

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Ecological
Modelling
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ECOMOD-18-226

Title: Performance evaluation and hyperparameter tuning of statistical and machine-learning models using spatial data

Article Type: Research Paper

Keywords: spatial modeling; machine-learning; statistical learning; model selection; hyperparameter tuning; spatial cross-validation

Corresponding Author: Mr. Patrick Johann Schratz, M.Sc.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena

First Author: Patrick Johann Schratz, M.Sc.

Order of Authors: Patrick Johann Schratz, M.Sc.; Jannes Muenchow, Dr.; Jakob Richter, M.Sc.; Alexander Brenning, Prof.

Abstract: Machine-learning algorithms have gained popularity in recent years in the field of ecological modeling due to their promising results in predictive performance of classification problems.

While the application of such algorithms has been highly simplified in the last years due to their well-documented integration in commonly used statistical programming languages such as R, there are several practical challenges in the field of ecological modeling related to unbiased performance estimation, optimization of algorithms using hyperparameter tuning and spatial autocorrelation.

We address these issues in the comparison of several widely used machine-learning algorithms such as Boosted Regression trees (BRT), k-Nearest Neighbor (WKNN), Random Forest (RF) and Support Vector Machine (SVM) to traditional parametric algorithms such as logistic regression (GLM) and semi-parametric ones like Generalized Additive Models (GAM).

Different nested cross-validation methods including hyperparameter tuning methods are used to evaluate model performances with the aim to receive bias-reduced performance estimates.

As a case study the spatial distribution of forest disease (*Diplodia sapinea*) in the Basque Country in Spain is investigated using common environmental variables such as temperature, precipitation, soil or lithology as predictors.

Results show that GAM and RF (AUROC estimates 0.705) outperform all other methods in predictive accuracy.

The effect of hyperparameter tuning saturates at around 50 iterations for this data set.

The AUROC differences between the bias-reduced (spatial cross-validation) and overoptimistic (non-spatial cross-validation) performance estimates of the GAM and RF are 0.167 (24 %) and 0.213 (30 %), respectively.

It is recommended to also use spatial partitioning for cross-validation hyperparameter tuning of spatial data.

The models developed in this study enhance the detection of *Diplodia sapinea* in the Basque Country compared to previous studies.

Suggested Reviewers: Hannah Meyer Dr.
Physical Geography, University of Marburg
hanna.meyer@geo.uni-marburg.de
Recently published a paper tackling a similar topic as this submission addresses.

David Roberts Dr.
Biometry and Environmental System Analysis, University of Freiburg
droxroberts@gmail.com
Published about cross-validation techniques for spatial data in 2017.

Christian Geiss Dr.
German Aerospace Center
christian.geiss@dlr.de
Published a paper in 2017 addressing the idea of spatial sampling in cross-validation: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8046029/>

Carsten Dormann Prof.
Department of Biometry and Environmental System Analysis, University of Freiburg
carsten.dormann@biom.uni-freiburg.de
Published several papers in the field of spatial modeling during the last decade.

Opposed Reviewers:

Cover letter

Brian Fath, Professor
Editor-in-Chief
Ecological Modelling
Elsevier B.V. Registered Office:
Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam, The Netherlands,
Registered in The Netherlands, Registration No. 33156677, BTW No. NL 005033019B01.

April 02 2018

Dear Prof. Fath,

I am submitting a manuscript for consideration of publication as a research paper in the journal “Ecological Modelling”. The manuscript is entitled “Performance evaluation and hyperparameter tuning of statistical and machine-learning models using spatial data”.

By comparing various widely used statistical and machine-learning algorithms on spatial data we show the importance of accounting for spatial autocorrelation in cross-validation. Additionally, we conducted the first analysis (to our knowledge) on comparing spatial and non-spatial hyperparameter tuning for machine-learning algorithms.

Our findings show that it is essential to account for spatial data not only during performance evaluation but also for the hyperparameter tuning step.

Moreover we integrated the possibility to perform spatial cross-validation for both performance evaluation and hyperparameter tuning in the R package ‘mlr’ to make this methodology easily available for other studies.

This work has been published previously as a preprint on arxiv.org and is accessible via the following link: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.11266>. It has not been submitted simultaneously for publication elsewhere.

We are suggesting the following potential reviewers:

- Hannah Meyer, Department of physical Geography, University of Marburg, hanna.meyer@geo.uni-marburg.de
- David Roberts, Department of Biometry and Environmental System Analysis, University of Freiburg, droxroberts@gmail.com

- Christian Geiss, German Aerospace Center, christian.geiss@dlr.de
- Carsten Dormann, Department of Biometry and Environmental System Analysis,, University of Freiburg, carsten.dormann@biom.uni-freiburg.de

Each named author of this manuscript has substantially contributed to conducting the underlying research and drafting this manuscript. Additionally, to the best of our knowledge, the named authors have no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely,

Patrick Schratz

Department of Geography, GIScience group
Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena
Grietgasse 6, 07743, Jena, Germany
E-Mail: patrick.schratz@uni-jena.de

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Performance evaluation and hyperparameter tuning of
10 statistical and machine-learning models using spatial
11 data
12
13
14

15 Patrick Schratz^a, Jannes Muenchow^a, Eugenia Iturritxa^b, Jakob Richter^c,
16 Alexander Brenning^a

17 ^aDepartment of Geography, GIScience group, Griegasse 6, 07743, Jena, Germany

18 ^bNEIKER, Granja Modelo -Arkaute, Apdo. 46, 01080 Vitoria-Gasteiz, Arab, Spain

19 ^cDepartment of Statistics, TU Dortmund University, Germany

20
21
22
23
24 **Abstract**
25

26 Machine-learning algorithms have gained popularity in recent years in the field
27 of ecological modeling due to their promising results in predictive performance
28 of classification problems. While the application of such algorithms has been
29 highly simplified in the last years due to their well-documented integration in
30 commonly used statistical programming languages such as R, there are sev-
31 eral practical challenges in the field of ecological modeling related to unbiased
32 performance estimation, optimization of algorithms using hyperparameter tun-
33 ing and spatial autocorrelation. We address these issues in the comparison of
34 several widely used machine-learning algorithms such as Boosted Regression
35 trees (BRT), k-Nearest Neighbor (WKNN), Random Forest (RF) and Support
36 Vector Machine (SVM) to traditional parametric algorithms such as logistic
37 regression (GLM) and semi-parametric ones like Generalized Additive Models
38 (GAM). Different nested cross-validation methods including hyperparameter
39 tuning methods are used to evaluate model performances with the aim to receive
40 bias-reduced performance estimates. As a case study the spatial distribution of
41 forest disease (*Diplodia sapinea*) in the Basque Country in Spain is investigated
42 using common environmental variables such as temperature, precipitation, soil
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Corresponding author
55 Email address: patrick.schratz@uni-jena.de (Patrick Schratz)

or lithology as predictors.

Results show that GAM and Random Forest (RF) (mean AUROC estimates 0.708 and 0.699) outperform all other methods in predictive accuracy. The effect of hyperparameter tuning saturates at around 50 iterations for this data set. The AUROC differences between the bias-reduced (spatial cross-validation) and overoptimistic (non-spatial cross-validation) performance estimates of the GAM and RF are 0.167 (24%) and 0.213 (30%), respectively. It is recommended to also use spatial partitioning for cross-validation hyperparameter tuning of spatial data. The models developed in this study enhance the detection of *Diplodia sapinea* in the Basque Country compared to previous studies.

Keywords: spatial modeling, machine learning, model selection, hyperparameter tuning, spatial cross-validation

1. Introduction

Statistical learning has become an important tool in the process of knowledge discovery from big data in fields as diverse as finance or geomarketing (Heaton et al., 2016; Schernthanner et al., 2017), medicine (Leung et al., 2016), public administration (Maenner et al., 2016) and the sciences (Garofalo et al., 2016). We can classify statistical learning broadly into supervised and unsupervised techniques (e.g., ordination, clustering) (James et al., 2013). Though both fields are important in the spatial modeling field, we will focus in this paper on supervised predictive modeling and the comparison of (semi-)parametric models and machine learning techniques. Spatial predictions are of great importance in a wide variety of fields including geomorphology (Brenning et al., 2015), remote sensing (Stelmaszczuk-Górska et al., 2017), hydrology (Naghibi et al., 2016), epidemiology (Adler et al., 2017), climatology (Voyant et al., 2017), the soil sciences (Hengl et al., 2017) and of course ecology. Ecological applications range from species distribution models (Halvorsen et al., 2016; Quillfeldt et al., 2017; Wieland et al., 2017), predicting floristic (Muenchow et al., 2013a) and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 faunal composition to disentangling the relationships between species and their
10 environment (Muenchow et al., 2013b). Additional applications include biomass
11 estimation (Fassnacht et al., 2014) and disease mapping as for example caused
12 by fungal infections (Iturritxa et al., 2014). The latter marks the research area
13 of this work.
14

15 Fungal species such as *Diplodia sapinea* inflict severe damage upon Monter-
16 rey pine trees (*Pinus radiata*) which trees are subjected to environmental stress
17 (Wingfield et al., 2008). Infected forest stands cause economic as well as ecologi-
18 cal damages worldwide (Ganley et al., 2009). In Spain, where timber production
19 is regionally an important economic factor, about 25% of the timber production
20 stems from Monterrey pine (*Pinus radiata*) plantations in northern Spain, and
21 here mostly from the Basque Country (Iturritxa et al., 2014). Consequently,
22 the early detection and subsequent containment of fungal diseases is of great
23 importance. Statistical and machine-learning models play an important role in
24 this process.
25

26 Supervised techniques can be broadly divided into parametric and non-
27 parametric models. Parametric models can be written as mathematical equa-
28 tions involving model coefficients. This enables ecologists to interpret interac-
29 tions between the response and its predictors and to improve the general under-
30 standing of the modeled relationship. Model interpretability should certainly
31 be an important criterion for choosing models when the analysis of relationships
32 between a response variable such as species richness or species presence/absence
33 and the corresponding environment is of interest (Goetz et al., 2015). While
34 the most commonly used statistical models such as generalized linear models
35 (GLMs) are parametric, especially machine learning techniques offer a non-
36 parametric approach to spatial modeling in ecology. These have gained popu-
37 larity due to their ability to handle high-dimensional and highly correlated data
38 and the lack of explicit model assumptions. Some model comparison studies in
39 the spatial modeling field suggest that machine learning models might be the
40 better choice when the primary aim is accurate prediction (Hong et al., 2015;
41 Smoliński & Radtke, 2016; Youssef et al., 2015). However, other studies found
42

no major performance difference to parametric models (Bui et al., 2015; Goetz et al., 2015).

