

Title	Dynamic selection of environmental variables to improve the prediction of aphid phenology: A machine learning approach
Authors	Holloway, Paul;Kudenko, Daniel;Bell, James R.
Publication date	2018-02-19
Original Citation	Holloway, P., Kudenko, D. and Bell, J. R. (2018) 'Dynamic selection of environmental variables to improve the prediction of aphid phenology: A machine learning approach', <i>Ecological Indicators</i> , 88, pp. 512-521. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.10.032
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1470160X17306696 - 10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.10.032
Rights	© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Download date	2023-09-26 16:28:52
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/5630



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

1 **Dynamic selection of environmental variables to improve the prediction of aphid phenology: a**
2 **machine learning approach.**

3 Paul Holloway^{1,2*}, Daniel Kudenko^{1,3}, and James R. Bell⁴

4 ¹Department of Computer Science, University of York, Deramore Lane, York, YO10 5GH, UK

5 ²Department of Geography, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

6 ³Saint Petersburg National Research Academic University of the Russian Academy of Science, Russia

7 ⁴Rothamsted Insect Survey, Biointeractions and Crop Protection, Rothamsted Research, AL5 2JQ, UK

8 paul.holloway@ucc.ie orcid.org/0000-0002-9773-4531

9 daniel.kudenko@york.ac.uk orcid.org/0000-0003-3359-3255

10 james.bell@rothamsted.ac.uk orcid.org/0000-0003-1640-6120

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Insect pests now pose a greater threat to crop production given the recent emergence of insecticide
14 resistance, the removal of effective compounds from the market (e.g. neonicotinoids) and the
15 changing climate that promotes successful overwintering and earlier migration of pests. As
16 surveillance tools, predictive models are important to mitigate against pest outbreaks. Currently they
17 provide decision support on species emergence, distribution, and migration patterns and their use
18 effectively gives growers more time to take strategic crop interventions such as delayed sowing or
19 targeted insecticide use. Existing techniques may have met their optimal usefulness, particularly in
20 complex systems and changing climates. Machine learning (ML) arguably is an advance over current
21 capabilities because it has the potential to efficiently identify the most informative time-windows
22 whilst simultaneously improving species predictions. In doing so, ML is likely to advance the length of
23 any integrated pest management opportunity when growers can intervene. As an example, we studied
24 the migration of 51 species of aphids, which include some of the most economically important pests
25 worldwide. We used a combination of entropy and C5.0 boosted decision trees to identify the most
26 informative time windows to link meteorological variables to aphid migration patterns across the UK.
27 Decision trees significantly improved the accuracy of first flight prediction by 20% compared to general
28 additive models; further, meteorological variables that were selected by entropy significantly
29 improved the accuracy by a further 3-5% compared to expert derived variables. Coarser (e.g. monthly)
30 weather variables resulted in similar accuracies to finer (e.g. daily) variables but the most accurate
31 model included multiple temporal resolutions with different period lengths. This combined resolution
32 model alone highlights the ability of machine learning to accurately predict complex relationships
33 between species and their meteorological drivers, largely beyond the experience of experts in the
34 field. Finally, we identified the potential of these models to predict long-term first flight patterns in
35 which machine learning attained equally high predictive ability as shorter-term forecasts. Whilst
36 machine learning is a statistical advance, it is not necessarily a panacea: experts will be needed to
37 underpin results with a mechanistic understanding, thus avoiding spurious relationships. The results
38 of this study should provide researchers with an automated methodology to derive and select the
39 most appropriate environmental variables when predicting ecological phenomena, while
40 simultaneously improving the accuracy of such models.

41 **Keywords:** Entropy, Scale; Weather; Decision Trees; Generalised Additive Models, GAM; First Flight

42 **Introduction:**

43 The role of meteorological variables in identifying the drivers of ecological phenomena is well
44 established (Gough et al. 1994; Awmack *et al.* 1997; Zhou *et al.* 1997; Harrington *et al.* 2001; Bale *et*
45 *al.* 2002; Lobo et al. 2002; Awmack *et al.* 2004; Cocu *et al.* 2005; Westgarth-Smith *et al.* 2007; Lima *et*
46 *al.* 2008; Estay *et al.* 2009; Sheppard *et al.* 2016; Thackeray *et al.* 2016); however, the use of basic or
47 incorrectly identified weather signals can lead to unreliable predictions, and subsequently
48 inappropriately timed management strategies (van de Pol 2016). Selecting the 'best' meteorological
49 variables that are indicative of the ecological phenomena under study is therefore critical. Despite this
50 importance, in a recent meta-analysis, van de Pol *et al.* (2016) found that variables were often selected
51 based on narrow hypotheses founded on previous studies (66%), with little thought given to what
52 other meteorological variables affect the phenomena of interest (86% only used a single weather
53 variable), over what time period (62% did not refine the time window), or how these variables should
54 be represented (55% only considered the arithmetic mean). Furthermore, 28% gave no justification
55 for the choice of meteorological variable chosen. While many studies obviously do give considerable
56 thought to the choice of meteorological variables, this is not always explicitly reported by authors, and
57 moreover the issues identified by van de Pol *et al.* (2016) are indicative of a potentially broader issue
58 in predictive ecological modelling.

