

1 Geometric models overestimate lake depth due to 2 imperfect slope measurement

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

4 ¹Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, 480 Wilson Rd., East Lansing, MI
5 48824, USA

6 **Key Points:**

- 7 • Geometric models to predict lake depth, which require in-lake slope, assume that
8 nearshore land slope is a good proxy for in-lake slope.
- 9 • Using data from thousands of lakes, we show that nearshore land slope is a poor
10 proxy for in-lake slope and increases prediction error.
- 11 • Systematic overprediction of depth in concave and reservoir lakes highlights po-
12 tential for improvement in future depth prediction efforts.

Corresponding author: J. Stachelek, stachel12@msu.edu

13 **Abstract**

14 Lake depth is a critical characteristic that influences many important ecological processes
 15 in lakes. Unfortunately, lake depth measurements are labor-intensive to gather and are
 16 only available for a tiny fraction of lakes globally. Therefore, scientists have tried to pre-
 17 dict lake depth from characteristics that are easily obtained for all lakes such as lake sur-
 18 face area or the slope of the land surrounding a lake. One approach for predicting lake
 19 depth simulates lake basins using a geometric model where nearshore land slope is as-
 20 sumed to be a representative proxy for in-lake slope and the distance to the center of the
 21 lake is assumed to be a representative proxy for the distance to the deepest point of the
 22 lake. However, these assumptions have rarely been tested in a broad range of lakes. We
 23 used bathymetry data from approximately 5,000 lakes and reservoirs to test these as-
 24 sumptions and to examine whether differences in lake type or shape influences depth pre-
 25 diction error. We found that nearshore land slope was not representative of in-lake slope
 26 and using it for prediction increases error substantially relative to models using true in-
 27 lake slope. We also found that models using nearshore land slope as a proxy systemat-
 28 ically overpredict lake depth in concave lakes (i.e. bowl-shaped; up to 18% of lakes in
 29 the study population) and reservoir lakes (up to 30% of lakes in the study population),
 30 suggesting caution in using geometric models for depth prediction in unsampled lakes.

31 **1 Introduction**

32 Lake depth is an important factor controlling lake physics, chemistry, and biota. For ex-
 33 ample, deeper lakes generally have higher water clarity and less complete mixing com-
 34 pared to shallow lakes (Fee et al., 1996; Read et al., 2014). These differences are reflected
 35 in variation among lakes in terms of biological productivity (Qin et al., 2020) and rates
 36 of greenhouse gas production (Li et al., 2020). However, because measured depth data
 37 is only available for a tiny fraction of lakes (including < 25% of all lakes in our study
 38 footprint), our ability to understand and predict depth-dependent processes is limited.
 39 The importance of lake depth, coupled with its limited availability, has led to numer-
 40 ous attempts to predict depth using measures available for all lakes such as lake surface
 41 area or the nearshore slope of the land surrounding a lake (Heathcote et al., 2015; Oliver
 42 et al., 2016; Sobek et al., 2011). Such efforts rely on a strategy of exploiting correlations
 43 between nearshore geomorphology and in-lake geometry, which at limited extents can
 44 be quite strong, while at larger extents can be dependent on geographic location and lake
 45 type (Oliver et al., 2016; Branstrator, 2009). Given the limited prediction accuracy of
 46 prior depth prediction efforts (\pm 6-7 m), a major focus has been on improving accuracy
 47 using strategies such as employing more diverse covariates (Oliver et al., 2016), varying
 48 lake buffer sizes (Heathcote et al., 2015), or estimating hidden groupings (e.g. fitting dif-
 49 ferent models for distinct size classes) among lakes (Cael et al., 2017; Sobek et al., 2011).
 50 Unfortunately, the predictive accuracy of these efforts has been limited.

51 One intuitive approach for predicting lake depth involves using a geometric model
 52 that assumes lake basins correspond to an idealized shape such as a cone, bowl, or an
 53 elliptic sinusoid (Getirana et al., 2018; Hollister et al., 2011; Neumann, 1959; Yigzaw et
 54 al., 2018). All such geometric models for lake depth prediction involve implicit assump-
 55 tions about the terms of geometric formulae. In the simplest case, where lakes basins are
 56 treated as cones (Equation 1, Figure 1), two assumptions are required to make depth pre-
 57 dictions for all lakes: 1) that nearshore land slope is a representative proxy for in-lake
 58 slope and 2) that the distance to the center of the lake is a representative proxy for the
 59 distance to the deepest point of the lake (Figure 1). This cone model imposes the fol-
 60 lowing fixed (i.e. geometric) relationship between slope and horizontal distance:

$$depth_{geometric} = \tan(slope) * distance \quad (1)$$




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.

where the product of slope and horizontal distance yields an exact geometric depth estimate ($depth_{geometric}$).

The assumptions of the cone model (as well as other geometric models) can be tested by comparing proxy measures of lake geometry against corresponding “true” (i.e. in-lake) values derived from bathymetric maps and by evaluating how lake cross-section shapes differ from that of an idealized cone (Johansson et al., 2007). For instance, lake cross-section shapes have been shown to vary from narrow “convex” forms to outstretched “concave” forms (Hakanson, 1977). Because tests of geometric model assumptions require bathymetric map data, which is only available for a tiny fraction of lakes (including about 15% of all lakes in our study footprint), existing evidence may not be applicable to all lakes. The few studies that have tested these assumptions have been limited to individual studies of very large (> 500 ha) lakes or studies on small numbers (< 100) of lakes (Johansson et al., 2007). Studies focused specifically on reservoirs (as opposed to the more typical case where reservoirs and natural lakes are combined), have been even more restricted to that of extremely large lakes > 1000 ha (Lehner et al., 2011; Messager et al., 2016).

