discriminating between different skills, but confounded by bias.  $F_1$  is increasing with bias, and should not be prioritized

122 to evaluate the performance of the model. The discussion of sensitivity to bias should come with a  
123 domain-specific caveat: although it is likely that interactions documented in ecological networks are  
124 correct, a lot of non-interactions are simply unobserved; as predictive models are used for data-inflation  
125 (*i.e.* the prediction of new interactions), it is not necessarily a bad thing to select models that predict more  
126 interactions than the original dataset, because the original dataset misses some interactions.

## 127 Numerical experiments

128 In the following section, we will generate random networks, and train four binary classifiers (as well as an  
129 ensemble model using the sum of the outputs) on 30% of the interaction data. Networks are generated by  
130 picking random generality  $g$  and vulnerability  $v$  traits for  $S = 200$  species uniformly on the unit interval,  
131 and assigning an interaction from species  $i$  to species  $j$  if  $0.2g_i - \xi \leq v_j \leq 0.2g_i + \xi$ , where  $\xi$  is a constant  
132 regulating the connectance of the networks, and varies uniformly in  $[5 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-1}]$ . This model gives  
133 fully interval networks that are close analogues to the niche model (Williams & Martinez, 2000), but has  
134 the benefit of only relying on two features  $(g_i, v_j)$ , and having the exact same rule for all interactions. It is,  
135 therefore, a simple case which most classifiers should be able to learn.

136 The training sample is composed of 30% of the  $4 \times 10^4$  possible entries in the network, *i.e.*  $n = 12000$ . Out  
137 of these interactions, we pick a proportion  $\nu$  (the training set bias) to be positive, so that the training set  
138 has  $\nu n$  interactions, and  $(1 - \nu)n$  non-interactions. We vary  $\nu$  uniformly in  $]0, 1[$ . This allows to evaluate  
139 how the measures of binary classification performance respond to artificially rebalanced dataset for a  
140 given network connectance. Note that both  $\xi$  and  $\nu$  are sampled from a distribution rather than being  
141 picked on a grid; this is because there is no direct relationship between the value of  $\xi$  and the connectance  
142 of the simulated network, and therefore the precise value of  $\xi$  is not relevant for the analysis of the results.

143 The dataset used for numerical experiments is composed of 20000 such  $(\xi, \nu)$  pairs, on which four learners  
144 are trained: a decision tree regressor, a boosted regression tree, a ridge regressor, and a random forest  
145 regressor. All models were taken from the `MLJ.jl` package (Blaom et al., 2020; Blaom & Vollmer, 2020) in  
146 Julia 1.7 (Bezanson et al., 2017). In order to pick the best adjacency matrix for a given learner, we  
147 performed a thresholding approach using 500 steps on predictions from the testing set, and picking the  
148 threshold that maximized Youden's informedness, which is usually the optimized target for imbalanced  
149 classification. During the thresholding step, we measured the area under the receiving-operator



characteristic (ROC-AUC) and precision-recall (PR-AUC) curves, as measures of overall performance over the range of returned values. We report the ROC-AUC and PR-AUC, as well as a suite of other measures as introduced in the next section, for the best threshold. The ensemble model was generated by summing the predictions of all component models on the testing set (ranged in  $[0, 1]$ ), then put through the same thresholding process. The complete code to run the simulations is given as an appendix.

After the simulations were completed, we removed all runs (*i.e.* pairs of  $\xi$  and  $\nu$ ) for which at least one of the following conditions was met: the accuracy was 0, the true positive or true negative rates were 0, the connectance was larger than 0.2. This removes both the obviously failed model runs, and the networks that are more densely connected compared to the connectance of empirical food webs (and are therefore less difficult to predict, being less imbalanced).

### Effect of training set bias on performance

In fig. 3, we present the response of MCC and informedness to (i) four levels of network connectance and (ii) a gradient of training set bias, for the four component models as well as the ensemble. All models reached a higher performance on more connected networks, and using more biased training sets (with the exception of ridge regression, whose informedness decreased in performance with training set bias). In all cases, informedness was extremely high, which is an expected consequence of the fact that this is the value we optimized to determine the cutoff. MCC increased with training set bias, although this increase became less steep with increasing connectance. Interestingly, the ensemble almost always outclassed its component models.

[Figure 3 about here.]

In fig. 4, we present the same information as fig. 3, this time using ROC-AUC and PR-AUC. ROC-AUC is always high, and does not vary with training set bias. On the other hand, PR-AUC shows very strong responses, increasing with training set bias. It is notable here that two classifiers that seemed to be performing well (Decision Tree and Random Forest) based on their MCC are not able to reach a high PR-AUC even at higher connectances. As in fig. 3, the ensemble outperforms its component models.

[Figure 4 about here.]