59 Aphids are a major pest of global importance, causing substantial damage to a wide variety of
60 commercial crops in agriculture, forestry, and horticulture. Aphids cause feeding damage and transmit
61 plant viruses to hosts. For example, the worldwide distributed peach-potato aphid *Myzus persicae* is
62 widely polyphagous feeding on over 40 plant families (CABI 2017) and transmits over 100 plant viruses
63 mediated by its highly adaptive and plastic life cycle (Bass *et al.* 2014). The need to better understand
64 the emergence, distribution, and migration patterns of such serious pests remains an on-going
65 challenge for growers. Ecological indicators (such as first flight day) are an important tool for
66 understanding aphid phenology in terms of the forthcoming season, and by understanding the
67 environmental drivers responsible for aphid migration, predictions can be made. This provides land
68 managers, farmers (small and large scale), forestry officials, and governments with vital decision
69 support on species emergence, distribution, and migration patterns that would reduce the
70 prophylactic use of insecticides.

71 Aphids have a low developmental temperature threshold of approximately 4°C, and above that
72 continue to develop at a rapid rate (estimated generation time of 120 degree days) assuming that the
73 temperatures do not exceed the optimum development threshold of approximately 25°C (Harrington
74 *et al.* 2007). Once adult, the temperature thresholds for initiating first flight are considered to range
75 from 11°C to 16°C for different aphid species (Irwin *et al.* 2007). In a recent study, Bell *et al.* (2015)
76 corroborated that harsher winters (measured using the North Atlantic Oscillation – NAO) resulted in
77 later first flight dates, while an increase in accumulated degree days (ADD) above 16°C in April and
78 May had a linear relationship with earlier first flight dates for common species in the UK. While the
79 importance of the host plant condition (Awmack and Leather 2002) and the emigration from host
80 plants due to critical population size (Dixon *et al.* 1968) are important determinants for first flight
81 initiation, the spatial scale of the meteorological drivers used in predictive entomological and
82 ecological studies arguably supersede these biotic interactions (Stoner and Joern 2004; Wisz et al.
83 2013; Miller and Holloway 2015).

84 Although the importance of temperature and NAO in understanding and predicting aphid flight dates
85 cannot be understated, the derivation of these variables is subject to a number of conceptual and
86 methodological uncertainties. In particular, the effect of the temporal scale used in variable selection
87 and how to select the most informative parameter needs to be considered. The temporal extent (i.e.

88 the overall time-period) and temporal resolution (i.e. the frequency of data collation, hourly, daily etc)
89 utilised for generating environmental variables will have important consequences for any inferences
90 made from resulting models.

91 For both annual and perennial species, the use of long-term averages can mask extreme
92 meteorological events that are important in determining specific indicators such as emergence,
93 migration, or death. Studies have subsequently begun to explore the 'window' of time over which
94 environmental variables are generated. For example, Thackeray *et al.* (2016) investigated the
95 differences in the seasonal periods within which climate had the most positive and negative
96 correlations with phenology of a large number of terrestrial and marine UK species, that included
97 aphid first flights. Thackeray *et al.*'s (2016) climate sensitivity profile approach improved the
98 understanding of long-term changes in phenological responses that are a consequence of climatic
99 changes. Similarly, van de Pol *et al.* (2016) introduced climwin, an R package that uses the Akaike
100 Information Criterion (AIC) to compare models fit using different predictor windows (Bailey and van
101 de Pol 2016). Studies have therefore begun to adopt a more flexible methodology in defining the
102 temporal extent used to generate the environmental variables that describe the physiological
103 tolerances of insect species (e.g. Cocu *et al.* 2005; Thackeray *et al.* 2016) as well as a large number of
104 other organisms (e.g. Reside *et al.* 2010; Price *et al.* 2013; Gillings *et al.* 2015; Selwood *et al.* 2015;
105 Fancourt *et al.* 2015; Holloway *et al.* 2016); however, there remains a need for research to identify
106 ecologically meaningful environmental time windows.