As a result of this limited testing, we lack knowledge on both the predictive performance of geometric models, the effect of proxies on depth prediction, and whether depth predictions are more sensitive to measurement errors in the horizontal dimension (i.e. distance to the deepest point of the lake) or measurement errors in the vertical dimension (i.e. in-lake slope). Additionally it is unclear whether model prediction error is related to differences in lake type such those with different cross-section shapes or those classified as reservoirs versus natural lakes. Given these knowledge gaps, we asked three research questions: 1) How representative is nearshore land slope of in-lake slope; and how representative is the distance to the center of a lake compared to the distance to the deepest point of a lake? 2) How does the use of proxies for lake geometry affect lake depth prediction error? 3) How does lake cross-section shape (i.e. concave versus convex) and lake type (i.e. natural lake vs reservoir) affect depth prediction error? To answer these questions, we extracted maximum depth (hereafter referred to as “observed

maximum depth”), in-lake slope, cross-section shape (i.e., concave versus convex), and distance to the deepest point, of approximately 5,000 lakes from bathymetric map data and supplemented this data with classification estimates of whether lakes are reservoirs or natural lakes. We used this data to compute geometric depth estimates (Equation 1) and prediction “offsets” to these estimates using the random forest algorithm (Equation 3). Covariates used in offset modeling included a variety of lake, watershed, and hydrologic subbasin measures that are available for all lakes (Table S1).

By definition, the distance proxy (distance to the center of the lake) must always be greater or equal to the true distance value (distance to the deepest point of the lake). Therefore, we expect that the use of this proxy will lead to overestimation of lake depth (Figure 1). Furthermore we expect to see greater overestimation error in reservoirs as compared to natural lakes because many reservoirs are known to be drowned river valleys where the deepest point is close to the edge at the end of the reservoir (i.e. next to the dam) rather than in the center of the reservoir (Lanza & Silvey, 1985). In a similar fashion, we expect to see overestimation error associated with using a nearshore land slope proxy in lakes with differing cross-section shape such that the depth of U-shaped (i.e. concave) lakes will be overpredicted whereas the depth of V-shaped (i.e. convex) lakes will be underpredicted (Figure S1). Finally, we expect that depth predictions themselves will be strongly related to lake area and hydrologic subbasin variables as these measures have been influential in prior studies (Oliver et al., 2016).

By testing these expectations, we can establish whether barriers to increased depth prediction accuracy lie in lack of correspondence between true and proxy measures of lake geometry or in hidden groupings among lakes (such as lake cross-section shape or reservoir status). This information could help direct future research efforts to focus on particular dimensions of lake geometry (i.e. horizontal versus vertical) or to stratify model predictions based on specific lake types and cross-section shapes. Ultimately, achieving increased depth prediction accuracy would allow for more precise estimates of depth-dependent biotic and chemical processes across broad spatial extents.

2 Methods

2.1 Data description

We compiled bathymetry data on approximately 5,000 lakes in the Northeastern and Mid-western US from nine official state databases (Figure S2). These lakes represent a diverse cross section of lakes in terms of their surface areas (4 - 18500 ha) and span a wide geographic extent including glaciated and non-glaciated regions. The original data came in a variety of formats including pre-interpolated rasters (Minnesota), contour lines (Nebraska, Michigan, Massachusetts, Kansas, Iowa), contour polygons (New Hampshire, Connecticut), or point depth soundings (Maine). For the Minnesota data, we simply clipped the raster for each lake to its outline. For data from the remaining states, we processed each lake by converting its original representation to a point layer (if necessary), rasterizing these points, and creating an interpolated bathymetry “surface” using a simple moving window average in the `raster` R package (Hijmans, 2019). The size of the moving window was adjusted iteratively to ensure that each bathymetry raster contained no missing data.

All lake bathymetry was specifically calculated relative to high-resolution (1:24,000 scale) National Hydrography Dataset (USGS, 2019) waterbodies such that source data and bathymetry surface outputs were clipped to the area of each lake polygon. We restricted the lakes in our study to those with an area of at least 4 ha and a maximum depth of at least 0.3 m (1 ft). The purpose of these restrictions was to ensure that lakes had enough contours (or points, or polygons) to generate adequately smooth interpolations with which to calculate in-lake geometry metrics.

We used our generated bathymetry surfaces to find the location of the deepest point in the lake and we resolved ties by choosing the deepest point that was closest to the center of the lake. We used the location of this deepest point to calculate "distance to the deepest point" as the minimum distance to the lake shoreline. To account for lakes where the centroid does not intersect lake bathymetry because it is located within an embedded island or peninsula, we calculated the center of the lake not as its centroid but rather by finding the point farthest from the lake shoreline (i.e. its "visual distance to lake center"). For these calculations, we used the `polylabelr` R package (Larsson, 2019), which interfaces with the Mapbox pole of inaccessibility algorithm (Agafonkin, 2019). We calculated in-lake slope as maximum lake depth divided by the distance to the deepest point where maximum lake depth is a point measurement derived from a bathymetric surface and distance to the deepest point is the smallest straight-line distance from that point to the waterbody perimeter. We calculated nearshore land slope for each lake by computing the slope within a 100-m buffer using data from a high resolution digital elevation model ($\sim 15 \times 15$ m grain) accessed using the `elevatr` R package (Hollister & Shah, 2017). Slope computations proceeded by passing a 3x3 moving window over the 100-m buffer to calculate the slope at each point using Horn's algorithm via the `terrain` function in the `raster` R package (Hijmans, 2019). Reported nearshore land slope values are the mean of all points in the buffer. In addition to the aforementioned techniques of calculating in-lake (and nearshore) slopes and distances, we tried 7 alternate techniques which are described in Table S2.

We categorized lakes based on their cross-section shape and reservoir class. For cross-section shape, we categorized lakes as either convex or concave following the method of Hakanson (1977) by computing normalized lake depth-area relationships (i.e. hypsographic curves) and assigning class membership based on whether a lake's curve falls above or below that of a simple straight-sided cone (Figure S3).

