Multilevel Urban Tree Growth equations

erker

November 19, 2018

Model Comparisons

Our approach increased model complexity at each step, first fitting a single weibull curve to all trees, and then allowing all parameters to vary by city, genus, and climate. Table 1 provides short descriptions of the models tested and the brms sytax used. Note, in the code used parameters were rescaled so that all parameters would be on roughly the same order of magnitude. This scaling was omitted from table 1 for clarity. ##+begin_{table} ##+end_{table}

Table 2 shows the models ranked by the approximate leave-one-out expected log point-wise predictive density? Lower values indicate better model predictive performance. The standard error for the elpd difference of 131 between model 6 and model 7 is 21.4, giving strong evidence that model 6 is superior to the other models.

M 11	Table 1: model numbers, short descriptions, and brms formula syntax		
Model	Description	brms formula syntax	
1	No varying parameters	$DBH \sim b0 + b1 * (1 - exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
		$b0 \sim 1$	
		$b1 \sim 1$	
		$b2 \sim 1$	
0	Danamatana arang laraktar	$b3 \sim 1$	
2	Parameters vary by city	DBH $\sim b0 + b1 * (1 - \exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
		$b0 \sim (1 \mid \text{City})$	
		$b1 \sim (1 \mid City)$	
		$b2 \sim (1 \mid City)$	
9	Department on a very by gaping and an ecias	$b3 \sim (1 \mid \text{City})$	
3	Parameters vary by genus and species Species is nested in genus	DBH $\sim b0 + b1 * (1 - \exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$ $b0 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus} / \text{Species})$	
	species is nested in genus	$b0 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus} \mid \text{Species})$ $b1 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus} \mid \text{Species})$	
		$61 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus} \mid \text{Species})$ $62 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus} \mid \text{Species})$	
		$b3 \sim (1 \mid Genus \mid Species)$ $b3 \sim (1 \mid Genus \mid Species)$	
4	Asymptote (β_1) varies by climate	$DBH \sim b0 + b1 * (1 - exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
7	$p_{ij} = p_{ij} + p_{ij} = p_{ij} + p_{ij} = p_{ij} + p_{ij} = p$	$b0 \sim 1$	
		$b1 \sim \text{gdd} * \text{precip}$	
		$b2 \sim 1$	
		$b3 \sim 1$	
5	Growth rate (β_3) varies by climate	$DBH \sim b0 + b1 * (1 - exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
, and the second	(p ₃) varies s _j emiliate	$b0 \sim 1$	
		$b1 \sim 1$	
		$b2 \sim 1$	
		$b3 \sim \text{gdd} * \text{precip}$	
6	Parameters vary by city, genus, species	$DBH \sim b0 + b1 * (1 - exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
	(but asymptote does not vary by city).	$b0 \sim (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
	Growth rate varies by climate.	$b1 \sim (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
	· ·	$b2 \sim (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
		$b3 \sim \text{precip} * \text{gdd} + (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
7	Parameters vary by city, genus, species.	$DBH \sim b0 + b1 * (1 - exp(-b2 * AGE^{b3}))$	
	Growth rate varies by climate.	$b0 \sim (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
	-	$b1 \sim (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
		$b2 \sim (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	
		$b3 \sim \text{precip} * \text{gdd} + (1 \mid \text{City}) + (1 \mid \text{Genus/Species})$	

Table 2: \widehat{elpd}_{loo} is the estimated expected log pointwise predictive density. elpd diff is the difference from the \widehat{elpd}_{loo} of the top model. se elpd loo is standard error of ? for descriptions

	Model	$elpd_{ m loo}$	difference
Best	6	-18845.41	0.00
	7	-18976.38	-130.97
	3	-18989.24	-143.83
	2	-19764.48	-919.06
	5	-20180.41	-1334.99
	4	-20195.21	-1349.80
Worst	1	-20513.12	-1667.70