The estimation of predictive performances and the tuning of model hyperparameters (where present) are two intertwined critical issues in ecological modeling and model comparisons, both of which are addressed in this study. Cross-validation and bootstrapping are two widely used performance estimation techniques (Brenning, 2005; Kohavi et al., 1995). However, in the presence of spatial autocorrelation, estimates obtained using regular (non-spatial) random resampling may be biased and overoptimistic, which has led to the adoption of spatial resampling in cross-validation and bootstrapping for bias reduction. Currently, different names are used in science for the same idea: Brenning (2005) named it "spatial cross-validation", Meyer et al. (2018) "Leave-location-out cross-validation" and Roberts et al. (2017) labels it "Block cross-validation". Although the importance of bias-reduced spatial resampling methods for performance estimation has been emphasized repeatedly in recent years (Geiß et al., 2017; Meyer et al., 2018; Wenger & Olden, 2012), such techniques have not been adopted in all cases (Bui et al., 2015; Pourghasemi & Rahmati, 2018; Smoliński & Radtke, 2016; Wollan et al., 2008; Youssef et al., 2015). Since default hyperparameter settings, which are used by some authors (Goetz et al., 2015; Ruß & Brenning, 2010; Ruß & Kruse, 2010; Vorpahl et al., 2012), can in no way guarantee an optimal performance of machine-learning techniques, additional attention should be directed to this potentially critical step. Again, performance estimation techniques such as cross-validation are used in this step, and the adequacy of non-spatial techniques for spatial data sets can be questioned. This work aims to be an exemplary model comparison study for spatial data using spatial cross-validation including spatial hyperparameter tuning to receive bias-reduced performance estimates. This approach is compared with cross-validation approaches that use other resampling strategies (i.e. random resampling) or conduct no hyperparameter tuning.

We provide the complete code (including a packrat file) in the supplementary material to make this work fully reproducible and to encourage a wider adoption

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1: Spatial distribution of tree observations within the Basque Country, northern Spain, showing infection state by *Diplodia sapinea*.

of the proposed methodology. In our exemplary analysis we used a selection of six models (statistical and machine-learning) that are commonly used in the spatial modeling field: Boosted Regression Trees (BRT), Generalized Additive Model (GAM), Generalized Linear Model (GLM), Weighted k -nearest neighbor (WKNN), RF and Support Vector Machines (SVM).

2. Data and study area

2.1. Data

This study uses the data set from Iturritxa et al. (2014) to illustrate procedures and challenges that are common to many geospatial analyses problems: An uneven distribution of the binary response variable, influence of spatial autocorrelation and predictor variables derived from various sources (other modeling results, remote sensing data, surveyed information). It is representative

for many other ecological data sets in terms of sample size (926) and the number (11) and types of predictors (numeric as well as nominal). The following (environmental) variables were used as predictors: mean temperature (March - September), mean total precipitation (July - September), Potential Incoming Solar Radiation (PISR), elevation, slope (degrees), potential hail damage at trees, tree age, pH value of soil, soil type, lithology type, and the year when the tree was surveyed. Tree infection caused by fungal pathogens (here *Diplodia sapinea*) represents the response variable. The ratio of infected and non-infected trees in the sample is roughly 1:3 (223, 703). Compared to the original data set from Iturritxa et al. (2014), we added soil type (aggregated from 12 to 7 classes in accordance with the world reference base (Working Group WRB, 2015)) (Hengl et al., 2017), lithology type (condensed from 17 to 5 classes) (GeoEuskadi, 1999) and pH value of the soil (European Commission, 2010) to the already available predictors.

Iturritxa et al. (2014) showed that hail damage explained best pathogen infections in trees in the Basque Country. In this study hail damage was a binary predictor available as in-situ observations. To make it available as a predictor for the Basque country, we spatially predicted the hail damage potential as a function of climatic variables using a GAM (Schratz, 2016).

Predictor *soil* was predicted by Hengl et al. (2017) using ca. 150.000 soil profiles at a spatial resolution of 250 m. Predictor *age* was imputed and trimmed to a value of 40 to reduce the influence of outliers. Predictor *pH* was mapped by European Commission (2010) using a regression-kriging approach based on 12,333 soil pH measurements from 11 different sources. Spatial predictions utilized 54 auxiliary variables in the form of raster maps at a 1 km × 1 km resolution and were aggregated to a spatial resolution of 5 km × 5 km. Information about lithology types were extracted from a classification provided by GeoEuskadi that is based on the year 1999 (GeoEuskadi, 1999). Rock type condensing was done using the respective top level class for magmatic types and sub-classes for sedimentary rocks (Grotzinger & Jordan, 2016) (Table B.4).

We removed three observations due to missing information in some variables

leaving a total of 926 observations (Table B.3). The methodology we present in this work, i.e. a binary classification problem, can be easily adapted to multiclass problems as well as to quantitative response variables.

125 2.2. Study area

The Basque country in northern Spain represents our study area (Figure 1). It has a spatial extent of 7355 km². Precipitation decreases towards the south while the duration of summer drought increases. Between 1961 and 1990, mean annual precipitation ranged from 600 to 2000 mm with annual mean temperatures between 8 and 16°C (Ganuza & Almendros, 2003). The wooded area covers approximately 54% of the territory (396.962 hectars), which is one of the highest ratios in the EU. Radiata pine is the most abundant species occupying 33.27% of the total area (Múgica et al., 2016).

3. Methods

135 In this study we provide an exemplary analysis combining both tuning of hyperparameters using nested cross-validation (CV) and the use of spatial CV to assess bias-reduced model performances. We compared predictive performances using four setups: non-spatial CV for performance estimation combined with non-spatial hyperparameter tuning (*non-spatial/non-spatial*), spatial CV estimation with spatial hyperparameter tuning (*spatial/spatial*), spatial CV estimation with non-spatial hyperparameter tuning (*spatial/non-spatial*), and spatial CV estimation without hyperparameter tuning (*spatial/no tuning*). We used a selection of commonly used machine learning algorithms (RF, SVM, WKNN, BRT) and the statistical methods GLM and GAM.

145 3.1. Cross-validation estimation of predictive performance

Cross-validation is a resampling-based technique for the estimation of a model's predictive performance (James et al., 2013). The basic idea behind CV is to split an existing data set into training and test sets using a user-defined number of partitions (Figure 2). First, the data set is divided into k

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 150 partitions or folds. The training set consists of $k - 1$ partitions and the test
10 set of the remaining partition. The model is trained on the training set and
11 evaluated on the test partition. A repetition consists of k iterations for which
12 every time a model is trained on the training set and evaluated on the test set.
13 Each partition serves as a test set once.

14
15 155 In ecology, observations are often spatially dependent (Dormann et al., 2007;
16 Legendre & Fortin, 1989). Subsequently, they are affected by underlying spatial
17 autocorrelation by a varying magnitude (Brenning, 2005; Telford & Birks, 2005).
18 Model performance estimates should be expected to be overoptimistic due to the
19 similarity of training and test data in a non-spatial partitioning setup when using
20 any kind of cross-validation for tuning or validation (Brenning, 2012). Therefore,
21 cross-validation approaches that adapt to this problem should be used in any
22 kind of performance evaluation when spatial data is involved (Brenning, 2012;
23 Meyer et al., 2018; Telford & Birks, 2009). In this work we use the spatial
24 cross-validation approach after Brenning (2012) which uses k -means clustering
25 to reduce the influence of spatial autocorrelation. In contrast to non-spatial
26 CV, spatial CV reduces the influence of spatial autocorrelation by partitioning
27 the data into spatially disjoint subsets (Figure 2).

28
29 Five-fold partitioning repeated 100 times was chosen for performance esti-
30 mation (Figure 2). For the hyperparameter tuning, again five folds were used to
31 split the training set of each fold. Hyperparameter tuning only applied to the
32 machine learning algorithms. A random search with a varying number of iter-
33 ations (0, 10, 50, 100, 200) was applied to each fold of the tuning level. Model
34 performances of every hyperparameter setting were computed at the tuning
35 level and averaged across folds. The hyperparameter setting with the highest
36 mean Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristics Curve (AUROC) re-
37 sult across all tuning folds was used to train a model on the training set of
38 the respective performance estimation level. This model was then evaluated on
39 the test set of the respective fold (performance estimation level). The procedure
40 was repeated 500 times (100 repetitions with five folds each and varying random
41 search iterations) to reduce the variance introduced by partitioning.




Figure 2: Theoretical concept of spatial and non-spatial nested cross-validation using five folds for hyperparameter tuning and performance estimation. Yellow/purple dots represent the training and test set for performance estimation, respectively. The tuning sample is based on the respective performance estimation fold sample and consists again of training (orange) and test set (blue). Although the tuning folds of only one fold are shown here, the tuning is performed for every fold of the performance estimation level.

The AUROC was selected as a goodness of fit measure due to the binary response variable. The present methodology can also be applied with other measures than AUROC which are suited for binary classification. This measure combines both True Positive Rate (TPR) and False Positive Rate (FPR) of the classification and is also independent of a specific decision threshold (Candy & Breitfeller, 2013). A resulting AUROC value of close to 0.5 indicates no separation power of the model while a value of 1.0 would mean that all cases were correctly classified.

Hyperparameter tuning was performed for RF, SVM, BRT and WKNN. For GLM, no tuning is needed because the model has no hyperparameters and assumes a logit relationship between response and predictors. For GAM, see subsubsection 3.4.5.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *3.2. Tuning of hyperparameters*

10
11 Determining the optimal (hyperparameter) settings for each model is crucial
12 for the bias-reduced assessment of a model's predictive power. While (semi-
13)parametric algorithms cannot be tuned in the same way as machine-learning
14 algorithms (although some perform an internal optimization, e.g. the implemen-
15 tation of the GAM in the *mgcv* package from Wood (2006)), hyperparameters of
16 machine-learning algorithms need to be tuned to achieve optimal performances
17 (Bergstra & Bengio, 2012; Duarte & Wainer, 2017; Hutter et al., 2011). Note
18 that for parametric models the term "parameter" is often used to refer to the re-
19 gression coefficients of each predictor in the fitted model. For machine-learning
20 algorithms, the terms "parameter" and "hyperparameter" both refer to "hyper-
21 parameter" as there are no regression coefficients for these models. In addition,
22 the term "parameter" is often used in programming to refer to an argument
23 of a function. These different usages often lead to confusion and hence both
24 terms should be used with caution. Hyperparameters are determined by finding
25 the optimal value for a model across multiple unknown data sets by using a
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Table 1: Hyperparameter limits and types for each model. Notations of hyperparameters from
37 the respective R packages were used.

