

Figure 1: Diagram showing the relations between true (black) and proxy (orange) metrics of lake geometry. Geometric depth calculated via Equation 1 requires a single distance and slope metric.




Figure 2: Diagram showing our expectation that slope-based models of lake depth will under predict true depth in convex lakes (left) and over predict true depth in concave lakes (right). Dashed lines represent extrapolated nearshore slope while solid lines represent the lake bottom.

Variable	Median	Q25	Q75	n
Max depth (m)	8.2 (7)	4.6 (3.7)	14 (12)	4850 (17700)
Elevation (m)	300 (340)	180 (210)	400 (460)	4850 (17700)
Area (ha)	55 (33)	21 (11)	140 (100)	4850 (17700)
Island area (ha)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.18 (0.076)	4850 (17700)
Perimeter (m)	4400 (3500)	2500 (1800)	8100 (7300)	4850 (17700)
Shoreline development	1.7 (1.7)	1.4 (1.4)	2.1 (2.2)	4850 (17700)
Watershed-lake ratio	7.8 (10)	3.9 (4.4)	17 (28)	4850 (17700)
Deepest point distance (m)	180 (-)	110 (-)	290 (-)	4850 (-)
Visual center distance (m)	240 (-)	160 (-)	380 (-)	4850 (-)
Inlake slope (m/m)	0.046 (-)	0.024 (-)	0.079 (-)	4850 (-)
Nearshore slope (m/m)	0.077 (-)	0.051 (-)	0.11 (-)	4850 (-)

Table 1: Summary of lake depth and predictor variables for modelling efforts (and for lakes in the contiguous United States from <LAGOSUS-Depth citation>). Predictor variables used in Eq 2 are printed in bold face. Dashes (-) indicate identical sample size among this study and that of the contiguous United States.




Figure 3: Comparison among lake shape and reservoir classes for A-B) distance to deepest point versus distance to lake visual center and C-D) nearshore slope versus inlake slope. A dashed 1:1 line is shown for comparison. Cross-section shape and reservoir class plots are not identical because not all lakes had a reservoir classification exceeding a 0.75 probability confidence level.




Figure 4: Model fit and predictive accuracy metrics for all combinations of true (inlake slope, deepest point distance) and proxy (nearshore slope, visual center distance) metrics. Tiles are colored by their R^2 values and labeled with their RMSE values.




Figure 5: Importance plot for random forest variables showing increase in mean square error. Higher values indicate greater importance to model predictions. See Equation 1 for a definition of geometric max depth. HUC4 ID is a 'dummy' variable of geographic (hydrologic subbasin) location.




Figure 6: Depth model residuals in meters by cross-section shape and reservoir class.



Water Resources Research

Supporting information for

Bathymetry data from thousands of lakes show that lake depth prediction is confounded by difficulty modeling inflake slope

J. Stachelek¹, P. Hanly¹, and P.A. Soranno¹

¹Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, 480 Wilson Rd., East Lansing, Michigan 48824 USA

Contents of this file

Figure S1 Map of study lakes

Figure S2 Comparison between reported depth and depth estimated from bathymetry surfaces

Figure S3 Lake characteristics by categorical variables

Figure S4 Hypsography classification by state




Figure S1: Map of study lakes showing A) lake maximum depth measurements, B) cross-section shape class, and C) reservoir classification.




Figure S2: Comparison between reported depth and depth estimated from bathymetry surfaces by US State where reported depths come from the LAGOSUS-Depth product (citation). For this figure, no reported depth values originated from the same source as its corresponding bathymetry-derived value.




Figure S3: Lake characteristics by categorical variables.




Figure S4: Hypsography classification by state. Numbers on panel labels indicate the percentage of lakes in each state with a convex versus a concave cross-section shape.