107 Like many organisms, environmental conditions drive each aphid life stage and these accumulate over
108 a period to determine when first flight will occur (Harrington *et al.* 2007). However, there is a trade-
109 off between data-volume and information that would otherwise make models slow to run and
110 unwieldy. For example, daily data provides a highly detailed, but possibly noisy account of the
111 temperature preceding the first-flight, while monthly data provides a more smoothed representation
112 of the preceding conditions but loses nuances, such as warm weather spikes, that may have profound
113 implications for migration to begin. It is unknown whether coarsening the resolution significantly
114 reduces the accuracy of predictive models, or whether daily data will result in an over-fitted model. In
115 certain instances, a combined resolution model may be more informative and capture the relevant
116 drivers at differing scales.

117 Machine Learning (ML) is a tool, which could resolve variable selection when modelling ecological
118 indicators across a large number of species with potentially differing meteorological drivers.
119 Applications of ML in ecological modelling are diverse, and due to their ability to model complex,
120 nonlinear ecological relationships have exhibited greater explanatory and predictive ability than
121 conventional, parametric approaches (Fielding 1999; Olden *et al.* 2008). ML has been utilized across
122 an array of ecological disciplines to identify migration patterns of species (Guilford *et al.* 2009),
123 quantify species richness (Knudby *et al.* 2010), automatically classify bird calls (Acevedo *et al.* 2009),
124 and predict habitat suitability (Franklin 2009).

125 Here we will use a machine learning approach to inform and predict aphid migration patterns using a
126 suite of meteorological variables. We focus on three main research questions: 1) does the modelling
127 approach influence the accuracy of predictions? 2) does data representation and variable choice in
128 predictive models affect the accuracy of the first flight indicator? and 3) does temporal scale, in terms
129 of a) extent and b) resolution affect first flight predictions?

130 **Methodology**

131 ***Data Collection***

132 In the UK, the Rothamsted Insect Survey (RIS) has a network of suction-traps that continuously
133 measure the areal density of flying aphids (currently 16 traps in 2017), and provides daily records
134 during the main aphid flying season (Harrington et al. 2007; Bell *et al.* 2015). Data from 17 suction
135 traps that supplied 10,715 first flight dates for 55 aphid species were obtained from the RIS, from 1980
136 to 2010. In order to remove any issues of sample size or bias, we removed four species that had less
137 than 30 observations in the series, resulting in a total of 51 species for analysis. We also removed
138 observations from January as we were unable to distinguish between genuine first flight dates and
139 those that were a construct of the new Julian calendar year (e.g. a first flight day of 1 suggests the
140 species did not initiate flight on January 1, but was rather already in the air on December 31). First
141 flights were converted to a binary Julian day series. Due to the continuous monitoring of the suction
142 traps, any date before first flight was recorded has to be associated with no flight at the location of
143 the suction trap. Therefore, for each first flight (FF) observation, we generated a spatially explicit no
144 flight (NF) counterpart, which occurred within 7-105 days prior to the FF day (figure based on expert
145 opinion). This resulted in 21,228 binary observations (10,614 FF : 10,614 NF) for use as response data
146 in the analysis.

147 Daily temperature (mean, maximum and minimum) and pressure data was obtained from the Dark
148 Sky API (<https://darksky.net/poweredby/>) from 1979 to 2010, and daily North Atlantic Oscillation
149 (NAO - the difference in atmospheric pressure at sea level between Iceland and the Azores) data was
150 obtained from the National Weather Service (<http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/>) for the same period.
151 Accumulated degree days (ADD) were generated at different temperature thresholds using both mean
152 and maximum temperature ranging from 11°C to 16°C and measures of winter harshness were
153 calculated using NAO, pressure, and mean, maximum, and minimum winter temperatures. We used a
154 variety of dynamic temporal extents to calculate both ADD and winter variables. For ADD, we
155 calculated the temporal extent immediately preceding a FF or NF observation, including 7-, 14-, 21-,
156 28-, 60-, 90-, 120-, 180-, and 364-days. For example, for a FF observation recorded on May 28, a 7-day
157 extent would calculate ADD on the temperatures recorded from May 20 to May 27, while a 14-day
158 extent would calculate ADD on the temperatures recorded from May 13 to May 27. Similarly, we
159 calculated winter harshness across a number of dynamic temporal extents, including 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, 6-
160 5, 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 months prior. For example, for the FF observation recorded on May 28, a 6-2 month
161 dynamic temporal extent would calculate the winter variable (e.g. NAO) from November 27 of the
162 previous year to March 27. The use of this methodology allows for dynamism in selecting the time
163 windows over which the variables are derived.