38
39
40

Algorithm (package)	Hyperparameter	Type	Value	Start	End
BRT (gbm)	n.tree	integer	-	100	10000
	shrinkage	numeric	-	0	1.5
	interaction.depth	integer	-	1	40
RF (ranger)	mtry	integer	-	1	11
	num.trees	integer	-	10	10000
SVM (kernlab)	C	numeric	-	2^{-12}	2^{15}
	σ	numeric	-	2^{-15}	2^6
WKNN (kknn)	k	integer	-	10	400
	distance	integer	-	1	100
	kernel	nominal	*		

56 * triangular, Epanechnikov, biweight, triweight, cos, inv, Gaussian, optimal
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 optimization procedure such as CV or Bayesian optimization while parameters
10 of parametric models are estimated when fitting them to the data (Kuhn &
11 Johnson, 2013).
12

13 We used a random search with a varying number of iterations (10, 50, 100,
14 200, 300, 400) for all machine learning models in this study to analyze the differ-
15 ence of varying tuning iterations. A random search has desirable properties in
16 high dimensional and no disadvantages in low dimensional situations compared
17 to a grid search (Bergstra & Bengio, 2012). This is due to the fact that often
18 high dimensional situations have a "low effective dimension", i.e. only a subset
19 of the hyperparameters is actually relevant. Another practical advantage is that
20 one does not have to set the step size for the grid but only the parameter limits.
21 We did not perform stepwise variable selection or similar for the parametric
22 models (GLM, GAM) as we required all models to have the same predictor set.
23 An exploratory analysis was done on using different starting basis dimensions
24 for the optimal smoothing estimation of each predictor of the GAM. The *mgcv*
25 package does an internal optimization of the smoothing degree value using the
26 supplied basis dimensions as the starting point. The reported GAM model was
27 initiated with $k = 10$ as the basis dimension which ensured full flexibility of the
28 smoothing terms for each predictor. Please note that although we attributed
29 the GAM to settings *non-spatial/no tuning* and *spatial/no tuning* as we did not
30 perform a tuning ourselves, the GAM actually does a non-spatial optimization
31 of the smoothing degrees for each predictor. We are aware that this attribution
32 is somewhat contrary to the attribution of all other algorithms in this study.
33 Strictly, we would also need to implement a spatial optimization procedure of
34 the smoothing degrees for the GAM to follow our philosophy of spatial hyper-
35 parameter tuning in this work. However, such an implementation exceeds the
36 scope of this work. Belonging to the parametric algorithm group, we decided to
37 attribute the GAM to the "no tuning" class and leave all the tuning settings to
38 the machine-learning models.
39


40 All models were fitted using their respective default hyperparameter settings,
41 i.e. no tuning was performed. For SVM we used $\sigma = 1$ and $C = 1$ to suppress
42

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 240 the automatic tuning of the *kernlab* package. The ranges of the tuning spaces
10 were set by iteratively checking the tuning results and adjusting the search space
11 to make sure that the resulting optimal hyperparameter settings of each fold
12 are not possibly limited by the defined search space. However, in practice this
13 is sometimes impossible (see the problems we faced for WKNN and BRT in
14 subsection 3.4) because models start to fail if hyperparameter values outside of
15 computationally valid ranges are tested.
16 245

17 Most packages offering CV solutions in R offer only random partitioning
18 methods, assuming independence of the observations. Package *mlr*, which was
19 used as the modeling framework in this work, was missing spatial partitioning
20 functions but provides a unified framework for modeling and simplifies hyper-
21 parameter tuning. With this study we implemented the spatial partitioning
22 methods of package *sperrrest* into *mlr*.
23
24

30 3.3. *Cross-Validation Setups*
31

32 To underline the crucial need for spatial CV when assessing a model's per-
33 formance, and to identify overoptimistic outcomes when neglecting to do so, we
34 used following CV setups: Nested non-spatial CV which uses random partition-
35 ing and non-spatial hyperparameter tuning (*non-spatial/non-spatial*), nested
36 spatial CV which uses k-means clustering for partitioning (Brenning, 2005) and
37 results in a spatial grouping of the observations and performs non-spatial hy-
38 perparameter tuning (*spatial/non-spatial*) , nested spatial CV including spatial
39 hyperparameter tuning (*spatial/spatial*) and spatial CV without hyperparam-
40 eter tuning (*spatial/no tuning*). Setup (*non-spatial/non-spatial*) was used to
41 show the overoptimistic results when using non-spatial CV with spatial data
42 and setups *spatial/non-spatial*, *spatial/spatial* to reveal the differences between
43 spatial and non-spatial hyperparameter tuning. Setup (*spatial/spatial*) should
44 be used when conducting spatial modeling with machine learning algorithms
45 that require hyperparameter tuning.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



49
 50 Figure 3: Comparison of spatial and non-spatial partitioning of the first five folds in spatial
 51 and non-spatial cross-validation performance estimation. Yellow/purple dots represent the
 52 training and test set, respectively.
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 3.4. Model characteristics and hyperparameters

10
11 An exemplary selection of widely-used statistical and machine-learning tech-
12 niques was compared in this study. While the following sections describe the
13 used models and their settings, a justification of the choice of specific implemen-
14 tations in the statistical software R is included in Appendix A. We used the
15 open-source statistical programming language R (R Core Team, 2017) for all
16 analyses and the packages *gbm* (Ridgeway, 2017) (BRT), *mgcv* (Wood, 2006)
17 (GAM), *kernlab* (Karatzoglou et al., 2004) (SVM), *kknn* (Schliep & Hechen-
18 bichler, 2016) (WKNN), and *ranger* (Wright & Ziegler, 2017) (RF). We have
19 integrated the spatial partitioning functions of the *sperrrest* package into the
20 *mlr* package as part of this work. *mlr* provides a standardized interface for a
21 wide variety of statistical and machine-learning models in R simplifying essential
22 modeling tasks such as hyperparameter tuning, model performance evaluation
23 and parallelization.

24
25 3.4.1. Random Forest

26 Classification trees are a non-linear technique that uses binary decision rules
27 to predict a class based on the given predictors (Gordon et al., 1984). RF
28 aggregates many classification trees by counting the votes of all individual trees.
29 The class with the most votes wins and will be the predicted class. Fitting a
30 high number of trees is then referred to as fitting a 'forest' in a metaphorical way.
31 Using many trees stabilizes the model (Breiman, 2001). However, RF saturates
32 at a specific number of trees, meaning that adding more trees will not increase
33 its performance anymore but only increases computing time. Randomness is
34 introduced in two ways: First a bootstrap sample of observations is drawn for
35 each tree. Second, for each node only a random subset of m_{try}) variables is
36 considered for generating the decision rule (Breiman, 2001).

37
38 3.4.2. Support Vector Machines

39 SVMs transform the data in a high-dimensional feature space by performing
40 non-linear transformations of the predictor variables (Vapnik, 1998). In this

high-dimensional setting, classes are linearly separated using decision hyperplanes. The tuning of SVMs is important and not trivial due to the sensitivity of the hyperparameters across a wide search space (Duan et al., 2003).

We decided to use the Radial Basis Function (RBF) kernel (also known as Gaussian kernel) which is the default in most implementations and most commonly used in the literature (Meyer et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2005; Pradhan, 2013). For this kernel, the regularization parameter C and bandwidth σ , which control the degree of non-linearity, are the hyperparameters which have to be optimized. An exploratory analysis of the Laplace and Bessel kernels was done, which confirmed the expected insensitivity to the choice of the kernel. All these kernels (including the RBF kernel) are classified as "general purpose kernels" (Karatzoglou et al., 2004).

3.4.3. Boosted Regression Trees

BRT are different from RF in that trees are fitted on top of previous trees instead of being fitted parallel to each other without a relation to adjacent trees. In this iterative process, each tree learns from the previous fitted trees by a magnitude specified by the *shrinkage* parameter (Elith et al., 2008). This process is also called 'stage-wise fitting' (not step-wise) because the previous fitted trees remain unchanged while additional trees are added. BRT have a tendency towards overfitting the more trees are added. Therefore, a combination of a small learning rate with a high number of trees is preferable. BRT acts similar as a GLM as it can be applied to several response types (binomial, Poisson, Gaussian, etc.) using a respective link function. Also, the final model can be seen as a large regression model with every tree being a single term (Elith et al., 2008). Hyperparameter tuning was performed on the learning rate *shrinkage*, the number of trees *n.tree* and the interaction depth between the variables *interaction.depth*.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 3.4.4. *Weighted k-Nearest Neighbor*

10 325 WKNN identifies the K-nearest neighbors within the training set for a new
11 observation to predict the target class based on the majority class among the
12 neighbors. The first formulation of the algorithm goes back to Fix & Hodges
13 (1951). Besides the standard hyperparameter *number of neighbors* ($n_{neighbors}$),
14 the implementation by Schliep & Hechenbichler (2016) also provides hyper-
15 parameter (*distance*) that allows to set the Minkowski distance and a choice
16 between different kernels (up to 12, see Table 1). Hyperparameter *distance*
17 helps finding the k -nearest training set vectors which are used for classification
18 together with the maximum of the summed kernel densities provided by hyper-
19 parameter *kernel* (Schliep & Hechenbichler, 2016). Training observations that
20 are closer to the predicted observation get a higher weight in the decision pro-
21 cess, when a kernel other then *rectangular* is chosen. The original idea of the
22 WKNN algorithm goes back to Dudani (1976).

23
24 Including weighting and kernel functions may increase predictive accuracy
25 but can also lead to overfitting of the training data.

26
27 340 3.4.5. *Generalized Linear Model and Generalized Additive Models*

28
29 345 GLMs extend linear models by allowing also non-Gaussian distributions,
30 e.g., binomial, Poisson or negative binomial distributions, for the response vari-
31 able. The option to apply a custom link function between the response and
32 the predictors already allows for some degree of non-linearity. GAMs are an
33 extension of GLMs allowing the response-predictor relationship to become fully
34 non-linear. For more details please refer to Zuur et al. (2009); Wood (2006);
35 James et al. (2013).

36
37 4. Results

38
39 4.1. *Tuning*

40
41 350 While ten (or more) hyperparameter tuning iterations substantially im-
42 proved the performance of BRT and SVM classifiers compared to default hy-
43 perparameter values, WKNN and RF hyperparameter tuning did not result in




Figure 4: Hyperparameter tuning results of the *spatial/spatial* CV setting for BRT, WKNN, RF and SVM: Number of tuning iterations (1 iteration = 1 random hyperparameter setting) vs. predictive performance (AUROC).

relevant changes in AUROC (Figure 4). Fifty tuning iterations and more further improved accuracies only slightly (WKNN) or not at all (SVM, BRT). SVM showed the highest tuning effect of all models with an increase of ~0.08 AUROC (Figure 4).

There were notable differences in the estimated optimal hyperparameters between the spatial (*spatial/spatial*) and non-spatial (*spatial/non-spatial*, *non-spatial/non-spatial*) tuning settings (Figure 5). For example when being spatially tuned, the estimated m_{try} values of RF mainly ranged between 1 and 3 with $m_{try} = 1$ being chosen most often. In contrast, in a non-spatial tuning situation m_{try} was mainly favored between 2 and 4 with $m_{try} = 3$ being the mode setting.

4.2. Predictive performance

For the spatial settings (*spatial/spatial* and *spatial/no tuning*), GAM and RF show the best predictive performance followed by GLM, SVM and WKNN (Figure 6). The absolute difference between the best (RF/GAM) and worst

(WKNN) performing model in our setup is 0.081 (mean AUROC, WKNN vs. RF/GAM) (Table 2).

The tuning of hyperparameters resulted in a clear increase of predictive performance for BRT (0.661 (*spatial/spatial*) vs. 0.587 (*spatial/no tuning*) AUROC) and SVM (0.654 (*spatial/spatial*) vs 0.574 (*spatial/no tuning*) AUROC) (Table 2). The type of partitioning for hyperparameter tuning (spatial (*spatial/spatial*) or non-spatial (*spatial/non-spatial*)) only had an substantial impact for SVM (Figure 6).