We further classified lakes using the output of a deep convolutional neural network model trained on satellite images labeled according to whether there was visual evidence of a water control structure significantly impacting flow. This model had an overall validation accuracy of 81% and produced a probability for each waterbody as to whether it is a reservoir or a natural lake. For our purposes, we set a conservative classification probability threshold of 0.75 to determine whether a lake would be considered a reservoir. Note that our reservoir classification defines reservoirs as any permanent waterbody that has a water control structure likely to significantly impact flow or pool water. It makes no distinction between different dam types, heights, or uses/purposes.

Covariates used in random forest modeling (Table S1, Equation 3) for lake elevation, area, island area, perimeter, shoreline development, watershed to lake area ratio, and hydrologic subbasin (i.e. HUC4s), were obtained from the LAGOS-US LOCUS database. One such measure, that of shoreline development, is a measure of lake perimeter shape defined as:

$$\text{shoreline}_{\text{devel}} = \text{perimeter} / (2 * \sqrt{(\pi * \text{waterarea} * 10000)}) \quad (2)$$

where sinuous lakes have larger values of shoreline development and circular lakes have smaller values of shoreline development. Watershed to lake area ratio is an approximation of water residence time and is defined as watershed area divided by lake area (Timms, 2009).

2.1.1 Proxy evaluation

We conducted a qualitative assessment of whether or not proxy measures of lake geometry are representative of their true values by visual inspection (i.e. plotting each proxy measure against its corresponding true value) and by computing coefficients of determini-

189 nation (R^2). We further tested proxy measures by examining their effect on lake depth
 190 prediction error. Our approach involved several steps. In the first step, we computed a
 191 geometric estimate of lake depth using only geometry information ($depth_{geometric}$, Equa-
 192 tion 1). In the second step, we fit a random forest model to predict observed (i.e. true)
 193 depth as a function of geometric depth along with several covariates available for all lakes
 194 (Table S1). The purpose of this random forest “offset” modeling was to more rigorously
 195 test our expectations regarding prediction error among different formulations of $depth_{geometric}$
 196 and among different lake types. Each of these steps were executed iteratively for each
 197 combination of true and proxy values of slope and distance (Table 1).

198 2.2 Model description

199 2.2.1 Geometric model

200 We used a geometric model of lakes where basins are treated as cones with a fixed re-
 201 lationship between slope and distance (Equation 1). One reason that we used the cone
 202 model is that, unlike other idealized shapes, it is well suited for modeling maximum depth
 203 and does not require any knowledge of lake volume or mean depth. Note that Equation
 204 1 is a geometric formula and has no intercept or coefficients and it produces a perfect
 205 depth estimate given true values of slope and distance. To use this model to predict the
 206 depth of all lakes, there is a necessary assumption that proxy slope and distance mea-
 207 sures, which are available for all lakes, are representative of true slope and distance (Fig-
 208 ure 1).

209 2.2.2 Random forest models

210 Prior studies using geometric models to predict lake depth include a statistical or ma-
 211 chine learning model “layer” or “offset” to boost predictive accuracy (Hollister et al., 2011;
 212 Yigzaw et al., 2018). For our purposes, this offset modeling enabled us to test our ex-
 213 pectations that prediction error would be different among different formulations of $depth_{geometric}$
 214 and among different lake types. It also facilitated direct comparison against prior mod-
 215 els of lake depth including those that are non-geometric. We generated an “offset” to
 216 geometric depth (sensu Hollister et al., 2011) using the random forest algorithm and the
 217 **ranger** R package (Wright & Ziegler, 2017) to predict observed maximum depth as a
 218 function of covariates including geometric maximum depth (from Equation 1) along with
 219 the lake elevation, area, perimeter, and ratio/index measures listed in Table 1:

$$220 \quad depth_{observed} \sim depth_{geometric} + covariates \quad (3)$$

221 Neither cross-section shape nor reservoir class was used as a covariate in any random for-
 222 est models. We used the random forest algorithm because it makes no assumptions about
 223 the distribution of model residuals, allows for non-linearity, and is insensitive to inter-
 224 actions (i.e. multicollinearity) among covariates (Prasad et al., 2006).

225 2.2.3 Model comparisons

226 We tested model sensitivity to slope and distance proxies by generating multiple “ge-
 227 ometric maximum depth” estimates from 3 different model runs using each of the pos-
 228 sible metric combinations for Equation 1 (true slope - proxy distance, proxy slope - true
 229 distance, proxy slope - proxy distance). Prior to entry into Equation 1, we standardized
 230 proxy distances to have the same numeric range as their true counterpart. The purpose
 231 of this standardization was to prevent lakes with extremely long proxy distances from
 232 having an outsized impact on model evaluation metrics. In addition to comparing among
 233 model runs using different metric combinations, we compared among sets of model runs

234 where slope and distance measures were calculated using different sets of calculation tech-
 235 niques (Table S2).

236 **2.2.4 Model evaluations**

237 We evaluated model fit and prediction error using root-mean-square error (RMSE) and
 238 coefficient of determination (R^2) metrics on a holdout set containing 25% of all lakes.
 239 We evaluated the residuals of each model relative to lake cross-section shape and reser-
 240 voir classes to determine whether depth is consistently over or under predicted for some
 241 lake types relative to others.

242 **3 Results**

243 Lakes belonging to each cross-section shape and reservoir class were not evenly distributed
 244 across our study area (Figure S2, S3). For example, concave lakes were nearly absent from
 245 Michigan whereas Maine lakes had an overabundance of lakes categorized as neither con-
 246 cave nor convex. Lakes in the southern portions of our study area tended to be classi-
 247 fied as reservoirs whereas lakes in the northern portions of our study area were a more
 248 even mix between reservoirs and natural lakes (Figure S2). Approximately 18%, 80%,
 249 and 2% of lakes were classified as having a concave, convex, or neither shape respectively
 250 whereas approximately 30% and 70% of lakes were classified as being a reservoir or a nat-
 251 ural lake.