164 To explore the effect of the resolution (granularity) on results and subsequent predictions, we used
165 the daily data to calculate temperature data at three different resolutions: daily, weekly and monthly.
166 We then implemented these new variables separately in the machine learning methodology. We also
167 employed a mixed resolution model, which consisted of daily observations for a two-month extent
168 immediately preceding FF or NF, weekly data back until six months, and then monthly data for the
169 remainder of the year. Baseline variables were defined as those deemed the most accurate and
170 informative by Bell *et al.* (2015). For FF, these were ADD16 across an extent of 60 days and NAO across
171 an extent of 6-2 months prior. It should be noted that Bell *et al.* (2015) used these variables to predict
172 Julian day of FF and not a binomial delineation of FF or NF; however, the importance of these variables
173 in determining FF should allow for comparison.

174 **Data Analysis – Machine Learning**

175 ***Variable Selection: Entropy***

176 Variable selection is an important way to improve the performance of ML techniques. The goal is to
177 automatically identify the most informative variables in terms of predicting the response variable. The
178 most informative variables are then used as predictor variables in the ML process and subsequently
179 in the final model, while the remaining variables are ignored. The entropy measure is a popular and
180 efficient way to select variables by measuring how well (or badly) a predictor variable distributes the
181 training data into partitions with respect to the response variable (FF or NF) values. High entropy
182 means that the resulting partitions tend to be 'impure' (i.e. have a uniform distribution of the training
183 examples with respect to the response variable values). For continuous predictor variables, entropy
184 can be used to discretise the values into subintervals to maximize the purity of the resulting partitions
185 of training examples (i.e. minimize the entropy values). Entropy for a binary classification with classes
186 a and b (corresponding to the target variable values) is defined as:

$$187 \quad \text{Entropy}(S) = -p(a) * \log(p(a)) - p(b) * \log(p(b)) \quad \text{Equation 1.}$$

188 S denotes a partition of the training examples, and $p(x)$ is the proportion of training examples of class
189 x in partition S . Entropy is maximal when $p(a) = p(b) = 0.5$, and minimal when $p(a) = 0$ or $p(b) = 0$. The
190 information gain of a variable is the decrease in entropy caused by splitting the training data according
191 to its values. We implemented entropy using the FSelector package (Romanski and Kotthoff 2016) in
192 R 3.3.1 (R Core Team 2016).

193 **Model Selection: Decision Trees and General Additive Models**

194 We used the C5.0 decision tree algorithm to test the predictive performance of the meteorological
195 drivers of aphid flight. The C5.0 algorithm is considered the industry standard for producing decision
196 trees due to its ability to perform comparably well on a variety of problems (Lantz 2013). C5.0 creates
197 a branched tree, that identifies the value of a predictor variable that yields the largest information
198 gain for the splitting the response variable (in this case FF or NF). The generation of the tree begins by
199 creating a root node, chooses a variable to test at the current node, and recursively creates child nodes
200 for each of the corresponding variable values. The training set is split accordingly, and the process
201 continues until there is no further significant information gain. The advantage of C5.0 over previous
202 implementations is that it builds smaller and more efficient trees. Another major advantage of
203 decision tree learning is the readability of the output (i.e. a prediction hypothesis in form of a decision
204 tree). Here we used the C50 package (Kuhn *et al.* 2015) in R 3.3.1 (R Core Team 2016) to create C5.0
205 boosted decision trees to identify meteorological drivers of aphid flight.

206 To illustrate the ability of decision tree learning to predict first flight, we compared the decision tree
207 models with general additive models (gams), a commonly applied statistical model that has been used
208 to explore similar ecological questions. Gams advance from general linear models by assuming that
209 the functions are additive and the components are smoothed (Guisan *et al.* 2002). We define the
210 expected value of the response value $E(Y)$ as:

$$211 \quad g(E(Y)) = \beta_0 + f_1(x_1) + f_2(x_2) + \dots + f_n(x_n) + \varepsilon \quad \text{Equation 2.}$$

212 where g describes the link function, β_0 is the intercept term, f describes the smoothing function used
213 on predictor variable x , and finally we assume that the error term, ε is constant across observations.
214 We generated gams from the same data as outlined above, meaning we used a binomial link function
215 to specify the distribution of the response variable and we specified the smoothing of the
216 environmental variables using thin plate regression splines. Again, we undertook analysis in R 3.3.1 (R
217 Core Team 2016) in the mgcv package (Wood 2011), with further details outlined in Supplementary
218 Information 1.