Figure 5: Best hyperparameter settings by fold (500 total) each estimated from 400 random search tuning iterations per fold using five-fold cross-validation. Split by spatial and non-spatial partitioning setup and model type. Red crosses indicate default hyperparameter values of the respective model. Black dots represent the winning hyperparameter setting out of each random search tuning of the respective fold.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Table 2: Mean AUROC (repetition level) for different 5-fold 100 times repeated cross-
10 validation settings. Settings with tuning are based on 400 random search iterations. Highest
11 values of each column are highlighted in bold. Note that non-spatial performance estimation
12 is over-optimistic.
13

Performance estimation	Non-Spatial		Spatial		
	Hyperparameter tuning	Non-Spatial	None	Non-Spatial	Spatial
GLM	-	0.859	-	-	0.665
GAM	-	0.874	-	-	0.708
BRT	0.908	0.792	0.699	0.671	0.583
RF	0.912	0.913	0.698	0.699	0.704
SVM	0.878	0.881	0.563	0.650	0.573
WKNN	0.872	0.870	0.657	0.624	0.635

29 Predictive performance estimates based on non-spatial partitioning (*non-*
30 *spatial/non-spatial* or *non-spatial/no tuning*) are around 24 - 39% higher, i.e.
31 overoptimistic, compared to their spatial equivalents (*spatial/spatial*). BRT and
32 WKNN show the highest differences between these two settings (35% and 39%,
33 respectively) while the GAM is least affected (24%).
34
35
36
37

39 5. Discussion

41 5.1. Tuning

43 Hyperparameter tuning becomes more and more expensive in terms of com-
44 puting time with an increasing number of iterations. Hence, the goal is to use
45 as few tuning iterations as possible to find a nearly optimal hyperparameter
46 setting for a model for a specific data set. In this respect, random search al-
47 gorithms are particularly promising in multidimensional hyperparameter spaces
48 with possibly redundant or insensitive hyperparameters (low effective dimen-
49 sionality; (Bergstra & Bengio, 2012)). These as well as adaptive search algo-
50 rithms offer computationally efficient solutions to these difficult global opti-
51 mization problems in which little prior knowledge on optimal subspaces is avail-
52
53
54
55
56
57
58




Figure 6: (Nested) CV estimates of model performance at the repetition level using 400 random search iterations. CV setting refers to performance estimation/hyperparameter tuning of the respective (nested) CV, e.g. "Spatial/Non-Spatial" means that spatial partitioning was used for performance estimation and non-spatial partitioning for hyperparameter tuning.

able. Bayesian Optimization and F-racing are other approaches that are widely used for optimization of black-box models (Birattari et al., 2002; Brochu et al., 2010; Malkomes et al., 2016). In this study, a random search with at least 50 iterations was sufficient for all considered algorithms.
395

Depending on the data set characteristics, some models (e.g. RF) can be insensitive to hyperparameter tuning (Biau & Scornet, 2016; Díaz-Uriarte & De Andres, 2006). As the effect of hyperparameter tuning always depends on the data set characteristics, we recommend to always tune hyperparameters. If
400

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 400 no tuning is conducted, it cannot be ensured that the respective model showed
10 its best possible predictive performance on the data set.
11

12 Computing power, especially when conducting a random search, should fo-
13 cus on plausible parameters for each model. It should be ensured by visual
14 inspection that the majority of the obtained optimal hyperparameter settings
15 does not range closely to the limits of the tuning space. If the optimal hy-
16 perparameter settings are clustered at the edge of the parameter limits, this
17 implies that optimal hyperparameters may actually lie outside the given range.
18 However, extending the tuning space is not always possible nor practical as
19 numerical problems within the algorithm may occur that may prohibit further
20 extension of the tuning space. This especially applies to models with a numer-
21 ical search space (e.g. SVM). In a practical sense one has to question oneself
22 if extending the parameter ranges could possibly result in a significant perfor-
23 mance increase and is worth the disadvantage of having an increased runtime.
24 All these points show the need for a thorough specification of parameter limits
25 for hyperparameter tuning. As the optimal parameter limits also depend on the
26 dataset characteristics, it is not possible to define an optimal search space for
27 an algorithm upfront. The chosen parameter limits of this work can serve as a
28 starting point for future analysis but do not claim to be universally applicable.
29 Users should analyze parameter search spaces of various studies to find suitable
30 limits that match their dataset characteristics. Within the framework of the
31 *mlr* project a database exists which stores tuning setups of various models from
32 users that can serve as a reference point (Richter, 2017).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 While in our study no major differences in model performances were found
46 when using spatial versus non-spatial hyperparameter tuning procedures (e.g.
47 0.03 for BRT (0.624 vs. 0.652 AUROC), we recommend using the same (spa-
48 tial) cross-validation procedure in the inner (tuning) cross-validation step as in
49 the outer (performance estimation). Generally spoken, hyperparameters from
50 a non-spatial tuning lead to models which are more adapted to the training
51 data than models with hyperparameters estimated from a spatial tuning. Mod-
52 els fitted with hyperparameters from a non-spatial tuning can then profit from
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the remaining spatial autocorrelation in the train/test split during performance estimation (compare results of settings *spatial/non-spatial* and *spatial/spatial* of BRT in Figure 3). Some software implementations (e.g., the SVM implementation of the *kernlab* package) provide an automated non-spatial CV for hyperparameter tuning. However, this is only useful for data without spatial and temporal dependencies.

Tuning of RF had no substantial effect on predictive performance in this study. Nevertheless, the estimated optimal hyperparameters of RF differ for the non-spatial and spatial tuning setting (Figure 5). In a non-spatial tuning setting, RF will prioritize spatially autocorrelated predictors as these will perform best in the optimization of the *Gini impurity measure* (Biau & Scornet, 2016; Gordon et al., 1984). In this pre-selection `mtry` values around 3 - 5 are favored because they provide a fair chance of having one of the autocorrelated predictors included in the selection. At the same time, `mtry` is low enough to prevent overfitting on the training data which would cause a bad performance on the test set. This means that mainly the predictors which profit from spatial autocorrelation will be selected. Although applying these non-spatially optimized hyperparameters on the spatially partitioned performance estimation fold has no advantages in predictive performance compared to using the spatially tuned hyperparameters, the resulting model will have a different structure. In the spatial tuning setting, mainly `mtry = 1` is chosen. This specific setting essentially removes the internal variable selection process by `mtry` as RF is forced to use the randomly chosen predictor. Subsequently, on average, each predictor will be chosen equally often and the higher weighting of spatially autocorrelated predictors in the final model (by choosing them more often in the trees) is reduced. This leads to a more general model that apparently performs better on heterogeneous datasets (e.g. if training and test data are less affected by spatial autocorrelation).

5.2. Predictive Performance

In this study we compared the predictive performance of six models using five different CV setups (subsection 4.2).

Our findings agree with previous studies in that non-spatial performance estimates appear to be substantially "better" than spatial performance estimates. However, this difference can be attributed to an overoptimistic bias in non-spatial performance estimates in the presence of spatial autocorrelation. (add references) Spatial cross-validation is therefore recommended for performance estimation in spatial predictive modeling, and similar grouped cross-validation strategies have been proposed elsewhere in environmental as well as medical contexts to reduce bias (Brenning & Lausen, 2008; Meyer et al., 2018; Peña & Brenning, 2015).

Although hyperparameter tuning certainly increases the predictive performance for some models (e.g. BRT and SVM) in our case, the magnitude always depends on the meaningful/arbitrary defaults of the respective algorithm and the characteristics of the data set. For SVM, we refrained from using automatic tuning algorithms (e.g. *kernlab* package) or optimized default values (e.g. Meyer et al. (2017)) for all "no tuning" settings. While the *kernlab* approach clearly violates the "no tuning" criterion, there are no globally accepted default values for σ and C . Subsequently we set both σ and C to an arbitrary value of 1. Naturally, the tuning effect is higher for models without meaningful defaults (such as BRT and SVM) than for models with meaningful defaults such as RF. Aside from the optimization of predictive performance the aim of hyperparameter tuning is the retrieval of bias-reduced performance estimates.

The biased-reduced outcomes of RF (*spatial/spatial* setting) and the GAM (*spatial/no tuning* setting) showed the best predictive performance in our study. Various other ecological modeling studies confirm the finding that RF is among the best performing models (Bahn & McGill, 2012; Jarnevich et al., 2017; Smoliński & Radtke, 2016; Vorpahl et al., 2012). It is noteworthy that the performance of the GLM is close to the one of the GAM and RF for this dataset.

In this work we assume that, on average, the predictive accuracy of parametric models with and without spatial autocorrelation structures is the same. However, there is little research on this specific topic (Dormann, 2007; Mets et al., 2017) and a detailed analysis goes beyond the scope of this work. In

our view, a possible analysis would need to estimate the spatial autocorrelation structure of a model for every fold of a cross-validation using a data-driven approach (i.e. automatically estimate the spatial autocorrelation structure from each training set in the respective CV fold) and compare the results to the same model fitted without a spatial autocorrelation structure. Since we only focused on predictive accuracy in this work, we did not use spatial autocorrelation structures during model fitting for GLM and GAM to reduce runtime.

Comparing the results of this work to the study of Iturritxa et al. (2014), an increase in AUROC of ~0.05 AUROC was observed (comparing the spatial CV result of the GLM from this study to the spatial CV result of *Diplodia sapinea* without predictor *hail* from Iturritxa et al. (2014)). However, the gain in performance is minimal if predictor *hail_prob* is removed from the model of this study (0.667 (this work) vs. 0.659 Iturritxa et al. (2014) AUROC). Subsequently, the influence of the additional predictors *slope*, *soil*, *lithology* and *pH* that were added to this study is negligible small. The relatively small performance increase of predictor *hail_prob* (0.667 to 0.694 AUROC) compared to predictor *hail* (0.659 to 0.962 AUROC) from Iturritxa et al. (2014) can be explained by the high correlation of the latter (0.93) with the response. This inherits from the binary type of the response and predictor *hail*. The spatially modeled predictor *hail_prob* of this work is of type numeric (probabilities) and therefore shows a much lower correlation to the response. In summary, the inclusion of the new predictors increased the predictive accuracy by 0.05 AUROC compared to Iturritxa et al. (2014).

We want to highlight the importance of spatial partitioning for an bias-reduced estimate of model performance. If only non-spatial CV had been used in this study, the main results of this study would look as follows: (i) The best model would have been RF instead of GAM. (ii) The predictive performance would have been reported with a mean value of 0.912 AUROC which is ~0.204 (29%) AUROC higher than the best bias-reduced performance estimated by spatial CV (*spatial/spatial*) (0.708 AUROC, GAM).

5.3. Other Model Evaluation Criteria

This work focuses only on the evaluation of models by comparing their predictive performances. However, in practice other criteria exist that might influence the selection of a algorithm for a specific data set in a scientific field.

Using multiple performance measures suited for binary classification may be a possible enhancement. However, looking at possible invariances (invariance = not being sensible to changes in the confusion matrix) of performance measures, Sokolova & Lapalme (2009) found that AUROC is among the best suitable measures for binary classification in all tested scenarios. This is the reason why most model comparison studies with a binary response (e.g. Goetz et al. (2015); Smoliński & Radtke (2016)) only use AUROC as a single error measure.

High predictive performance does not always mean that a model also has a high practical plausibility. Steger et al. (2016) showed that in the field of landslide modeling, models achieving high AUROC estimates may have a low geomorphic plausibility.

Although the process of automated variable selection is not a criterion that can be compared in a quantitative way, users should always be aware of the selection process of predictor variables when interpreting the plausibility of a model in the ecological modeling field. While in our case the predictor variables have been selected by expert knowledge, automated variable selection processes (e.g. stepwise variable selection) for parametric models may lead to potentially biased input data (Steger et al., 2016). As a consequence, the user might receive high performance estimates with unrealistic susceptibility maps (Demoulin & Chung, 2007).

Another non-quantitative model selection criterion within the spatial modeling field is the surface quality of a predicted map. Homogeneous prediction surfaces might be favored over predictive power if the difference is acceptable small. Inhomogeneous surfaces can be an indicator for a poor plausibility of the predicted map, simply caused by the nature of the algorithm (e.g. RF) which splits continuous predictors into classes (Steger et al., 2016). In comparison a spatial prediction map from a GAM, GLM or SVM shows much smoother

prediction surfaces.