252 Although proxy distance to lake center was often larger in magnitude compared
 253 to the true distance to the deepest point of lakes', they were strongly related ($R^2 = 0.8$).
 254 Note that the coefficient of determination for this relationship is not strictly correct given
 255 that distance to lake center is an upper bound on distance to the deepest point of lakes.
 256 In contrast to distance metrics, proxy nearshore land slope and true in-lake slope were
 257 more weakly related ($R^2 = 0.17$). For slope measures, most lakes had lower magnitude
 258 (i.e. shallower) nearshore land slope compared to true in-lake slope (Figure 2). Taken
 259 together, these results suggest that proxy distance to the center of lakes is representa-
 260 tive of true distance to the deepest point of lakes whereas proxy nearshore land slope
 261 is not representative of true in-lake slope. The strong relationship between distance to
 262 the center of lakes and distance to the deepest point means that it is possible to com-
 263 pute a "correction factor" to convert between the two measures (See best-fit equations
 264 in Figure 2).

265 In addition to overall differences between slope and distance measures, we found
 266 differences in these relationships among lake shape classes. For example, in-lake slope
 267 and distance to the deepest point of the lake metrics were consistently larger in magni-
 268 tude for convex lakes as compared to concave lakes (Figure S4). We found evidence that
 269 this difference was at least partly explained by the fact that convex lakes are deeper than
 270 concave lakes (Figure S5). There were not similar differences among slope and distance
 271 metrics for natural lakes versus reservoirs.

272 Model fit and prediction error differed depending on the technique used to calcu-
 273 late in-lake and nearshore geometry metrics (Table S2). We found that the best model
 274 fit and lowest model error occurred when in-lake slope was calculated as the average point-
 275 wise slope of all points at maximum lake depth rather than a single point of maximum
 276 depth. However, given the small difference in the fit of models using either of these tech-
 277 niques and the significant cost in terms of computational load and complexity, we limit
 278 our discussion hereafter to the simpler case involving only a single deepest point.

279 The use of proxy nearshore land slope had a larger effect on model fit and predic-
 280 tion error than the use of proxy distance to lake center (Table 1). More specifically, the
 281 true slope - proxy distance model had a better fit ($R^2 = 0.7$) and lower prediction er-




Figure 2. Comparison among proxy and true values of lake geometry for A) distance to deepest point versus distance distance to lake center and B) nearshore land slope versus in-lake slope. A best-fit line and coefficient of determination is shown to illustrate representativeness.

rror (RMSE = 4.4m, MAPE = 29%) compared to the proxy slope - true distance model ($R^2 = 0.32$, RMSE = 6.6m, MAPE = 60%). Furthermore, analysis of model residuals showed overestimation of lake depth for concave lakes when models included a proxy slope measure (Figure 3). We observed similar but smaller overestimation depending on if a lake was classified as a reservoir rather than a natural lake (Figure 3).

Table 1. Model fit and predictive accuracy metrics (RMSE = root mean square error, R^2 = coefficient of determination, MAPE = mean absolute percent error) for all combinations of true (in-lake slope, distance to the deepest point of the lake) and proxy (nearshore land slope, distance to lake center) metrics.

slope	distance	RMSE	R^2	MAPE
true	true	-	-	-
true	proxy	4.4 m	0.70	29 %
proxy	true	6.6 m	0.32	60 %
proxy	proxy	6.4 m	0.35	59 %

The most important covariates in offset models were those relating to spatial location, lake area, and perimeter (Figure S7). Conversely, watershed metrics and lake elevation had little contribution to random forest model fit (Figure S7). The spatial location (i.e. HUC4) covariate was notably less importance in the true slope model compared to the two proxy slope models. Model importance calculations indicated that omitting a geometric max depth measure results in a 130%, 60%, or 50% increase in mean square error depending on the formulation of geometric max depth in Equation 1 (Figure S7).

4 Discussion

Our tests of geometric lake depth models show that specific proxy measures of lake geometry are not representative of true geometry measures across a broad array of lakes. Models using non-representative proxies showed increased error and systematic overestimation of depth in concave and reservoir lakes. Although our analysis was limited to




Figure 3. Depth model residuals (residual = observed - predicted) in meters by cross-section shape and reservoir class indicating overprediction of concave and reservoir lakes.

lakes with available bathymetry data, these lakes did not have characteristics that differed from that of the overall lake population (Figure S8, S10). Although there is a possibility that there is some hidden bias not explored for in our analyses, this lack of difference suggests that our results are likely to be broadly applicable to all lakes.

4.1 Representativeness of proxy measures of lake geometry

In comparing among lake geometry measures, our analysis suggests that proxy distance to lake center is representative of true distance to the deepest point of the lakes but that proxy nearshore land slope is not representative of true in-lake slope. A simple indication of this non representativeness is that proxy nearshore land slope was often (in > 74% of cases) steeper than true in-lake slope. This finding is consistent with Heathcote et al. (2015) whose results suggest that in-lake slopes are shallower compared to the surrounding land. Furthermore, the fact that in-lake slopes were shallower compared to the surrounding land even after controlling for differences in area (Figure S5) is consistent with the idea of topographic scaling (i.e. scale invariance) explored in previous work and detailed by (Cael et al., 2017). The underlying reason for these shallow in-lake slopes may be related to slope-induced turbidity currents which distribute sediment from shallow high-energy areas of lakes to deep low-energy areas (Håkanson, 1981; Johansson et al., 2007). The strength of such sediment focusing is likely greater in "younger" lakes with steeper slopes leading to a smoothing of their bathymetry over time (Blais & Kalff, 1995).