176 Based on the results presented in fig. 3 and fig. 4, it seems that informedness and ROC-AUC are not  
177 necessarily able to discriminate between good and bad classifiers (although this result may be an artifact  
178 for informedness, as it has been optimized when thresholding). On the other hand, MCC and PR-AUC  
179 show a strong response to training set bias, and may therefore be more useful at model comparison.

## 180 **Required amount of positives to get the best performance**

181 The previous results revealed that the measure of classification performance responds both to the bias in  
182 the training set *and* to the connectance of the network; from a practical point of view, assembling a  
183 training set requires to withhold positive information, which in ecological networks are very scarce (and  
184 typically more valuable than negatives, on which there is a doubt). For this reason, across all values of  
185 connectance, we measured the training set bias that maximized a series of performance measures. When  
186 this value is high, the training set needs to skew positive in order to get a good model; when this value is  
187 about 0.5, the training set needs to be artificially balanced to optimize the model performance. These  
188 results are presented in fig. 5.

189 [Figure 5 about here.]

190 Interestingly, as long as the connectance of the network was above  $\approx 0.1$ , the optimal prevalence in the  
191 training set is 0.5, *i.e.* as many positives as negatives. Low connectance is usually achieved for very large  
192 networks, due to the scaling relationship between richness and links (MacDonald et al., 2020). Therefore,  
193 larger networks may require *more* biasing of the training set in order to be optimally predicted, whereas  
194 smaller, more connected networks may not. It is worth noting that the optimal bias for the training set  
195 stabilizes at 0.5 regardless of connectance *and* model *and* measure of model evaluation.

196 [Figure 6 about here.]

## 197 **Guidelines for the assesment of network predictive models**

198 The results presented here highlight an interesting paradox: larger networks (with lower connectance)  
199 require more training set bias in order to maximize model performance fig. 5, but are also more difficult to

200 predict according to MCC and PR-AUC fig. 6. This suggests that the task of network prediction will be  
201 difficult regardless of network size: by being limited by the *frequency* of interactions when the network is  
202 large, and by being limited by the *number* of interactions when the network is small. Nevertheless, based  
203 on the simulations and numerical experiments, it is possible to formulate a series of recommendations for  
204 the evaluation of network prediction models.

205 First, because we should have more trust in reported interactions than in reported absences of interactions,  
206 we can draw on previous literature to recommend informedness as a measure to decide on a threshold  
207 (Chicco et al., 2021); this being said, because informedness is insensitive to bias, the model performance is  
208 better evaluated through the use of MCC fig. 3. Because  $F_1$  is monotonously sensitive to classifier bias  
209 fig. 1 and network connectance fig. 2, MCC should be preferred as a measure of model evaluation.

210 Second, because the PR-AUC responds more to network connectance fig. 6 and training set imbalance  
211 fig. 4, it should be used as a measure of model performance over the ROC-AUC. This is not to say that  
212 ROC-AUC should be discarded (in fact, a low ROC-AUC is a sign of an issue with the model), but that its  
213 interpretation should be guided by the PR-AUC value. This again echoes recommendations from other  
214 fields (Saito & Rehmsmeier, 2015).

215 Thirdly, regardless of network connectance *or* measure to evaluate the model performance, as long as the  
216 network connectance is larger than  $\approx 0.1$ , artificially balancing the training set to have equiprevalence will  
217 give the best possible results. This was true for all models.

218 Finally, it is noteworthy that the ensemble model was systematically better than the component models;  
219 even when poor models were included (Random Forest and Decision Tree), the ensemble was able to  
220 leverage the different biases expressed by the models to make an overall more accurate prediction. We do  
221 not expect that ensembles will *always* be better than single models. In a recent multi-model comparison,  
222 Becker et al. (2021) found that the ensemble was *not* the best model. There is no general conclusion to  
223 draw from this besides reinforcing the need to be pragmatic about which models should be included in the  
224 ensemble, or whether to use an ensemble at all. In a sense, the surprising performance of the ensemble  
225 model should form the basis of the last recommendation: optimal training set bias and its interaction with  
226 connectance and binary classifier is, in a sense, an hyperparameter that should be assessed. The  
227 distribution of results in fig. 5 and fig. 6 show that there are variations around the trend; furthermore,  
228 networks with different structures than the one we simulated here may respond in different ways.