5.4. Model Interpretability

555 Although there is an ongoing discussion about the usage of parametric vs.
non-parametric models in the field of ecological modeling (Perretti & Munch,
2015), most studies prefer parametric ones due to the ability to interpret rela-
tionships between the predictors and the response (Aertsen et al., 2010; Jabot,
2015). However, when interpreting the coefficients of (semi-)parametric spatial
560 models (e.g. GLM, GAM), spatial autocorrelation structures should be included
within the model fitting process (e.g. possible in R with *MASS::glmmPQL()* or
mgcv::gamm()). Otherwise, the independence assumption might be violated
which in turn might lead to biased coefficients and p-values and hence wrong
(ecological) conclusions (Cressie, 1993; Dormann et al., 2007; Telford & Birks,
565 2005).

Variable importance information as provided by machine-learning algorithms is only suitable to provide an overview of the most important variables but does not give detailed information about the predictor-response relationships (Hastie et al., 2001). Using the concept of variable permutation during cross-validation (Brenning, 2012), Ruß & Brenning (2010) showed how to analyze variable importance of machine-learning models in the context of spatial prediction.

6. Conclusion

A total of six statistical and machine-learning models have been compared in this study focusing on predictive performance. For our test case, all machine learning models outperformed parametric models in terms of predictive accuracy with RF and GAM showing the best results. The effect of hyperparameter tuning of machine learning models depends on the algorithm and data set. However, it should always be performed using a suitable amount of iterations and well defined parameter limits. The accuracy of detecting *Diplodia sapinea* was increased by 0.05 AUROC compared to Iturritxa et al. (2014) with predictor

"hail damage at trees" being the main driver. Spatial CV should be favored over non-spatial CV when working with spatial data to obtain bias-reduced predictive performance results for both hyperparameter tuning and performance estimation. Furthermore, we recommend to be clear on the analysis aim before conducting spatial modeling: If the goal is to understand environmental processes with the help of statistical inference, (semi-)parametric models should be favored even if they do not provide the best predictive accuracy. On the other hand, if the intention is to make highly accurate spatial predictions, spatially tuned machine-learning models should be considered for the task. We hope that this work motivates and helps scientists to report more bias-reduced performance estimates in the future.

7. Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the EU LIFE project Healthy Forest: LIFE14 ENV/ES/000179.

8. Appendix

Appendix A. Package selection

Appendix A.1. Random Forest

Several RF implementations exist in R. We used package *ranger* because of its fast runtime. The RF implementation in package *ranger* is up to 25 times faster, taking number of observations as benchmark criteria, and up to 60 times if hyperparameter n_{trees} is the benchmark measure, respectively, compared to package *randomForest* (Wright & Ziegler, 2017). Other packages such as *randomForestSRC*, *bigrf*, *Random Jungle* or *Rborist* lie in between.

Appendix A.2. Support Vector Machine

605 Package *kernlab* (Karatzoglou et al., 2004) was chosen in favor of the widely
used *e1071* (Meyer et al., 2017) package because *kernlab* offers more kernel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 options. Other kernels than RBF have been tested partly but not analyzed in
10 detail in this work.
11

12
13 *Appendix A.3. Boosted Regression Trees*
14

15 For BRT, only one implementation exists in R (to our knowledge) in package
16 *gbm* (Ridgeway, 2017).
17

18
19 *Appendix A.4. Generalized Linear/Additive Model*
20

21 We used the base implementation of GLMs in the *stats* package which be-
22 longs to the core packages of R. For GAMs, the *mgcv* package was chosen in
23 favor of *gam* because it provides several optimization methods to find the opti-
24 mal smoothing degree of each variable and the ability to include random effects
25 within the model. The *mgcv* package lets the user specify different smooth
26 terms and limits for the degree of non-linearity (Wood, 2006). By default, the
27 upper limit of parameter k , which limits the degree of non-linearity, is set to
28 $k - 1$ with k being the number of variables. Note: It is important to ensure
29 that during optimization k does not hit the upper limit in any of the optimized
30 smooth terms of a predictor variable. Otherwise, the degree of non-linearity of a
31 predictor variable would be restricted and cannot be modeled accurately. Sub-
32 sequently, model performance would not be optimal. Setting k to a high value
33 relative to the final smoothing degree result leads to highly increased run-time
34 or even convergence problems.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **Appendix B. Descriptive summary of numerical and nominal predic-**
10 **tor variables**

Variable	n	Min	q ₁	\tilde{x}	\bar{x}	q ₃	Max	IQR	#NA
temp	926	12.6	14.6	15.2	15.1	15.7	16.8	1.0	0
p_sum	926	124.4	181.8	224.6	234.2	252.3	496.6	70.5	0
r_sum	926	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0
elevation	926	0.6	197.2	327.2	338.7	455.9	885.9	258.8	0
slope_degrees	926	0.2	12.5	19.5	19.8	27.1	55.1	14.6	0
hail_prob	926	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.5	0
age	926	2.0	13.0	20.0	18.9	24.0	40.0	11.0	0
ph	926	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.8	6.0	0.4	0

25 Table B.3: Summary of numerical predictor variables. Precipitation (p_sum) in mm/m²,
26 temperature (temp) in °C, solar radiation (r_sum) in kW/m², tree age (age) in years. Statistics
27 show sample size (n), minimum (Min), 25% percentile (q₁), median (\tilde{x}), mean (\bar{x}), 75%
28 percentile (q₃), maximum (Max), inner-quartile range (IQR) and NA Count (#NA).
29
30

Variable	Levels	n	%
diplo01	0	703	75.9
	1	223	24.1
	all	926	100.0
lithology	surface deposits	32	3.5
	clastic sedimentary rock	602	65.0
	biological sedimentary rock	136	14.7
	chemical sedimentary rock	143	15.4
	magmatic rock	13	1.4
	all	926	100.0
soil	soils with little or no profile differentiation (Cambisols, Fluvisols)	672	72.6
	pronounced accumulation of organic matter in the mineral topsoil (Chernozems, Kastanozem)	22	2.4
	soils with limitations to root growth (Cryosols, Leptosols)	19	2.0
	accumulation of moderately soluble salts or non-saline substances (Durisols, Gypsisols)	13	1.4
	soils distinguished by Fe/Al chemistry (Ferralsols, Gleysols)	35	3.8
	organic soil (Histosols)	14	1.5
	soils with clay-enriched subsoil (Lixisols, Luvisols)	151	16.3
	all	926	100.0
year	2009	401	43.3
	2010	261	28.2
	2011	102	11.0
	2012	162	17.5
	all	926	100.0

Table B.4: Summary of nominal predictor variables

Appendix C. Additional hyperparameter tuning results




Figure C.7: Best hyperparameter settings by fold (500 total) each estimated from 400 random search tuning iterations per fold using five-fold cross-validation. Split by spatial and non-spatial partitioning setup and model type. Red crosses indicate default hyperparameter values of the respective model. Black dots represent the winning hyperparameter setting out of each random search tuning of the respective fold.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **References**

- 10
11 Adler, W., Gefeller, O., & Uter, W. (2017). Positive reactions to pairs of aller-
12 gens associated with polysensitization: analysis of IVDK data with machine-
13 learning techniques. *Contact Dermatitis*, 76, 247–251.
14
15 Aertsen, W., Kint, V., van Orshoven, J., Özkan, K., & Muys, B. (2010).
16
17 Comparison and ranking of different modelling techniques for prediction
18 of site index in mediterranean mountain forests. *Ecological Modelling*,
19 221, 1119–1130. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.01.007>.
20
21
22
23
24
25 Bahn, V., & McGill, B. J. (2012). Testing the predictive performance of distri-
26 bution models. *Oikos*, 122, 321–331. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.00299.x>.
27
28
29
30 Bergstra, J., & Bengio, Y. (2012). Random search for hyper-parameter opti-
31 mization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13, 281–305. URL: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2188385.2188395>.
32
33
34
35
36 Biau, G., & Scornet, E. (2016). A random forest guided tour. *TEST*, 25, 197–
37 227. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11749-016-0481-7>. doi:10.1007/s11749-016-0481-7.
38
39
40
41 Birattari, M., Stützle, T., Paquete, L., & Varrentrapp, K. (2002). A racing
42 algorithm for configuring metaheuristics. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual*
43 *Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation* (pp. 11–18). Morgan
44 Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
45
46
47
48 Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32.
49 URL: [https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1010933404324](https://doi.org/10.1023%2Fa%3A1010933404324). doi:10.1023/a:
50 1010933404324.
51
52
53
54 Brenning, A. (2005). Spatial prediction models for landslide hazards: re-
55 view, comparison and evaluation. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sci-*
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *ence*, 5, 853–862. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5194%2Fnhess-5-853-2005>.
10 doi:10.5194/nhess-5-853-2005.

11
12 Brenning, A. (2012). Spatial cross-validation and bootstrap for the as-
13 sessment of prediction rules in remote sensing: The R package sperror-
14 est. In *2012 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*. IEEE.
15 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109%2Figarss.2012.6352393>.
16 doi:10.1109/igarss.2012.6352393 R package version 2.1.0.

17
18 Brenning, A., & Lausen, B. (2008). Estimating error rates in the classification
19 of paired organs. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27, 4515–4531. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fsim.3310>. doi:10.1002/sim.3310.

20
21 Brenning, A., Schwinn, M., Ruiz-Páez, A. P., & Muenchow, J. (2015). Land-
22 slide susceptibility near highways is increased by 1 order of magnitude in the
23 Andes of southern Ecuador, Loja province. *Natural Hazards and Earth Sys-*
24 *tem Sciences*, 15, 45–57. URL: [http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.](http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/15/45/2015/)
25 net/15/45/2015/.

26
27 Brochu, E., Cora, V. M., & de Freitas, N. (2010). A tutorial on bayesian op-
28 timization of expensive cost functions, with application to active user mod-
29 eling and hierarchical reinforcement learning. *CoRR, abs/1012.2599*. URL:
30
31 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1012.2599>.

32
33 Bui, D. T., Tuan, T. A., Klempe, H., Pradhan, B., & Revhaug, I. (2015).
34 Spatial prediction models for shallow landslide hazards: a comparative as-
35 sessment of the efficacy of support vector machines, artificial neural net-
36 works, kernel logistic regression, and logistic model tree. *Landslides*, 13,
37 361–378. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10346-015-0557-6>. doi:10.
38 1007/s10346-015-0557-6.