One surprising finding with respect to the relationship between true and proxy geometry measures when examined by lake class was the fact that there was no greater difference between proxy and true distances in reservoirs compared to natural lakes. This is contrary to the idea that most reservoirs are drowned river valleys where the deepest point is close to the edge at the end of the reservoir (i.e. next to the dam) rather than in the center of the reservoir (Lanza & Silvey, 1985). One possible explanation is that our reservoir classification data uses a more general definition of a reservoir (i.e. any permanent waterbody that has a water control structure likely to significantly impact flow or pool water) compared to that of conventional classifications that are tied to specific dam types or dam heights. Another possible explanation is that conventional reservoir classifications are conceptually biased towards more southern areas with few natural lakes (Figure S2).

We found other differences among lake geometry measures according to lake cross-section shape. One finding was that convex lakes, when compared to concave lakes, had longer distances to lake centers relative to corresponding distances to the deepest point of lakes. In addition, convex lakes often had steeper in-lake slopes relative to nearshore land slopes as compared to concave lakes. Finally, it was notable that convex lakes were deeper than concave lakes despite having similar distributions of lake surface area (Figure S9). The underlying cause of these differences is unknown but one possibility is that geometry is tied to the circumstances of lake formation whereby the formation of concave lakes were a result of more intense glacial scouring compared to that of convex lakes (Gorham, 1958). While our findings provide some evidence in support of this idea, namely that there is a geographic hotspot of concave lakes associated with the glaciated “prairie pothole region” (see Hayashi & van der Kamp, 2000), the overall geographic distribution of lake cross-section shapes does not support this idea. Instead of a concentrated area of concave lakes in formerly glaciated regions, there appears to be a fairly even mix of concave and convex lakes distributed amongst the northern (i.e. glaciated) and southern (non-glaciated) portions of our study area (Figure S2).

4.2 Effects of proxy measures of lake geometry depth prediction error

Models using only proxy variables had prediction error rates ($\text{RMSE} = 6.4\text{m}$) of a similar magnitude as that of prior studies ($\text{RMSE} = 6 - 7.3\text{m}$) predicting lake depth at broad geographic extents (Hollister et al., 2011; Oliver et al., 2016; Messager et al., 2016). When only a single proxy measure was used, there was a difference in model sensitivity depending on if it was a horizontal distance measure or a vertical slope measure. In the case of a true slope and proxy distance combination, models were more accurate ($\pm 4.4\text{m}$, 29%) than even the most accurate of prior studies (Hollister et al., 2011; Oliver et al., 2016; Messager et al., 2016). Conversely, models using a proxy slope and true distance combination had prediction error rates ($\pm 6.6\text{m}$, 60%) of a similar magnitude as that of the baseline proxy-proxy model ($\pm 6.4\text{m}$, 59%). The greater sensitivity of depth predictions to proxy slope measures relative to proxy distance measures may be explained by the fact that proxy slope measures were a more imperfect representation of true in-lake slopes relative to proxy versus true distances. We did not find evidence that the outsized sensitivity of depth predictions to slope was dependent on variations in how these measures were calculated (Table S2). In a general sense, the sensitivity of depth predictions to slope help explain the relatively poor predictive performance of prior non-geometric lake depth models given that they rely heavily on lake area as a predictor (Messager et al., 2016; Oliver et al., 2016; Sobek et al., 2011) and both horizontal distance measures and vertical slope measures appear to be decoupled from lake area (Figure S9).

4.3 Effects of lake shape and lake type on depth prediction error

As expected, we found that the maximum depth of concave lakes was systematically overpredicted by a simple geometric model using proxy nearshore land slope (Figure S1). However, contrary to our expectation, we did not observe underprediction of depth in convex lakes. The reason we did not observe underprediction of the depth of convex lakes is likely because geometric depth itself was always greater than observed maximum depth owing to the fact that proxy distance is constrained to be greater than true distance. This suggests that depth estimates in prior studies may be overestimated when they encompass large numbers of lakes with diverse cross-section shapes.

4.4 Future research

One of our models (where $\text{depth}_{\text{geometric}}$ was calculated using true slope and proxy distance) was more accurate than even the most accurate of prior studies. However, parameterization of this model requires data on bathymetry which is not available for all lakes.

380 We propose that the error rate of this model ($\pm 4.4\text{m}$, 29%) be used as an out-of-sample
 381 prediction benchmark for future studies such that they should attempt to match it but
 382 not expect to exceed it.

383 Because this most accurate model requires bathymetry data, this suggests that it
 384 may not be possible with current data and models to produce depth predictions for all
 385 lakes with error rates below 6m. To achieve high prediction accuracy using data avail-
 386 able for all lakes, future studies could explore alternative modeling approaches such as
 387 ordinal modeling, which would capture whether or not a lake crosses some important depth
 388 threshold but would not seek to predict a specific depth value, or emerging data types
 389 such as “topobathymetric” products that integrate both topographic and bathymetric
 390 data in a seamless fashion rather than treating them as separate entities. Topobathymetry
 391 would allow for more robust tests of the representativeness of geometric model inputs.
 392 Unfortunately, topobathymetric products are rare, have mostly been limited nearshore
 393 marine environments, and as such are not yet widely available for inland waters (Danielson
 394 et al., 2016).

395 Finally, our findings indicate that geometry measures differ according to lake cross-
 396 section shape. This makes it an attractive target for inclusion in depth prediction mod-
 397 els. Unfortunately, identifying a lake’s cross-section shape requires bathymetry data which
 398 is unavailable for most lakes. However, given the conceptual links between cross-section
 399 shape, glaciation, and sedimentation (Johansson et al., 2007) it may be advantageous
 400 for future studies to compile data on sedimentation to determine if this data can be used
 401 to predict cross-section shape and boost depth prediction accuracy.