219 **Model Evaluation**

220 Six accuracy metrics were utilised to evaluate the predictions. The area under the curve (AUC) is
221 calculated by summing the area under the receiver operating curve (ROC) plot, a graph of the false-
222 positive error rate on the x-axis plotted against the true positive rate on the y-axis. Values range from
223 0 to 1, with a perfect classification recorded as 1, while 0.5 suggests a classifier that is no better than
224 random. Sensitivity measures the proportion of correctly predicted first flights and specificity
225 measures the proportion of correctly predicted no flights. Proportion correctly classified (PCC)
226 measures the total number of correctly predicted responses. The true skill statistic (TSS) measures the
227 combined sum of sensitivity and specificity. Kappa is a metric of categorical agreement that
228 incorporates the differences between the observed agreement and chance agreement, with a value
229 of 1 suggesting complete agreement. See Franklin (2009) for a discussion of these metrics in an
230 ecological modelling context. We evaluated our models using a 10-fold cross-validation technique.

231 **Results**

232 ***Modelling Approach***

233 Implementation of a machine learning methodology resulted in significantly higher recorded first
234 flight (FF) accuracies in five of the six evaluation metrics considered when compared with a gam
235 implementation (measured to an $\alpha \leq 0.01$ using paired sample t-tests - Figure 1). The differences in
236 mean accuracy ranged from an increase of 0.05 for AUC to 0.21 for sensitivity, with recorded specificity
237 0.10 higher for the gam methodology. The higher sensitivity and lower specificity scores suggest that
238 the machine learning methodologies are generating a smaller number of false positives, yet the gam
239 methodology is predicting a larger number of false negatives and this is severely and substantially
240 affecting the predictive models and in turn their accuracy. This is also seen in the evaluation metrics
241 that take into account the correct prediction of both FF and NF, with decision trees recording higher
242 PCC, TSS, and Kappa scores than gam implementations.

243 ***Data Representation (Variable Selection)***

244 The use of entropy identified the variation in real-world variables that appear to best delineate first
245 flight observations from no flight observations. Table 1 identifies the information gain across the
246 different accumulated degree days (ADD) and winter variables for *M. persicae*, an aphid of global
247 importance to agriculture. It can be seen that the information gain varies substantially across the
248 different temperature thresholds and temporal extents. The ADD values calculated from the
249 maximum temperature resulted in a higher information gain (or a purer split), than the use of the
250 mean temperature (measured to an $\alpha \leq 0.01$ using paired sample t-tests). Furthermore, the use of
251 entropy to select one ADD and one winter metric resulted in an increase in accuracy for over 80% of
252 species (Table 2). When the proportion of correctly classified (PCC) observations were compared for
253 a decision tree implementation using entropy selected variables against baseline selected variables,
254 we observed an increase in the average accuracy of 0.027 (or ~3%). Again, this increase was significant
255 at an $\alpha \leq 0.01$ when these values were compared using a paired sample t-test. The accuracy of
256 entropy selected variables were consistently more accurate than decision trees fit on baseline
257 variables across the different accuracy metrics including specificity.

258 When the frequency distribution of environmental variables with the highest information gain for
259 each species were analysed, we saw differences in both the thresholds (e.g. ADD value) and temporal
260 extents (e.g. number of days) reported, with certain patterns emerging when species were analysed
261 based on phenology (Figure 2). In general, the lower ADD thresholds resulted in higher information
262 gain (Figure 2a), with 20 of the 51 species best predicted by a threshold of 11°C. A dynamic temporal
263 window of 60 days immediately prior to FF was the most informative temporal extent for both host
264 alternating and non-host alternating species (Figure 2b). The average maximum temperature reported

265 higher information gains across the winter metrics, with neither NAO nor pressure resulting in the
266 highest gain for any species (Figure 2c). Shorter dynamic temporal winter metrics were most
267 informative, with longer periods of time prior to an observation indicative of a larger gain (Figure 2d).

