

Appendix S2

AppendixS2.pdf

Comparison of large-scale citizen science data and long-term study
data for phenology modeling

Shawn D. Taylor, Joan M. Meiners, Kristina Riemer, Michael C. Orr, Ethan P. White

Supplementary materials

Supplementary images S1 - S11 and Tables S1-S2

Figure S1: Sensitivity test results from using a 15 versus 30 day cutoff between the 'yes' and most recent 'no' in the USA-NPN dataset. Each point represents the value of a single parameter for one of eight models for 32 unique species/phenophase combinations. This is from 23 species with varying combinations of the budburst and flowering phenophases (see Table S1). Only 32 comparisons were possible here as the stricter 15 day cutoff resulted in three species/phenophase combinations not having sufficient observations. This figure does not include any data from the LTER datasets. Note that the primary analysis states 35 combinations using the 15 day cutoff. This is because 3 species are duplicated in the Harvard Forest and Hubbard Brook datasets, thus 3 extra comparisons are available for the primary analysis.




Figure S1

Figure S2: Comparisons of parameter estimates between NPN and LTER derived models. As in Figure 2 in the main text, but using a threshold of 15 instead of 30 days between the first 'yes' and most recent 'no' in the USA-NPN dataset. See methods for details.




Figure S2

Figure S3: Comparison of predicted day of year (DOY) of all phenological events between NPN and LTER-derived models. As in Figure 3 in the main text, but using a threshold of 15 instead of 30 days between the first 'yes' and most recent 'no' in the USA-NPN dataset. See methods for details.




Figure S3

Figure S4: Differences in prediction error between NPN and LTER-derived models.

As in Figure 4 in the main text, but using a threshold of 15 instead of 30 days between the first 'yes' and most recent 'no' in the USA-NPN dataset. See methods for details.




Figure S4

Figure S5: RMSE for specific species and phenophases using all combinations of models and data sources. Red X's mark the best performing models for each respective dataset.




Figure S5

Figure S6: Pearson correlation coefficients for specific species and phenophases using all combinations of models and data sources. Note that since all predictions from each Naive model are the same the Pearsons correlation cannot be calculated here. Red X's mark the best performing models for each respective dataset.



Figure S6

Figure S7: RMSE of all species and phenophases of the four scenarios described in the text. These values were calculated using held out test data.



Figure S7

Figure S8: Distribution of parameters of the Naive, GDD, Fixed GDD, and Linear models for the three species common to the Hubbard Brook, Harvard, and USA-NPN datasets. The phenophase is budburst for all three species. Vertical lines indicate either the mean (solid) or median (dashed) of the respective distribution. Note the heading for each sub figure.




Figure S8

Figure S9: As in Figure S4, but for the Alternating and Uniforc models.




Figure S9

Figure S10: As in Figure S4, but for 4 selected species to show the difference in parameter distributions between LTER and USA-NPN derived models. The phenophase for the four species is budburst. These 4 species are representative of the analysis, and for the remaining comparisons the reader is pointed to the script 'analysis/plot_select_species_parameters.R' in the code repository to generate additional figures.




Figure S10

Figure S11: As in Figure S6, but for the Alternating and Uniforc models.




Figure S11

Table S1: Species used in the analysis along with the sample size from each dataset. The numbers indicate the sample size of the training data and the size of the testing data in parenthesis.

species	phenophase	phenophase_type	harvard	hjandrews	hubbard	jornada	npn
acer circinatum	371	Budburst	-	266 (66)	-	-	39 (10)
acer circinatum	501	Flowers	-	116 (29)	-	-	33 (8)
acer pensylvanicum	371	Budburst	80 (20)	-	-	-	34 (9)
acer rubrum	371	Budburst	100 (25)	-	-	-	957 (239)
acer rubrum	501	Flowers	96 (24)	-	-	-	668 (167)
acer saccharum	371	Budburst	60 (15)	-	164 (41)	-	365 (91)
betula alleghaniensis	371	Budburst	60 (15)	-	178 (44)	-	133 (33)
betula alleghaniensis	501	Flowers	26 (7)	-	-	-	64 (16)
betula lenta	371	Budburst	58 (14)	-	-	-	96 (24)
betula papyrifera	371	Budburst	76 (19)	-	-	-	96 (26)
betula papyrifera	501	Flowers	18 (5)	-	-	-	36 (9)
fagus grandifolia	371	Budburst	76 (19)	-	177 (44)	-	259 (65)
fraxinus americana	371	Budburst	84 (21)	-	-	-	90 (23)
fraxinus americana	501	Flowers	22 (6)	-	-	-	52 (13)
ilex verticillata	371	Budburst	35 (9)	-	-	-	26 (6)
larrea tridentata	501	Flowers	-	-	-	27 (7)	118 (30)
nyssa sylvatica	371	Budburst	27 (7)	-	-	-	63 (16)
pinus strobus	496	Budburst	38 (10)	-	-	-	77 (19)
populus tremuloides	371	Budburst	38 (10)	-	-	-	208 (51)
populus tremuloides	501	Flowers	17 (4)	-	-	-	79 (22)
prosopis glandulosa	501	Flowers	-	-	-	49 (12)	78 (20)
prunus serotina	371	Budburst	58 (14)	-	-	-	228 (57)
pseudotsuga menziesii	480	Budburst	-	182 (46)	-	-	38 (10)
quercus alba	371	Budburst	62 (15)	-	-	-	174 (43)
quercus rubra	371	Budburst	80 (20)	-	-	-	242 (60)
quercus rubra	501	Flowers	56 (14)	-	-	-	127 (32)
quercus velutina	371	Budburst	77 (19)	-	-	-	72 (18)
rhododendron macrophyllum	371	Budburst	-	84 (21)	-	-	48 (12)
rhododendron macrophyllum	501	Flowers	-	27 (7)	-	-	50 (12)
trillium ovatum	488	Budburst	-	222 (55)	-	-	68 (17)
trillium ovatum	501	Flowers	-	169 (42)	-	-	60 (15)
vaccinium corymbosum	371	Budburst	38 (10)	-	-	-	60 (15)
vaccinium corymbosum	501	Flowers	38 (10)	-	-	-	65 (16)
vaccinium parvifolium	371	Budburst	-	149 (37)	-	-	25 (6)
vaccinium parvifolium	501	Flowers	-	162 (41)	-	-	25 (6)

Table S1

Table S2: Overall best models when doing cross dataset comparisons. Observations for all species and phenophases were aggregated together to calculate RMSE and Pearsons coefficient for each combination of Parameter source (either USA-NPN or LTER), observation source (either USA-NPN or LTER), and model (6 possible phenology models). Bold indicates the best performing model for a specific parameter and observation combination, with some combinations having ties among multiple models.

Parameter Source	Held Out Observation Source	Alternating		Fixed GDD		GDD		Linear		M1		MSB		Naive		Uniform	
		p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE	p	RMSE
LTER	LTER	0.87	8.73	0.84	10.14	0.90	7.89	0.81	10.27	0.90	7.89	0.87	8.73	0.72	12.35	0.90	7.86
LTER	USA-NPN	0.44	26.07	0.72	22.70	0.68	20.52	0.65	22.94	0.68	20.52	0.44	26.07	0.34	31.25	0.70	19.69
USA-NPN	LTER	0.63	16.17	0.69	16.15	0.70	13.73	0.68	16.59	0.71	13.79	0.66	15.79	0.61	27.08	0.72	13.48
USA-NPN	USA-NPN	0.80	15.27	0.76	20.18	0.82	14.67	0.77	16.19	0.82	14.71	0.80	15.20	0.53	21.57	0.82	14.37

Table S2