402 5 Conclusion

403 To our knowledge, the present study is the largest and most comprehensive test to date
 404 of geometric models of lake depth. Using bathymetry data on approximately 5,000 lakes,
 405 we show that proxy slope measures are not representative of true in-lake slope and this
 406 leads to inaccuracies in predicting the depth of concave and reservoir lakes. These in-
 407 accuracies suggest that caution is warranted in using geometric models for depth pre-
 408 diction in unsampled lakes. Despite these apparent biases, overall prediction accuracy
 409 was equivalent to that of prior depth prediction studies ($\pm 6\text{-}7\text{m}$). Only our models us-
 410 ing a true measure of in-lake slope, which is limited in availability to lakes with bathymetry
 411 data and where we already know lake depth, had greater accuracy than that of prior stud-
 412 ies ($\pm 4.4\text{m}$, 29%). Lack of improved prediction accuracy (short of including data that
 413 is unavailable for most lakes) suggests that improved prediction may require new types
 414 of data or novel analysis techniques.

415 Acknowledgments

416 All data as well as code for data processing, model fitting, and model evaluation is avail-
 417 able at [Zenodo DOI]. Funding was provided by the US NSF Macrosystems Biology Pro-
 418 gram grants, DEB-1638679; DEB-1638550, DEB-1638539, DEB-1638554. PAS was also
 419 supported by USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Hatch Project, Grant
 420 Number: 176820. Author contributions: JS conceived of the study, built models, ana-
 421 lyzed data, and wrote the paper. PJH and PAS provided interpretation of results and
 422 edited the paper. This work benefited from participation in the Global Lake Ecological
 423 Observatory Network (GLEON). We thank K.S. Cheruvellil for a friendly review of an
 424 earlier draft.

425 References

- 426 Agafonkin, V. (2019). *A JS library for finding optimal label position inside a poly-*
 427 *gon*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/mapbox/polylabel>

- 428 Blais, J. M., & Kalff, J. (1995). The influence of lake morphometry on sediment fo-
 429 cusing. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 40(3), 582–588. doi: 10.4319/lo.1995.40
 430 .3.0582
- 431 Branstrator, D. K. (2009). Origins of types of lake basins. In *Encyclopedia of inland*
 432 *waters* (pp. 613–624). Elsevier Inc.
- 433 Cael, B. B., Heathcote, A. J., & Seekell, D. A. (2017). The volume and mean depth
 434 of Earth's lakes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(1), 209–218. doi: 10.1002/
 435 2016GL071378
- 436 Danielson, J. J., Poppenga, S. K., Brock, J. C., Evans, G. A., Tyler, D. J., Gesch,
 437 D. B., ... Barras, J. A. (2016). Topobathymetric Elevation Model Develop-
 438 ment using a New Methodology: Coastal National Elevation Database. *Journal*
 439 *of Coastal Research*, 76, 75–89. doi: 10.2112/SI76-008
- 440 Fee, E. J., Hecky, R. E., Kasian, S. E. M., & Cruikshank, D. R. (1996). Ef-
 441 fects of lake size, water clarity, and climatic variability on mixing depths in
 442 Canadian Shield lakes. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 41(5), 912–920. doi:
 443 10.4319/lo.1996.41.5.0912
- 444 Getirana, A., Jung, H. C., & Tseng, K.-H. (2018). Deriving three dimensional reser-
 445 voir bathymetry from multi-satellite datasets. *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
 446 217, 366–374. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2018.08.030
- 447 Gorham. (1958). The Physical Limnology of Northern Britain: An Epitome of the
 448 Bathymetrical Survey of the Scottish Freshwater Lochs, 1897.–1909. *Limnology*
 449 *and Oceanography*, 11.
- 450 Hakanson, L. (1977). On Lake Form, Lake Volume and Lake Hypsographic Survey.
 451 *Geografiska Annaler. Series A, Physical Geography*, 31.
- 452 Hakanson, L. (1981). On lake bottom dynamics—the energy-topography factor.
 453 *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 18(5), 899–909. doi: 10.1139/e81-086
- 454 Hayashi, M., & van der Kamp, G. (2000). Simple equations to represent the vol-
 455 ume-area-depth relations of shallow wetlands in small topographic depres-
 456 sions. *Journal of Hydrology*, 237(1-2), 74–85. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1694(00)
 457 00300-0
- 458 Heathcote, A. J., del Giorgio, P. A., Prairie, Y. T., & Brickman, D. (2015). Pre-
 459 dicting bathymetric features of lakes from the topography of their surrounding
 460 landscape. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 72(5), 643–
 461 650. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-2014-0392
- 462 Hijmans, R. J. (2019). *Raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling*. Retrieved
 463 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=raster>
- 464 Hollister, Milstead, W. B., & Urrutia, M. A. (2011). Predicting maximum lake depth
 465 from surrounding topography. *PloS one*, 6(9), e25764. doi: 10.1371/journal
 466 .pone.0025764
- 467 Hollister, J., & Shah, T. (2017). *Elevatr: Access elevation data from various APIs*.
 468 Retrieved from <http://github.com/usepa/elevatr>
- 469 Johansson, H., Brolin, A. A., & Hakanson, L. (2007). New Approaches to the Mod-
 470 elling of Lake Basin Morphometry. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*,
 471 12(3), 213–228. doi: 10.1007/s10666-006-9069-z
- 472 Lanza, G. R., & Silvey, J. (1985). Interactions of reservoir microbiota: Eutrophica-
 473 tion—related environmental problems. In *Microbial processes in reservoirs* (pp.
 474 99–119). Springer.
- 475 Larsson, J. (2019). *Polylabelr: Find the pole of inaccessibility (visual center) of a*
 476 *polygon*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/jolars/polylabelr>
- 477 Lehner, B., Liermann, C. R., Revenga, C., Vörösmarty, C., Fekete, B., Crouzet, P.,
 478 ... Wisser, D. (2011). High-resolution mapping of the world's reservoirs and
 479 dams for sustainable river-flow management. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
 480 *Environment*, 9(9), 494–502. doi: 10.1890/100125
- 481 Li, M., Peng, C., Zhu, Q., Zhou, X., Yang, G., Song, X., & Zhang, K. (2020).
 482 The significant contribution of lake depth in regulating global lake diffusive