268 **Machine Learning and Entropy**

269 Introducing temperature variables calculated at various temporal resolutions further increased the
270 accuracy when compared to baseline and entropy models (Figure 3). When models fit with four
271 different temperature resolutions were compared, we observed that the use of daily data (Figure 3a)
272 did not result in an over-fitting of the models, reporting equally high accuracies when compared with
273 other implementations (Figure 3e), although it did record a number of lower outliers that most likely
274 resulted from noisy data. Similarly, the use of monthly data (Figure 3c) did not result in a smoothing
275 of the models, reporting a higher number of more accurate models than the use of daily data (Figure
276 3e). The use of weekly data (Figure 3b) resulted in a higher frequency of PCC scores for non-host
277 alternating species compared to other temporal resolutions (Figure 3e), while for host-alternating
278 species the temperature data consisting of various resolutions (Figure 3d) recorded the highest
279 frequency of PCC scores (Figure 3e). This model incorporated daily data for the two months
280 dynamically preceding the observations, weekly data back until six months, and then monthly data for
281 the remainder of the year, suggesting that the use of different scales improves the predictive ability
282 of decision trees fit for host-alternating species of aphids.

283 Figure 4 illustrates the mixed temporal resolution (Figure 3d) decision tree for *M. persicae* which
284 recorded the highest PCC score across the different models. Here we can see the benefit of
285 incorporating variables at multiple resolutions. The root node splits the response data on the mean
286 temperature for the twelfth month prior to the observation, with a temperature value of 9.4°C.
287 Alternatively we see nodes (4, 5, 16, and 17) split the response data on recent daily temperature
288 values. This identifies the hierarchical nature of the first flight phenomena, with both shorter term
289 (less than a week) and longer-term (a year prior) temperature variables constantly deemed important
290 in determining differentiation among flight or no flight. Many of the splits in the decision tree identify
291 temperatures at these different temporal resolutions for which no-flight was recorded. Node 3
292 identifies that if the maximum temperature for the eleventh month prior to an observation was
293 $\leq 20.2^{\circ}\text{C}$, then no flight was recorded (with a pure node of 145 observations). This suggests that
294 conditions during the previous aphid flight season restrict whether aphids will be recorded there in
295 the next season. Similarly, node 8 illustrates that if the minimum temperature for 32 days before the
296 observation was $\leq 6.7^{\circ}\text{C}$, then no flight occurred (with a pure node of 65 observations).

297 **Discussion**

298 There has been a recent resurgence in the importance of selecting appropriate environmental
299 variables when attempting to explain or predict ecological phenomena (van de Pol *et al.* 2016). In
300 addressing this, the aims of our study were twofold. Firstly, we identified the power of machine
301 learning (specifically decision tree learning) to address complex, hierarchical ecological questions, and
302 illustrated how this method can be used to attain highly accurate models and identify previously
303 unknown features of ecological importance. Secondly, we utilised this methodology to explore the
304 ecological indicators for UK aphids, and improved upon existing prediction techniques. The results of
305 this study should provide researchers with an automated methodology to derive and select the most
306 appropriate environmental variables when predicting ecological phenomena, while simultaneously
307 improving the accuracy of such models.

308 We identified from expert-opinion and well-established aphid literature (Harrington *et al.* 2007; Bell
309 *et al.* 2015) that a measure of spring development (ADD16 in the previous 60 days) and a measure of

310 winter harshness (mean NAO from 6-2 months' prior) are strong predictors of aphid first flight. While
311 we acknowledge that there are most likely other meteorological variables influencing these complex
312 processes, our aim was to utilise machine learning to refine the temporal scales associated with these
313 predictor variables. Here we used entropy to identify the most informative variables (ADD thresholds
314 and winter variables) and subsequent temporal extents (spring and winter) for 51 UK aphid species.
315 Decision tree models fit on entropy derived variables resulted in significantly higher accuracies
316 compared to models fit on baseline variables (Table 2). NAO and pressure provided little input into
317 our predictive models, and consistently provided less information gain than measures of winter
318 temperature. While NAO incorporates various aspects of daily weather (e.g. wind, precipitation,
319 temperature), as well as being important for aphid population dynamics (e.g. Westgarth-Smith *et al.*
320 2007), it does not take into account spatial variation. NAO provides one daily value for the entire
321 country and subsequently has been used to model ecological indicators at coarser spatiotemporal
322 resolutions than we investigated here. The use of temperature as a winter metric provided both spatial
323 and temporal variation among observations of aphid first flight, resulting in more accurate predictions
324 compared to the NAO (Table 2).

