How predictable is extinction?

Forecasting species survival at million-year timescales

Peter D Smits, Seth Finnegan

Department of Integrative Biology, University of California – Berkeley

Foundational assertion of conservation paleobiology

By studying the past,
we can better predict the future.

What are we predicting?

Extinction is hard to predict, but is important to conservation decisions.

Predicting extinction

- A taxon with a greater than average global geographic range is likely to survive for longer than a taxon with less than average global geographic range.

Predicting extinction

- A taxon with a greater than average global geographic range is likely to survive for longer than a taxon with less than average global geographic range.
- A taxon's global geographic range can change over time.

Predicting extinction

- A taxon with a greater than average global geographic range is likely to survive for longer than a taxon with less than average global geographic range.
- A taxon's global geographic range can change over time.
- What happens to extinction risk as a taxon changes geographic range? How is extinction risk impacted if that taxon's global geographic range has recently increased or decreased?

Data being analyzed





How we're analyzing the data

- Encoding the past
  - Change in geographic range between current observation and previous observation.
  - Average global temperature at time of previous observation (Mg/Ca isotope).
  - Age in millions of years at time of observation.
- Explore model adequacy using posterior predictive distribution.
- Estimate out-of-sample predictive performance using k-fold cross-validation.

A conceptual model for predicting extinction



Measuring performance: confusion matrix

		True condition	
	Total population	Condition positive	Condition negative
Predicted condition	Predicted condition positive	**True positive**, Power	**False positive**, Type I error
	Predicted condition negative	**False negative**, Type II error	**True negative**

(wikimedia)

Measuring performance: Receiver Operating Characteristic



TP	FP
FN	TN



(wikimedia)

Measuring performance: AUC ROC



(https://goo.gl/91nEpM)

$$\text{AUC} = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{non discrimination} \\ 0.6 - 0.7 & \text{poor} \\ 0.7 - 0.8 & \text{acceptable/fair} \\ 0.8 - 0.9 & \text{excellent/good} \\ > 0.9 & \text{outstanding} \end{cases}$$

The area represents the probability of correct ranking of a random "extinct"-"extant" pair.

Measuring performance: k-fold cross-validation



(Ken Williams, https://goo.gl/qLcfL8)

In-sample predictive performance, full dataset



In-sample predictive performance, by time



Cross-validation results, full dataset



Cross-validation results, by time



Summary

- The past matters. . .
  - Our best supported model includes our historical covariates and allows all effects to vary over time.
- But not that much. . .
  - None of our models are good at predicting extinction.
- Perhaps mechanisms behind changes to geographic range operate at sub-million year scales. Perhaps their effects are weak/masked at million (or greater) year scales.

Acknowledgements

- **Seth Finnegan**
- Adiel Klompmaker
- Emily Orzechowski
- Larry Taylor
- Sara Kahanamoku
- Josh Zimmt
- Franziska Franeck (University of Oslo)

GitHub

psmits.github.io/ **trident**

@PeterDSmits



International Nannoplankton Association