- 483 methane emissions. *Water Research*, 115465. doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2020
484 .115465
- 485 Messager, M. L., Lehner, B., Grill, G., Nedeva, I., & Schmitt, O. (2016). Estimating
486 the volume and age of water stored in global lakes using a geo-statistical
487 approach. *Nature Communications*, 7, 13603. doi: 10.1038/ncomms13603
- 488 Neumann, J. (1959). Maximum depth and average depth of lakes. *Journal of the
489 Fisheries Board of Canada*, 16(6), 923–927. doi: 10.1139/f59-065
- 490 Oliver, S. K., Soranno, P. A., Fergus, C. E., Wagner, T., Winslow, L. A., Scott,
491 C. E., ... Stanley, E. H. (2016). Prediction of lake depth across a 17-state
492 region in the United States. *Inland Waters*, 6(3), 314–324.
- 493 Prasad, A. M., Iverson, L. R., & Liaw, A. (2006). Newer Classification and Regres-
494 sion Tree Techniques: Bagging and Random Forests for Ecological Prediction.
495 *Ecosystems*, 9(2), 181–199. doi: 10.1007/s10021-005-0054-1
- 496 Qin, B., Zhou, J., Elser, J. J., Gardner, W. S., Deng, J., & Brookes, J. D. (2020).
497 Water Depth Underpins the Relative Roles and Fates of Nitrogen and Phos-
498 phorus in Lakes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(6), 3191–3198. doi:
499 10.1021/acs.est.9b05858
- 500 Read, J. S., Winslow, L. A., Hansen, G. J., Van Den Hoek, J., Hanson, P. C., Bruce,
501 L. C., & Markfort, C. D. (2014). Simulating 2368 temperate lakes reveals weak
502 coherence in stratification phenology. *Ecological Modelling*, 291, 142–150. doi:
503 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.07.029
- 504 Sobek, S., Nisell, J., & Fölster, J. (2011). Predicting the depth and volume of lakes
505 from map-derived parameters. *Inland Waters*, 1(3), 177–184. doi: 10.5268/IW
506 -1.3.426
- 507 Timms, B. (2009). Geomorphology of Lake Basins. In *Encyclopedia of Inland Wa-
508 ters* (pp. 479–486). Elsevier. doi: 10.1016/B978-012370626-3.00024-7
- 509 USGS. (2019). *National hydrography Dataset* (Tech. Rep.). Retrieved 2018-04-30,
510 from <https://nhd.usgs.gov/>
- 511 Wright, M. N., & Ziegler, A. (2017). Ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random
512 Forests for High Dimensional Data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Soft-
513 ware*, 77(1), 1–17. doi: 10.18637/jss.v077.i01
- 514 Yigzaw, W., Li, H.-Y., Demissie, Y., Hejazi, M. I., Leung, L. R., Voisin, N., & Payn,
515 R. (2018). A New Global Storage-Area-Depth Data Set for Modeling Reser-
516 voirs in Land Surface and Earth System Models. *Water Resources Research*,
517 54(12). doi: 10.1029/2017WR022040

Supporting Information for "Geometric models overestimate lake depth due to imperfect slope measurement"

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

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

Contents of this file

1. **Figure S1:** Diagram showing expectations regarding depth prediction bias
2. **Figure S2:** Map of study lakes
3. **Figure S3:** Hypsography classification by state
4. **Figure S4:** Lake geometry comparison among shape and reservoir classes
5. **Figure S5:** Lake geometry comparison among shape classes by depth and area
6. **Figure S6:** Effect of calculation technique on in-lake/nearshore slope comparison.
7. **Figure S7:** Importance plot for random forest variables
8. **Figure S8:** Characteristics of lakes with bathymetry versus non-bathymetry lakes
9. **Figure S9:** Lake characteristics comparison among shape and reservoir classes
10. **Figure S10:** Comparison between reported depth and bathymetry depth
11. **Table S1:** Summary of lake characteristics for the present study
12. **Table S2:** Effect of calculation technique on depth model fit and accuracy.




Figure S1. 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 land slope while solid lines represent the lake bottom.




Figure S2. Map of study lakes showing A) lake maximum depth measurements, B) cross-section shape class, and C) reservoir classification.




Figure S3. 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.




Figure S4. 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 S5. Comparison between in-lake and nearshore slopes in concave and convex lakes of the same size and max depth.



nearshore

Figure S6. Comparison between in-lake and nearshore slope using different calculation techniques. The techniques used in the main text analyses are bolded and the combination of these techniques (top-left corner) produces the strongest relationship between the two metrics. **slope_mean** is the mean slope of all inlake or nearshore buffer points. **slope_pnts** is the average **slope_pnt** of all points at maximum depth. **slope_online_mean** is the mean pixel-to-pixel slope of each pixel lying on a straight line either from the single deepest point to the lake shoreline (in the case of inlake slope) or from the lake shoreline point extending to the buffer exterior (in the case of nearshore slope). **slopes_online_mean** is the same as **slope_online_mean** except for all inlake points at maximum depth. **dists_deepest** is the same as **dist_deepest** except distance is calculated for all points at maximum depth.

December 3, 2020, 5:53pm




Figure S7. 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 S8. Comparison between characteristics of lakes with bathymetry data against lakes with depth from other sources in the LAGOSUS-Depth product. The distance to urban area metric is calculated using data from the 2018 US Census Urban and Rural Classification.