## 229 References

- 230 Allouche, O., Tsoar, A., & Kadmon, R. (2006). Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models:  
231 Prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 43(6), 1223–1232.  
232 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01214.x>
- 233 Becker, D., Albery, G. F., Sjodin, A. R., Poisot, T., Bergner, L., Dallas, T., Eskew, E. A., Farrell, M. J., Guth,  
234 S., Han, B. A., Simmons, N. B., Stock, M., Teeling, E. C., & Carlson, C. J. (2021). Optimizing predictive  
235 models to prioritize viral discovery in zoonotic reservoirs. *bioRxiv*, 2020.05.22.111344.  
236 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.111344>
- 237 Bezanson, J., Edelman, A., Karpinski, S., & Shah, V. (2017). Julia: A Fresh Approach to Numerical  
238 Computing. *SIAM Review*, 59(1), 65–98. <https://doi.org/10.1137/141000671>
- 239 Blaom, A. D., Kiraly, F., Lienart, T., Simillides, Y., Arenas, D., & Vollmer, S. J. (2020). MLJ: A Julia package  
240 for composable machine learning. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(55), 2704.  
241 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.02704>
- 242 Blaom, A. D., & Vollmer, S. J. (2020, December 31). *Flexible model composition in machine learning and its*  
243 *implementation in MLJ*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.15505>
- 244 Boughorbel, S., Jarray, F., & El-Anbari, M. (2017). Optimal classifier for imbalanced data using Matthews  
245 Correlation Coefficient metric. *PloS One*, 12(6), e0177678.  
246 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177678>
- 247 Branco, P., Torgo, L., & Ribeiro, R. (2015, May 13). *A Survey of Predictive Modelling under Imbalanced*  
248 *Distributions*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.01658>
- 249 Chicco, D., & Jurman, G. (2020). The advantages of the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) over F1  
250 score and accuracy in binary classification evaluation. *BMC Genomics*, 21(1), 6.  
251 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-019-6413-7>
- 252 Chicco, D., Tötsch, N., & Jurman, G. (2021). The Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) is more reliable  
253 than balanced accuracy, bookmaker informedness, and markedness in two-class confusion matrix  
254 evaluation. *BioData Mining*, 14, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-021-00244-z>
- 255 Delgado, R., & Tibau, X.-A. (2019). Why Cohen’s Kappa should be avoided as performance measure in  
256 classification. *PloS One*, 14(9), e0222916. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222916>

257 Jordano, P. (2016a). Chasing Ecological Interactions. *PLOS Biol*, 14(9), e1002559.  
 258 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002559>

259 Jordano, P. (2016b). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*.  
 260 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763>

261 MacDonald, A. A. M., Banville, F., & Poisot, T. (2020). Revisiting the Links-Species Scaling Relationship in  
 262 Food Webs. *Patterns*, 1(0). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100079>

263 McLeod, A., Leroux, S. J., Gravel, D., Chu, C., Cirtwill, A. R., Fortin, M.-J., Galiana, N., Poisot, T., & Wood,  
 264 S. A. (2021). Sampling and asymptotic network properties of spatial multi-trophic networks. *Oikos*,  
 265 *n/a*(*n/a*). <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08650>

266 Saito, T., & Rehmsmeier, M. (2015). The Precision-Recall Plot Is More Informative than the ROC Plot  
 267 When Evaluating Binary Classifiers on Imbalanced Datasets. *PLOS ONE*, 10(3), e0118432.  
 268 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118432>

269 Somodi, I., Lepesi, N., & Botta-Dukát, Z. (2017). Prevalence dependence in model goodness measures with  
 270 special emphasis on true skill statistics. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(3), 863–872.  
 271 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2654>

272 Strydom, T., Catchen, M. D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., Forero-Muñoz,  
 273 N. R., Higino, G., Mercier, B., Gonzalez, A., Gravel, D., Pollock, L., & Poisot, T. (2021). A roadmap  
 274 towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of*  
 275 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 376(1837), 20210063.  
 276 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0063>

277 Whalen, S., Schreiber, J., Noble, W. S., & Pollard, K. S. (2021). Navigating the pitfalls of applying machine  
 278 learning in genomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 1–13.  
 279 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-021-00434-9>

280 Williams, R., & Martinez, N. (2000). Simple rules yield complex food webs. *Nature*, 404, 180–183.  
 281 <http://userwww.sfsu.edu/>



Figure 1: Consequences of changing the classifier skills ( $s$ ) and bias ( $b$ ) for a connectance  $\rho = 0.15$ , on accuracy,  $F_1$ , positive predictive value, and  $\kappa$ . Accuracy increases with skill, but also increases when the bias tends towards estimating *fewer* interactions. The  $F_1$  score increases with skill but also increases when the bias tends towards estimating *more* interactions; PPV behaves in the same way. Interestingly,  $\kappa$  responds as expected to skill (being negative whenever  $s < 0.5$ ), and peaks for values of  $b \approx 0.5$ ; nevertheless, the value of bias for which  $\kappa$  is maximized is *not*  $b = 0.5$ , but instead increases with classifier skill. In other words, at equal skill, maximizing  $\kappa$  would lead to select a *more* biased classifier.




Figure 2: TODO




Figure 3: TODO






Figure 4: TODO




Figure 5: TODO




Figure 6: TODO