

Closing the gap between statistical and scientific workflows for improved forecasts in ecology

Victor Van der Meersch, J. Regetz, T. J. Davies* & EM Wolkovich

March 25, 2025

* Says he is happy to help and give friendly review, but not sure he will reach level of co-author.

1. Intro

- Ecology super challenged to predict stuff for decision making (kind of a whole new world of relevance?)
 - Example of stuff to predict: populations, policy-relevant questions...
- General way to do this so far... (bifurcated?)
 - long term data (GBIF, Biotime...) for estimation of trends
 - PBM, SDMs for forecast
- Gap, problem: None of this is going well
 - debates over trends, not only on the significance but also the direction!
 - predictive modeling trapped in overly complex models, hard to get scientific insights? (same as GCMs?)
- Here we introduce a universal workflow to adress this (say more)

2. Overview

- General scientific method we all learn stresses: RQ → study design → collect data → build model → answer
- Divergences from this are common:
 - bad science (data lead to question)
 - important question for which we cannot get data quickly, we have to use existing
 - complexity makes this simple workflow hard/impossible
- this workflow works across these realities by
 - stressing the need to think about model before study design
 - advancing data simulation
- More details on ideal workflow: walk through the different steps
 - spend more time in critical quadrat, post-model pre-data
 - feedbacks

– uncertainty

3. How to address current issues (two case studies)

(a) Trends!

- Outline current problem: different answers from different analysis (and slightly different datasets?)
→ It is a problem because we can't make decisions on +/- debate... (and it degrades trust in science?)
- two big missing parts are data simulation steps:
 - retrodictive check: would highlight missing pieces (speed up current process, because without this step each slightly different model is a paper... whereas each big iteration of the workflow—including multiple feedbacks—should be a paper)
 - simulated data: you would know that you have low data sooner => the debate is actually not just models but really limited data

(b) Forecasts!

- Outline current problem:
 - black box: intrication between model build and data fitting (calibration), everything is mixed
 - complexity trap [mention uncertainty]
 - developing a model has become the goal, whereas it should be a way to answer a research question!
- We need the workflow to open the black box! Simulating data would allow to add a necessary step between model building and data fitting, which would highlight strong degeneracies
- Workflow would also force you to clearly express a research question, define a limited context in which the model should apply

(c) Step back

- we need more data, and better question (relate this to both previous study cases)
- where can we best reduce uncertainties through new scientific insights?
- machine learning! If we do nothing, what's the point of not doing ML? ML > process-based without question, and ML > trends without mechanisms

4. Wrap up: how to make it happen?

- usual issues: publication pressure, low standards (especially for models)
"we allow far more hand-waving in the presentation of modeling results than we do for experimental data" (J. Aber, 1997)
- growing concerns, leading to increase in reproducibility and data sharing practices [mention uncertainty]
- need a little more here...

- better training! on BOTH estimation AND prediction
 - estimation: being aware of what is a parameter, and mention uncertainty propagation
 - prediction: should be a natural outcome, not a finality
- ML, benchmarking models are probably useful but should not be the core of our scientific practice, not the spirit!