Figure S9. Comparison of lake characteristics according to differences in lake cross-section shape or reservoir status.




Figure S10. Comparison between reported depth and depth extracted from bathymetry surfaces by US State where reported depths come from the LAGOSUS-Depth product. For this figure, no reported depth values originated from the same source as its corresponding bathymetry-derived value.

Table S1. Summary of lake characteristics for the present study (and for lakes in the contiguous United States). Predictor variables for computing random forest offsets (Equation 2) are printed in bold face. Dashes (-) indicate an identical sample size among this study and that of the contiguous United States.

Variable	Median	Q25	Q75	n
Max depth (m)	8.2 (7)	4.6 (3.7)	14 (12)	4820 (17700)
Area (ha)	55 (33)	21 (11)	140 (100)	4820 (17700)
Island area (ha)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.18 (0.076)	4820 (17700)
Perimeter (m)	4400 (3500)	2500 (1800)	8100 (7300)	4820 (17700)
Shoreline development	1.7 (1.7)	1.4 (1.4)	2.1 (2.2)	4820 (17700)
Elevation (m)	300 (340)	180 (210)	400 (460)	4820 (17700)
Watershed-lake ratio	7.8 (10)	3.8 (4.4)	17 (29)	4820 (17700)
Deepest point distance (m)	180 (-)	110 (-)	290 (-)	4820 (-)
Mean deepest point distance (m)	140 (-)	87 (-)	230 (-)	4820 (-)
Visual center distance (m)	240 (-)	160 (-)	390 (-)	4820 (-)
Inlake slope (m/m)	0.046 (-)	0.024 (-)	0.079 (-)	4820 (-)
Inlake slope online (m/m)	0.062 (-)	0.029 (-)	0.14 (-)	4800 (-)
Inlake slopes (m/m)	0.057 (-)	0.032 (-)	0.098 (-)	4820 (-)
Inlake slopes online (m/m)	0.07 (-)	0.034 (-)	0.15 (-)	4800 (-)
Mean inlake slope (m/m)	0.043 (-)	0.021 (-)	0.09 (-)	4820 (-)
Nearshore mean slope (m/m)	0.077 (-)	0.051 (-)	0.11 (-)	4820 (-)
Nearshore slope online (m/m)	0.077 (-)	0.038 (-)	0.13 (-)	4590 (-)
Nearshore slopes online (m/m)	0.077 (-)	0.037 (-)	0.13 (-)	4540 (-)

Table S2. Model fit and predictive accuracy metrics (RMSE = root mean square error, R^2 = coefficient of determination, MAPE = mean absolute percent error) for the proxy - proxy combination of geometry metrics (see main text Table 1). Each row shows model metrics when proxy and "true" measures are calculated with slight differences from the default (bolded) used in the main text. **slope_mean** is the mean slope of all inlake or nearshore buffer points. **slope_pnts** is the average **slope_pnt** of all points at maximum depth. **slope_online_mean** is the mean pixel-to-pixel slope of each pixel lying on a straight line either from the single deepest point to the lake shoreline (in the case of inlake slope) or from the lake shoreline point extending to the buffer exterior (in the case of nearshore slope). **slopes_online_mean** is the same as **slope_online_mean** except for all inlake points at maximum depth. **dists_deepest** is the same as **dist_deepest** except distance is calculated for all points at maximum depth.

Inlake slope	Nearshore slope	Inlake distance	RMSE	R^2	MAPE
slope_pnts	slope_mean	dists_deepest	6.2 m	0.38	58 %
slope_pnt	slope_mean	dist_deepest	6.4 m	0.35	59 %
slope_pnts	slopes_online_mean	dist_deepest	6.4 m	0.32	61 %
slope_online_mean	slope_mean	dists_deepest	6.5 m	0.41	63 %
slope_pnts	slope_mean	dist_deepest	6.7 m	0.44	58 %
slope_online_mean	slope_mean	dist_deepest	6.7 m	0.36	59 %
slope_online_mean	slopes_online_mean	dist_deepest	6.7 m	0.32	66 %
slope_mean	slope_mean	dists_deepest	6.8 m	0.36	59 %
slope_pnt	slopes_online_mean	dists_deepest	6.8 m	0.25	73 %
slope_pnts	slope_online_mean	dist_deepest	6.9 m	0.3	71 %
slope_online_mean	slope_online_mean	dist_deepest	6.9 m	0.32	68 %
slope_online_mean	slope_online_mean	dists_deepest	6.9 m	0.33	65 %
slope_mean	slopes_online_mean	dists_deepest	7 m	0.24	65 %
slope_mean	slope_mean	dist_deepest	7.1 m	0.4	64 %
slopes_online_mean	slope_mean	dist_deepest	7.1 m	0.37	56 %
slope_mean	slope_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.1 m	0.3	69 %
slopes_online_mean	slopes_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.2 m	0.32	63 %
slopes_online_mean	slopes_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.3 m	0.25	64 %
slope_pnt	slope_mean	dists_deepest	7.3 m	0.35	61 %
slopes_online_mean	slope_mean	dists_deepest	7.3 m	0.36	60 %
slope_online_mean	slopes_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.3 m	0.29	58 %
slope_pnts	slope_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.4 m	0.27	64 %
slopes_online_mean	slope_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.4 m	0.33	67 %
slopes_online_mean	slope_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.5 m	0.26	61 %
slope_pnt	slopes_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.5 m	0.33	69 %
slope_mean	slopes_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.6 m	0.26	64 %
slope_pnt	slope_online_mean	dist_deepest	7.7 m	0.27	68 %
slope_pnts	slopes_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.8 m	0.3	65 %
slope_pnt	slope_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.9 m	0.27	67 %
slope_mean	slope_online_mean	dists_deepest	7.9 m	0.31	60 %

December 3, 2020 5:53pm