325 With approximately 4400 known species of aphid (Harrington *et al.* 2007), the temporal scales used
326 to generate variables to predict first flight are likely to be highly species or even clone specific.
327 Differences among aphid life cycles between species and clones (i.e. genotypes) are likely to influence
328 such decisions. Similarly, different species may respond to different thresholds in weather patterns.
329 The use of 'events' (e.g. heat wave, drought) or 'episodes' (e.g. degree day calculations) have been
330 widely used in entomological (and other ecological) research, and have been found to improve
331 interpretations of ecological phenomena (Bateman *et al.* 2012; Bell *et al.* 2015; Selwood *et al.* 2015).
332 Despite this, these methods of variable derivation are still subject to the scale uncertainties associated
333 with the temporal extent used.

334 The use of shorter temporal extents when generating ADD increased the accuracy for certain species,
335 in particular host-alternating species (Table 2; Figure 2). For example, *Hyalopterus pruni* produces
336 wings in the summer and migrates from *Prunus* trees to grasses. Our results suggest that shorter-term
337 changes in increasing temperature are better predictors than longer-term extents. Similarly, for non-
338 host alternating tree aphids *Myzocallis castanicola*, *Betulaphis quadrituberculata*, and *Elatobium*
339 *abietinum*, and the cereal aphid *Sitobion avenae* that respond to overcrowding or senescing of host
340 plants, a shorter temporal extent of a month coupled with higher temperature thresholds were better
341 predictors, possibly representing spikes in temperature which could cause population booms or
342 increased stress to plants (Dixon and Glen 1971; Watt and Dixon 1981). From these results, we may
343 infer that host-alternating species respond by taking first flight based on short-term changes in
344 meteorological variables, while non-host alternating species respond by taking first flight once the
345 population on the host-plant exceeds a certain number, which could be represented by a
346 meteorological variable indicative of egg development or generation time. The variation in the ADD
347 threshold that best predicted first flight was not unanticipated due to the phenology of the 51 species.
348 However, we did not expect initiation of first flight to be predicted at 11°C for 40% of the species
349 (Table 2). The use of data-driven variable selection improves the accuracy of these final predictive
350 models, and illustrates the potential for such methodologies to be utilised widely when selecting
351 environmental variables. The results from this research should help foster discussion on variable
352 derivation in entomological research, but are also widely applicable to any predictive (or explanatory)
353 ecological research that uses ecological indicators.

354 An advantage of decision tree models is that they have the ability to handle more variables than
355 commonly applied parametric approaches, in part due to the fact that they are not as sensitive to
356 issues relating to multi-collinearity. Our results suggest that suitable information pertaining to the

357 prediction of aphid first flight can be ascertained from both voluminous daily data and smoothed
358 monthly data (Figure 3). This has important practical consequences for implementations of these
359 predictive models; projecting species-environment relationships into future space and time at a
360 monthly resolution would reduce the resources and cost of such an endeavour compared to using
361 daily data. Moreover, as ecological phenomena are often influenced by drivers operating across
362 multiple temporal scales, the use of variables generated at different temporal resolutions allowed for
363 both longer- term conditions that enforce an overarching influence and shorter-term variations that
364 describe finer-scale patterns to be included in the model (Figure 4). It should be noted that the use of
365 a large number of meteorological variables within such models could result in the identification of an
366 incorrect spuriously correlated variable that has nothing to do with aphid lifecycles. However, the high
367 accuracy obtained from these models in predicting aphid first flight and the use of 10-fold cross-
368 validation to control for such concerns suggests that our models do well in identifying the
369 meteorological drivers of this phenomena. One caveat to the study is that ML methods require a rich
370 data set for the training of the algorithm and thus this technique may be limited to longer-term
371 studies.

372 Finally, to illustrate the applicability of decision trees to mitigate against long-term future pest
373 outbreaks by strategic crop interventions, we implemented our methodology with filters (Figure 5a).
374 In every instance our objective was the same, to predict FF or NF for day x ; however, we applied filters
375 (ranging from 28 days to 364 days) to the range of environmental days used in the generation of
376 predictor variables. This resulted in a new set of predictor variables to use when estimating FF or NF
377 at day x . The accuracy of our models decreased as the size of the filter increased towards a year;
378 however, this difference was minimal (0.0286 difference in AUC - Figure 5b). The decision tree
379 methodology discriminates between FF and NF for a variety of meteorological variables across a year
380 period, choosing among days, weeks, or months when thresholds are representative of FF or NF.
381 Therefore, the differences in FF predictions when fit on filtered environmental variables are negligible
382 when a dynamic time window is applied. Subsequently, the high accuracies obtained should allow
383 such methods to generate long-term predictions and mitigate against further crop losses.