39
40 Candy, J. V., & Breitfeller, E. F. (2013). *Receiver Operating Characteristic*
41 (*ROC*) *Curves: An Analysis Tool for Detection Performance*. Technical Re-
42 port. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2172%2F1093414>. doi:10.2172/1093414.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 685 Cressie, N. A. C. (1993). *Statistics for Spatial Data*. John Wiley &
10 Sons, Inc. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002%2F9781119115151>. doi:10.
11 1002/9781119115151.
- 12
13
14 Demoulin, A., & Chung, C.-J. F. (2007). Mapping landslide susceptibility
15 from small datasets: A case study in the pays de herve (e belgium). *Geo-*
16 *morphology*, 89, 391–404. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.01.008>.
- 17
18 690
19
20 Diaz-Uriarte, R., & De Andres, S. A. (2006). Gene selection and classification
21 of microarray data using random forest. *BMC bioinformatics*, 7, 3.
- 22
23
24 Dormann, C. F. (2007). Effects of incorporating spatial autocorrelation into the
25 analysis of species distribution data. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16,
26 129–138. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2006.00279.x>.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
700
705
710
715
720
725
730
735
740
745
750
755
760
765
770
775
780
785
790
795
800
805
810
815
820
825
830
835
840
845
850
855
860
865
870
875
880
885
890
895
900
905
910
915
920
925
930
935
940
945
950
955
960
965
970
975
980
985
990
995
1000
1005
1010
1015
1020
1025
1030
1035
1040
1045
1050
1055
1060
1065
1070
1075
1080
1085
1090
1095
1100
1105
1110
1115
1120
1125
1130
1135
1140
1145
1150
1155
1160
1165
1170
1175
1180
1185
1190
1195
1200
1205
1210
1215
1220
1225
1230
1235
1240
1245
1250
1255
1260
1265
1270
1275
1280
1285
1290
1295
1300
1305
1310
1315
1320
1325
1330
1335
1340
1345
1350
1355
1360
1365
1370
1375
1380
1385
1390
1395
1400
1405
1410
1415
1420
1425
1430
1435
1440
1445
1450
1455
1460
1465
1470
1475
1480
1485
1490
1495
1500
1505
1510
1515
1520
1525
1530
1535
1540
1545
1550
1555
1560
1565
1570
1575
1580
1585
1590
1595
1600
1605
1610
1615
1620
1625
1630
1635
1640
1645
1650
1655
1660
1665
1670
1675
1680
1685
1690
1695
1700
1705
1710
1715
1720
1725
1730
1735
1740
1745
1750
1755
1760
1765
1770
1775
1780
1785
1790
1795
1800
1805
1810
1815
1820
1825
1830
1835
1840
1845
1850
1855
1860
1865
1870
1875
1880
1885
1890
1895
1900
1905
1910
1915
1920
1925
1930
1935
1940
1945
1950
1955
1960
1965
1970
1975
1980
1985
1990
1995
2000
2005
2010
2015
2020
2025
2030
2035
2040
2045
2050
2055
2060
2065
2070
2075
2080
2085
2090
2095
2100
2105
2110
2115
2120
2125
2130
2135
2140
2145
2150
2155
2160
2165
2170
2175
2180
2185
2190
2195
2200
2205
2210
2215
2220
2225
2230
2235
2240
2245
2250
2255
2260
2265
2270
2275
2280
2285
2290
2295
2300
2305
2310
2315
2320
2325
2330
2335
2340
2345
2350
2355
2360
2365
2370
2375
2380
2385
2390
2395
2400
2405
2410
2415
2420
2425
2430
2435
2440
2445
2450
2455
2460
2465
2470
2475
2480
2485
2490
2495
2500
2505
2510
2515
2520
2525
2530
2535
2540
2545
2550
2555
2560
2565
2570
2575
2580
2585
2590
2595
2600
2605
2610
2615
2620
2625
2630
2635
2640
2645
2650
2655
2660
2665
2670
2675
2680
2685
2690
2695
2700
2705
2710
2715
2720
2725
2730
2735
2740
2745
2750
2755
2760
2765
2770
2775
2780
2785
2790
2795
2800
2805
2810
2815
2820
2825
2830
2835
2840
2845
2850
2855
2860
2865
2870
2875
2880
2885
2890
2895
2900
2905
2910
2915
2920
2925
2930
2935
2940
2945
2950
2955
2960
2965
2970
2975
2980
2985
2990
2995
3000
3005
3010
3015
3020
3025
3030
3035
3040
3045
3050
3055
3060
3065
3070
3075
3080
3085
3090
3095
3100
3105
3110
3115
3120
3125
3130
3135
3140
3145
3150
3155
3160
3165
3170
3175
3180
3185
3190
3195
3200
3205
3210
3215
3220
3225
3230
3235
3240
3245
3250
3255
3260
3265
3270
3275
3280
3285
3290
3295
3300
3305
3310
3315
3320
3325
3330
3335
3340
3345
3350
3355
3360
3365
3370
3375
3380
3385
3390
3395
3400
3405
3410
3415
3420
3425
3430
3435
3440
3445
3450
3455
3460
3465
3470
3475
3480
3485
3490
3495
3500
3505
3510
3515
3520
3525
3530
3535
3540
3545
3550
3555
3560
3565
3570
3575
3580
3585
3590
3595
3600
3605
3610
3615
3620
3625
3630
3635
3640
3645
3650
3655
3660
3665
3670
3675
3680
3685
3690
3695
3700
3705
3710
3715
3720
3725
3730
3735
3740
3745
3750
3755
3760
3765
3770
3775
3780
3785
3790
3795
3800
3805
3810
3815
3820
3825
3830
3835
3840
3845
3850
3855
3860
3865
3870
3875
3880
3885
3890
3895
3900
3905
3910
3915
3920
3925
3930
3935
3940
3945
3950
3955
3960
3965
3970
3975
3980
3985
3990
3995
4000
4005
4010
4015
4020
4025
4030
4035
4040
4045
4050
4055
4060
4065
4070
4075
4080
4085
4090
4095
4100
4105
4110
4115
4120
4125
4130
4135
4140
4145
4150
4155
4160
4165
4170
4175
4180
4185
4190
4195
4200
4205
4210
4215
4220
4225
4230
4235
4240
4245
4250
4255
4260
4265
4270
4275
4280
4285
4290
4295
4300
4305
4310
4315
4320
4325
4330
4335
4340
4345
4350
4355
4360
4365
4370
4375
4380
4385
4390
4395
4400
4405
4410
4415
4420
4425
4430
4435
4440
4445
4450
4455
4460
4465
4470
4475
4480
4485
4490
4495
4500
4505
4510
4515
4520
4525
4530
4535
4540
4545
4550
4555
4560
4565
4570
4575
4580
4585
4590
4595
4600
4605
4610
4615
4620
4625
4630
4635
4640
4645
4650
4655
4660
4665
4670
4675
4680
4685
4690
4695
4700
4705
4710
4715
4720
4725
4730
4735
4740
4745
4750
4755
4760
4765
4770
4775
4780
4785
4790
4795
4800
4805
4810
4815
4820
4825
4830
4835
4840
4845
4850
4855
4860
4865
4870
4875
4880
4885
4890
4895
4900
4905
4910
4915
4920
4925
4930
4935
4940
4945
4950
4955
4960
4965
4970
4975
4980
4985
4990
4995
5000
5005
5010
5015
5020
5025
5030
5035
5040
5045
5050
5055
5060
5065
5070
5075
5080
5085
5090
5095
5100
5105
5110
5115
5120
5125
5130
5135
5140
5145
5150
5155
5160
5165
5170
5175
5180
5185
5190
5195
5200
5205
5210
5215
5220
5225
5230
5235
5240
5245
5250
5255
5260
5265
5270
5275
5280
5285
5290
5295
5300
5305
5310
5315
5320
5325
5330
5335
5340
5345
5350
5355
5360
5365
5370
5375
5380
5385
5390
5395
5400
5405
5410
5415
5420
5425
5430
5435
5440
5445
5450
5455
5460
5465
5470
5475
5480
5485
5490
5495
5500
5505
5510
5515
5520
5525
5530
5535
5540
5545
5550
5555
5560
5565
5570
5575
5580
5585
5590
5595
5600
5605
5610
5615
5620
5625
5630
5635
5640
5645
5650
5655
5660
5665
5670
5675
5680
5685
5690
5695
5700
5705
5710
5715
5720
5725
5730
5735
5740
5745
5750
5755
5760
5765
5770
5775
5780
5785
5790
5795
5800
5805
5810
5815
5820
5825
5830
5835
5840
5845
5850
5855
5860
5865
5870
5875
5880
5885
5890
5895
5900
5905
5910
5915
5920
5925
5930
5935
5940
5945
5950
5955
5960
5965
5970
5975
5980
5985
5990
5995
6000
6005
6010
6015
6020
6025
6030
6035
6040
6045
6050
6055
6060
6065
6070
6075
6080
6085
6090
6095
6100
6105
6110
6115
6120
6125
6130
6135
6140
6145
6150
6155
6160
6165
6170
6175
6180
6185
6190
6195
6200
6205
6210
6215
6220
6225
6230
6235
6240
6245
6250
6255
6260
6265
6270
6275
6280
6285
6290
6295
6300
6305
6310
6315
6320
6325
6330
6335
6340
6345
6350
6355
6360
6365
6370
6375
6380
6385
6390
6395
6400
6405
6410
6415
6420
6425
6430
6435
6440
6445
6450
6455
6460
6465
6470
6475
6480
6485
6490
6495
6500
6505
6510
6515
6520
6525
6530
6535
6540
6545
6550
6555
6560
6565
6570
6575
6580
6585
6590
6595
6600
6605
6610
6615
6620
6625
6630
6635
6640
6645
6650
6655
6660
6665
6670
6675
6680
6685
6690
6695
6700
6705
6710
6715
6720
6725
6730
6735
6740
6745
6750
6755
6760
6765
6770
6775
6780
6785
6790
6795
6800
6805
6810
6815
6820
6825
6830
6835
6840
6845
6850
6855
6860
6865
6870
6875
6880
6885
6890
6895
6900
6905
6910
6915
6920
6925
6930
6935
6940
6945
6950
6955
6960
6965
6970
6975
6980
6985
6990
6995
7000
7005
7010
7015
7020
7025
7030
7035
7040
7045
7050
7055
7060
7065
7070
7075
7080
7085
7090
7095
7100
7105
7110
7115
7120
7125
7130
7135
7140
7145
7150
7155
7160
7165
7170
7175
7180
7185
7190
7195
7200
7205
7210
7215
7220
7225
7230
7235
7240
7245
7250
7255
7260
7265
7270
7275
7280
7285
7290
7295
7300
7305
7310
7315
7320
7325
7330
7335
7340
7345
7350
7355
7360
7365
7370
7375
7380
7385
7390
7395
7400
7405
7410
7415
7420
7425
7430
7435
7440
7445
7450
7455
7460
7465
7470
7475
7480
7485
7490
7495
7500
7505
7510
7515
7520
7525
7530
7535
7540
7545
7550
7555
7560
7565
7570
7575
7580
7585
7590
7595
7600
7605
7610
7615
7620
7625
7630
7635
7640
7645
7650
7655
7660
7665
7670
7675
7680
7685
7690
7695
7700
7705
7710
7715
7720
7725
7730
7735
7740
7745
7750
7755
7760
7765
7770
7775
7780
7785
7790
7795
7800
7805
7810
7815
7820
7825
7830
7835
7840
7845
7850
7855
7860
7865
7870
7875
7880
7885
7890
7895
7900
7905
7910
7915
7920
7925
7930
7935
7940
7945
7950
7955
7960
7965
7970
7975
7980
7985
7990
7995
8000
8005
8010
8015
8020
8025
8030
8035
8040
8045
8050
8055
8060
8065
8070
8075
8080
8085
8090
8095
8100
8105
8110
8115
8120
8125
8130
8135
8140
8145
8150
8155
8160
8165
8170
8175
8180
8185
8190
8195
8200
8205
8210
8215
8220
8225
8230
8235
8240
8245
8250
8255
8260
8265
8270
8275
8280
8285
8290
8295
8300
8305
8310
8315
8320
8325
8330
8335
8340
8345
8350
8355
8360
8365
8370
8375
8380
8385
8390
8395
8400
8405
8410
8415
8420
8425
8430
8435
8440
8445
8450
8455
8460
8465
8470
8475
8480
8485
8490
8495
8500
8505
8510
8515
8520
8525
8530
8535
8540
8545
8550
8555
8560
8565
8570
8575
8580
8585
8590
8595
8600
8605
8610
8615
8620
8625
8630
8635
8640
8645
8650
8655
8660
8665
8670
8675
8680
8685
8690
8695
8700
8705
8710
8715
8720
8725
8730
8735
8740
8745
8750
8755
8760
8765
8770
8775
8780
8785
8790
8795
8800
8805
8810
8815
8820
8825
8830
8835
8840
8845
8850
8855
8860
8865
8870
8875
8880
8885
8890
8895
8900
8905
8910
8915
8920
8925
8930
8935
8940
8945
8950
8955
8960
8965
8970
8975
8980
8985
8990
8995
9000
9005
9010
9015
9020
9025
9030
9035
9040
9045
9050
9055
9060
9065
9070
9075
9080
9085
9090
9095
9100
9105
9110
9115
9120
9125
9130
9135
9140
9145
9150
9155
9160
9165
9170
9175
9180
9185
9190
9195
9200
9205
9210
9215
9220
9225
9230
9235
9240
9245
9250
9255
9260
9265
9270
9275
9280
9285
9290
9295
9300
9305
9310
9315
9320
9325
9330
9335
9340
9345
9350
9355
9360
9365
9370
9375
9380
9385
9390
9395
9400
9405
9410
9415
9420
9425
9430
9435
9440
9445
9450
9455
9460
9465
9470
9475
9480
9485
9490
9495
9500
9505
9510
9515
9520
9525
9530
9535
9540
9545
9550
9555
9560
9565
9570
9575
9580
9585
9590
9595
9600
9605
9610
9615
9620
9

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Dudani, S. A. (1976). The distance-weighted k-nearest-neighbor rule.
10 *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, SMC-6*, 325–
11 327. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109%2Ftsmc.1976.5408784>. doi:10.1109/715
12 tsmc.1976.5408784.
- 13
14
15
16 Elith, J., Leathwick, J. R., & Hastie, T. (2008). A working guide
17 to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77, 802–813.
18 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x>. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01390.x.
- 19
20
21
22
23 European Commission, J. R. C. (2010). 'Map of Soil pH in Europe', *Land Re-*
24 *sources Management Unit, Institute for Environment & Sustainability*. URL:
25 <http://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/content/soil-ph-europe>.
- 26
27
28 Fassnacht, F., Hartig, F., Latifi, H., Berger, C., Hernández, J., Corvalán, P., &
29
30 Koch, B. (2014). Importance of sample size, data type and prediction method
31 for remote sensing-based estimations of aboveground forest biomass. *Remote*
32 *Sensing of Environment*, 154, 102–114. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.rse.2014.07.028>. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2014.07.028.
- 33
34
35
36 Fix, & Hodges (1951). *Discriminatory analysis, nonparametric discrimination:*
37 *Consistency properties*. Technical Report U.S. Air Force, School of Aviation
38
39 Medicine, Randolph Field, TX.
- 40
41
42 Ganley, R. J., Watt, M. S., Manning, L., & Iturritxa, E. (2009). A global climatic
43 risk assessment of pitch canker disease. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*,
44 39, 2246–2256. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1139%2Fx09-131>. doi:10.1139/735
45 x09-131.
- 46
47
48 Ganuza, A., & Almendros, G. (2003). Organic carbon storage in soils
49 of the Basque country (Spain): The effect of climate, vegetation type
50 and edaphic variables. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, 37, 154–162. URL: [10.1007/s00374-003-0579-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-003-0579-4). doi:10.1007/s00374-003-0579-4.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 740 Garofalo, M., Botta, A., & Ventre, G. (2016). Astrophysics and big data: Challenges, methods, and tools. *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, 12, 345–348. doi:10.1017/S1743921316012813.
- 10
11
12
13
14 745 Geiß, C., Pelizari, P. A., Schrade, H., Brenning, A., & Taubenböck, H. (2017). On the effect of spatially non-disjoint training and test samples on estimated model generalization capabilities in supervised classification with spatial features. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 14, 2008–2012. doi:10.1109/LGRS.2017.2747222.
- 15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 750 GeoEuskadi (1999). *Litología y permeabilidad*. URL: <http://www.geo.euskadi.eus/geonetwork/srv/spa/main.home>.
- 23
24
25
26
27 755 Goetz, J. N., Cabrera, R., Brenning, A., Heiss, G., & Leopold, P. (2015). Modelling landslide susceptibility for a large geographical area using weights of evidence in lower Austria, Austria. In *Engineering Geology for Society and Territory - Volume 2* (pp. 927–930). Springer International Publishing. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-319-09057-3_160. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-09057-3_160.
- 28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 760 Gordon, A. D., Breiman, L., Friedman, J. H., Olshen, R. A., & Stone, C. J. (1984). Classification and regression trees. *Biometrics*, 40, 874. URL: [https://doi.org/10.2307/2530946](https://doi.org/10.2307%2F2530946). doi:10.2307/2530946.
- 37
38
39
40
41 765 Grotzinger, J., & Jordan, T. (2016). Sedimente und sedimentgesteine. In *Press/Siever Allgemeine Geologie* (pp. 113–144). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-662-48342-8_5. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48342-8_5.
- 42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58 770 Guo, Q., Kelly, M., & Graham, C. H. (2005). Support vector machines for predicting distribution of sudden oak death in California. *Ecological Modelling*, 182, 75–90. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2004.07.012>. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2004.07.012.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Halvorsen, R., Mazzoni, S., Dirksen, J. W., Næsset, E., Gobakken, T., & Ohlson,
10 M. (2016). How important are choice of model selection method and spa-
11 tial autocorrelation of presence data for distribution modelling by MaxEnt?
12
13 770 *Ecological Modelling*, 328, 108–118. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.ecolmodel.2016.02.021>.
14
15
16
17 Hastie, T., Friedman, J., & Tibshirani, R. (2001). *The Elements of Sta-*
18 *tistical Learning*. Springer New York. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-0-387-21606-5>. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-21606-5.
19
20
21
22 Heaton, J. B., Polson, N. G., & Witte, J. H. (2016). Deep learning in finance.
23
24 775 *CoRR*, abs/1602.06561. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.06561>.
25
26 Hengl, T., de Jesus, J. M., Heuvelink, G. B. M., Gonzalez, M. R., Kilibarda, M.,
27 Blagotić, A., Shangguan, W., Wright, M. N., Geng, X., Bauer-Marschallinger,
28 Buevara, M. A., Vargas, R., MacMillan, R. A., Batjes, N. H., Leenaars, J.
29
30 780 G. B., Ribeiro, E., Wheeler, I., Mantel, S., & Kempen, B. (2017). Soil-
31 Grids250m: Global gridded soil information based on machine learning.
32
33 *PLOS ONE*, 12, e0169748. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169748>. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169748.
34
35
36
37 Hong, H., Pradhan, B., Jebur, M. N., Bui, D. T., Xu, C., & Akgun, A. (2015).
38
39 785 Spatial prediction of landslide hazard at the Luxi area (China) using support
40 vector machines. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 75. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-015-4866-9>.
41
42
43
44 Hutter, F., Hoos, H. H., & Leyton-Brown, K. (2011). Sequential model-
45 based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *Lecture*
46
47 790 *Notes in Computer Science* (pp. 507–523). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
48
49 URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-642-25566-3_40. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-25566-3_40.
50
51
52
53 Iturritxa, E., Mesanza, N., & Brenning, A. (2014). Spatial analysis of the risk
54 of major forest diseases in Monterey pine plantations. *Plant Pathology*, 64,
55
56 795 880–889. doi:10.1111/ppa.12328.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Jabot, F. (2015). Why preferring parametric forecasting to nonparametric meth-
10 ods? *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 372, 205–210. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jtbi.2014.07.038>. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2014.07.038.
11
12
13
14 James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to*
15 *Statistical Learning*. Springer New York. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-1-4614-7138-7>. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-7138-7.
16
17
18
19 Jarnevich, C. S., Talbert, M., Morisette, J., Aldridge, C., Brown, C. S., Ku-
20 mar, S., Manier, D., Talbert, C., & Holcombe, T. (2017). Minimizing effects
21 of methodological decisions on interpretation and prediction in species dis-
22 tribution studies: An example with background selection. *Ecological Mod-
23 elling*, 363, 48–56. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.ecolmodel.2017.08.017>.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Karatzoglou, A., Smola, A., Hornik, K., & Zeileis, A. (2004). kernlab – an S4
31 package for kernel methods in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 11, 1–20.
32
33 URL: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v11/i09/>. R package version 0.9-25.
34
35 Kohavi, R. et al. (1995). A study of cross-validation and bootstrap for accuracy
36 estimation and model selection. In *Ijcai* (pp. 1137–1145). Stanford, CA
37 volume 14.
38
39
40 Kuhn, M., & Johnson, K. (2013). *Applied Predictive Modeling*. Springer New
41 York. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-1-4614-6849-3>. doi:10.
42
43
44
45
46 Legendre, P., & Fortin, M. J. (1989). Spatial pattern and ecological analy-
47 sis. *Vegetatio*, 80, 107–138. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fbf00048036>.
48 doi:10.1007/bf00048036.
49
50
51
52 Leung, M. K. K., Delong, A., Alipanahi, B., & Frey, B. J. (2016). Machine learn-
53 ing in genomic medicine: A review of computational problems and data sets.
54
55 *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104, 176–197. doi:10.1109/JPROC.2015.2494198.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Maenner, M. J., Yeargin-Allsopp, M., Van Naarden Braun, K., Christensen,
10 D. L., & Schieve, L. A. (2016). Development of a machine learning al-
11 gorithm for the surveillance of autism spectrum disorder. *PLOS ONE*,
12 11, 1–11. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0168224>. doi:10.
13 1371/journal.pone.0168224.
14
15
16
17
18 Malkomes, G., Schaff, C., & Garnett, R. (2016). Bayesian optimiza-
19 tion for automated model selection. In D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama,
20 U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, & R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in Neu-
21 ral Information Processing Systems 29* (pp. 2900–2908). Cur-
22 ran Associates, Inc. URL: <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/6466-bayesian-optimization-for-automated-model-selection.pdf>.
23
24
25
26
27
28 Mets, K. D., Armenteras, D., & Dávalos, L. M. (2017). Spatial autocorre-
29 lation reduces model precision and predictive power in deforestation analy-
30 ses. *Ecosphere*, 8, e01824. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1824>.
31 doi:10.1002/ecs2.1824.
32
33
34 Meyer, D., Dimitriadou, E., Hornik, K., Weingessel, A., & Leisch, F. (2017).
35 e1071: Misc functions of the department of statistics, probability theory
36 group (formerly: E1071), TU Wien, . URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=e1071>. R package version 1.6-8.
37
38
39
40
41 Meyer, H., Reudenbach, C., Hengl, T., Katurji, M., & Nauß, T. (2018). Improv-
42 ing performance of spatio-temporal machine learning models using forward
43 feature selection and target-oriented validation. *Environmental Modelling &*
44
45 *Software*, 101, 1–9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.12.001>. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.12.001.
46
47
48
49
50 Muenchow, J., Feilhauer, H., Bräuning, A., Rodríguez, E. F., Bayer, F., Ro-
51 dríguez, R. A., & Wehrden, H. (2013a). Coupling ordination techniques and
52 GAM to spatially predict vegetation assemblages along a climatic gradient
53 in an ENSO-affected region of extremely high climate variability. *Journal*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *of vegetation science*, 24, 1154–1166. URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jvs.12038/full>.

10
11
12 Muenchow, J., Hauenstein, S., Bräuning, A., Bäumler, R., Rodríguez, E. F., &
13 von Wehrden, H. (2013b). Soil texture and altitude, respectively, widely deter-
14 mine the floristic gradient of the most diverse fog oasis in the peruvian desert.
15
16 855 *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 29, 427–438. doi:10.1017/S0266467413000436.

17
18
19 Múgica, J. R. M., Murillo, J. A., Ikazuriaga, I. A., Peña, B. E., Rodríguez, A. F.,
20 & Díaz, J. M. (2016). *Libro blanco del sector de la madera: actividad forestal e*
21 *industria de transformación de la madera. Evolución reciente y perspectivas en*
22 *Euskadi*. Eusko Jaurlaritzaren Argitalpen Zerbitzu Nagusia, Servicio Central
23 de Publicaciones del Gobierno VAsco, C/ Donostia-San Sebastián 1, 01010
24 Vitoria-Gasteiz.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Naghibi, S. A., Pourghasemi, H. R., & Dixon, B. (2016). GIS-based groundwater
32 potential mapping using boosted regression tree, classification and regression
33 tree, and random forest machine learning models in Iran. *Environmental*
34 *monitoring and assessment*, 188, 44.
35
36

37 Peña, M., & Brenning, A. (2015). Assessing fruit-tree crop classification from
38 landsat-8 time series for the maipo valley, chile. *Remote Sensing of En-*
39 *vironment*, 171, 234–244. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.10.029>.
40
41 865 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2015.10.029.

42
43 Perretti, C. T., & Munch, S. B. (2015). On estimating the reliability of ecological
44 forecasts. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 372, 211–216. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.02.031>. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.02.031.

45
46 Pourghasemi, H. R., & Rahmati, O. (2018). Prediction of the landslide sus-
47 ceptibility: Which algorithm, which precision? *CATENA*, 162, 177–192.
48 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2017.11.022>. doi:10.1016/
49 j.catena.2017.11.022.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Pradhan, B. (2013). A comparative study on the predictive ability of the
10 decision tree, support vector machine and neuro-fuzzy models in landslide
11 susceptibility mapping using GIS. *Computers & Geosciences*, 51, 350–365.
12 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.cageo.2012.08.023>. doi:10.1016/
13
14 j.cageo.2012.08.023.
- 15
16 Quillfeldt, P., Engler, J. O., Silk, J. R., & Phillips, R. A. (2017). Influence
17 of device accuracy and choice of algorithm for species distribution
18 modelling of seabirds: a case study using black-browed albatrosses.
19 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fjav.01238>.
20 doi:10.1111/jav.01238.
- 21
22 R Core Team (2017). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*.
23 R Foundation for Statistical Computing Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/> R version 3.3.3.
- 24
25 Richter, J. (2017). *mlrHyperopt: Easy Hyperparameteroptimization with mlr*
26 and *mlrMBO*. URL: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.896269> R package
27 version 0.1.1.
- 28
29 Ridgeway, G. (2017). *gbm: Generalized Boosted Regression Models*. URL:
30 URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gbm> R package version 2.1.3.
- 31
32 Roberts, D. R., Bahn, V., Ciuti, S., Boyce, M. S., Elith, J., Guillera-Arroita,
33 G., Hauenstein, S., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., Schröder, B., Thuiller, W., Warton,
34 D. I., Wintle, B. A., Hartig, F., & Dormann, C. F. (2017). Cross-validation
35 strategies for data with temporal, spatial, hierarchical, or phylogenetic struc-
36 ture. *Ecography*, 40, 913–929. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fecog.02881>. doi:10.1111/ecog.02881.
- 37
38 Ruß, G., & Brenning, A. (2010). Spatial variable importance assessment for yield
39 prediction in precision agriculture. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (pp.
40 184–195). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-3-642-13062-5_18. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-13062-5_18.

- Ruß, G., & Kruse, R. (2010). Regression models for spatial data: An example from precision agriculture. In *Advances in Data Mining. Applications and Theoretical Aspects* (pp. 450–463). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14400-4_35. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-14400-4_35.
- Schernthanner, H., Asche, H., Gonschorek, J., & Scheele, L. (2017). Spatial modeling and geovisualization of rental prices for real estate portals. *International Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Information Systems*, 8, 78–91. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijaeis.2017040106>. doi:10.4018/ijaeis.2017040106.
- Schliep, K., & Hechenbichler, K. (2016). *kknn: Weighted k-Nearest Neighbors*. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kknn> R package version 1.3.1.
- Schratz, P. (2016). *Modeling the spatial distribution of hail damage in pine plantations of northern Spain as a major risk factor for forest disease*. Master's thesis Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.814262> (unpublished).
- Smoliński, S., & Radtke, K. (2016). Spatial prediction of demersal fish diversity in the Baltic Sea: Comparison of machine learning and regression-based techniques. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, (p. fsw136). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw136>. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsw136.
- Sokolova, M., & Lapalme, G. (2009). A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks. *Information Processing & Management*, 45, 427–437. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2009.03.002>. doi:10.1016/j.ipm.2009.03.002.
- Steger, S., Brenning, A., Bell, R., Petschko, H., & Glade, T. (2016). Exploring discrepancies between quantitative validation results and the geomorphic plausibility of statistical landslide susceptibility maps. *Geomorphology*,

935 262, 8–23. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.geomorph.2016.03.015>.
doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.03.015.

940 Stelmaszczuk-Górska, M., Thiel, C., & Schmullius, C. (2017). Remote sensing for aboveground biomass estimation in boreal forests. In *Earth Observation for Land and Emergency Monitoring* (pp. 33–55). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002%2F9781118793787.ch3>.
doi:10.1002/9781118793787.ch3.

945 Telford, R., & Birks, H. (2005). The secret assumption of transfer functions: problems with spatial autocorrelation in evaluating model performance. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 24, 2173–2179. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.quascirev.2005.05.001>. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2005.05.001.

Telford, R., & Birks, H. (2009). Evaluation of transfer functions in spatially structured environments. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 28, 1309–1316. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.quascirev.2008.12.020>. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2008.12.020.

950 Vapnik, V. (1998). The support vector method of function estimation. In *Nonlinear Modeling* (pp. 55–85). Springer US. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007%2F978-1-4615-5703-6_3. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-5703-6_3.

Vorpahl, P., Elsenbeer, H., Märker, M., & Schröder, B. (2012). How can statistical models help to determine driving factors of landslides? *Ecological Modelling*, 239, 27–39. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.ecolmodel.2011.12.007>. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.12.007.

Voyant, C., Notton, G., Kalogirou, S., Nivet, M.-L., Paoli, C., Motte, F., & Fouilloy, A. (2017). Machine learning methods for solar radiation forecasting: A review. *Renewable Energy*, 105, 569–582.

960 Wenger, S. J., & Olden, J. D. (2012). Assessing transferability of ecological models: an underappreciated aspect of statistical validation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3, 221–232. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.01522.x.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Ecology and Evolution*, 3, 260–267. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.2041-210x.2011.00170.x>.

10
11
12 Wieland, R., Kerkow, A., Früh, L., Kampen, H., & Walther, D. (2017). Au-
13 tomatic feature selection for a machine learning approach toward mod-
14 eling a mosquito distribution. *Ecological Modelling*, 352, 108–112. URL:
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.ecolmodel.2017.02.029>. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.02.029.

16
17 Wingfield, M. J., Hammerbacher, A., Ganley, R. J., Steenkamp, E. T., Gordon,
18 T. R., Wingfield, B. D., & Coutinho, T. A. (2008). Pitch canker caused
19 by *Fusarium circinatum*—a growing threat to pine plantations and forests
20 worldwide. *Australasian Plant Pathology*, 37, 319. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1071%2Fap08036>. doi:10.1071/ap08036.

21
22 Wollan, A. K., Bakkestuen, V., Kauserud, H., Gulden, G., & Halvorsen, R.
23 (2008). Modelling and predicting fungal distribution patterns using herbar-
24 ium data. *Journal of Biogeography*, 35, 2298–2310. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1365-2699.2008.01965.x>. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2008.01965.x.

25
26 Wood, S. (2006). *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Chap-
27 man and Hall/CRC.

28
29 Working Group WRB, I. (2015). *World Reference Base for Soil Resources
30 2014, update 2015 International soil classification system for naming soils
31 and creating legends for soil maps. World Soil Resources Reports No. 106.
32 FAO, Rome.*

33
34 Wright, M. N., & Ziegler, A. (2017). ranger: A fast implementation of ran-
35 dom forests for high dimensional data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical
36 Software*, 77, 1–17. doi:10.18637/jss.v077.i01.

37
38 Youssef, A. M., Pourghasemi, H. R., Pourtaghi, Z. S., & Al-Katheeri, M. M.
39 (2015). Erratum to: Landslide susceptibility mapping using random forest,

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 990 boosted regression tree, classification and regression tree, and general linear
10 models and comparison of their performance at Wadi Tayyah Basin, Asir
11 Region, Saudi Arabia. *Landslides*, 13, 1315–1318. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10346-015-0667-1>.
12
13
14
15
16 Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. M.
17 995 (2009). *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. Springer New
18 York. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6>. doi:10.
19 1007/978-0-387-87458-6.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Made with





Natural Earth

Free vector and raster map data @ naturalearthdata.com

Metadata


CRS: EPSG 4326 (WGS 84)




Spatial**Performance estimation****Non-spatial****Tuning**

● = Training set

○ = Test set




Model BRT RF SVM WKNN





tuning effects**BRT (non-spatial/non-spatial)**


n.trees and shrinkage

**RF (non-spatial/non-spatial)**


num.trees and mtry

**SVM (non-spatial/non-spatial)**C and σ **WKNN (non-spatial/non-spatial)**



k and distance

**BRT (spatial/non-spatial)**


n.trees and shrinkage

**RF (spatial/non-spatial)**


num.trees and mtry

**SVM (spatial/non-spatial)**C and σ **WKNN (spatial/non-spatial)**



k and distance

**BRT (spatial/spatial)**


n.trees and shrinkage



**RF (spatial/spatial)**

num.trees and mtry

**SVM (spatial/spatial)**C and σ **WKNN (spatial/spatial)**


k and distance






tuning effects (non-spatial)


interaction.depth and shrinkage

**BRT (non-spatial/non-spatial)**


interaction.depth and n.trees

**WKNN (non-spatial/non-spatial)**


k and kernel

**BRT (spatial/non-spatial)**


interaction.depth and shrinkage

**BRT (spatial/non-spatial)**


interaction.depth and n.trees

**WKNN (spatial/non-spatial)**


k and kernel

**BRT (spatial/spatial)**


interaction.depth and shrinkage

**BRT (spatial/spatial)**

interaction.depth and n.trees

**WKNN (spatial/spatial)**

k and kernel



elsarticle-template.bbl

[Click here to download LaTeX Source Files: elsarticle-template.bbl](#)

Citation Style

[Click here to download LaTeX Source Files: model5-names.bst](#)

LaTeX Source Files

[Click here to download LaTeX Source Files: elsarticle-template.tex](#)