384 **Acknowledgements**

385 This research was jointly funded by BBSRC and InnovateUK under grant reference BB/M006980. We
386 would like to thank Ian Bedford for initial comments on this research. We are also grateful to
387 collaborators and staff who have contributed to the Rothamsted Insect Survey suction-trap network
388 since the 1960s. We thank Jon Pickup and others in SASA for their use of data. The RIS is a National
389 Capability funded by BBSRC.

390 **References**

- 391 Acevedo, M.A., Corrada-Bravo, C.J., Corrada-Bravo, H., Villanueva-Rivera, L.J., Aide, T.M., 2009.
392 Automated classification of bird and amphibian calls using machine learning: A comparison of
393 methods. *Ecological Informatics* 4, 206-214.
- 394 Awmack, C.S., Leather, S.R. 2002. Host plant quality and fecundity in herbivorous insects. *Annual*
395 *Review of Entomology* 47, 817-844.
- 396 Awmack, C.S., Woodcock, C., Harrington, R. 1997. Climate change may increase vulnerability of aphids
397 to natural enemies. *Ecological Entomology* 22, 366-368.
- 398 Awmack, C.S., Harrington, R., Lindroth, R.L. 2004. Aphid individual performance may not predict
399 population responses to elevated CO₂ or O₃. *Global Change Biology* 10, 1414-1423.

400 Bailey, L.D., van de Pol, M. 2016. climwin: An R Toolbox for Climate Window Analysis. *PLoS ONE* 11,
401 e0167980.

402 Bale, J.S., Masters, G.J., Hodkinson, I.D., Awmack, C., Bezemer, T.M., Brown, V.K., Butterfield, J., Buse,
403 A., Coulson, J.C., Farrar, J., Good, J.E., 2002. Herbivory in global climate change research: direct effects
404 of rising temperature on insect herbivores. *Global Change Biology*, 8, 1-16.

405 Bass, C., Puinean, A.M., Zimmer, C.T., Denholm, I., Field, L.M., Foster, S.P., Gutbrod, O., Nauen, R.,
406 Slater, R., Williamson, M.S., 2014. The evolution of insecticide resistance in the peach potato aphid,
407 *Myzus persicae*. *Insect biochemistry and molecular biology* 51, 41-51.

408 Bateman, B.L., VanDerWal, J., Johnson, C.N. 2012. Nice weather for bettongs: using weather events,
409 not climate means, in species distribution models. *Ecography* 35, 306-314.

410 Bell, J.R., Alderson, L., Izera, D., Kruger, T., Parker, S., Pickup, J., Shortall, C.R., Taylor, M.S., Verrier, P.,
411 Harrington, R., 2015. Long-term phenological trends, species accumulation rates, aphid traits and
412 climate: five decades of change in migrating aphids. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 84, 21-34.

413 CABI. 2017. *Myzus persicae* (green peach aphid). – Available at
414 <http://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/35642>.

415 Cocu, N., Harrington, R., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Worner, S.P., Hulle, M., 2005. Geographical location,
416 climate and land use influences on the phenology and numbers of the aphid, *Myzus persicae*, in
417 Europe. *Journal of Biogeography* 32, 615-632.

418 Dixon, A.F.G., Burns, M.D., Wangboonkong, S. 1968. Migration in aphids: response to current
419 adversity. *Nature* 220, 1337-1338.

420 Dixon, A.F.G., Glen, D.M. 1971. Morph determination in the bird-cherry oat aphid, *Rhopalosiphum*
421 *padi* (L). *Annals of Applied Biology* 68, 11-21.

422 Estay, S.A., Lima, M., Harrington, R. 2009. Climate mediated exogenous forcing and synchrony in
423 populations of the oak aphid in the UK. *Oikos* 118, 175-182.

424 Fancourt, B.A., Bateman, B.L., VanDerWal, J., Nicol, S.C., Hawkins, C.E., Jones, M.E., Johnson, C.N.
425 2015. Testing the role of climate change in species decline: is the eastern quoll a victim of a change in
426 the weather?. *PLoS one* 10, p.e0129420.

427 Fielding, A. 1999. *Machine learning methods for ecological applications*. Springer Science & Business
428 Media.

429 Franklin, J. 2009. *Mapping species distributions: spatial inference and prediction*. Cambridge:
430 Cambridge University Press.

431 Gillings, S., Balmer, D.E., Fuller, R.J. 2015. Directionality of recent bird distribution shifts and climate
432 change in Great Britain. *Global Change Biology* 21, 2155-2168.

433 Gough, L., Grace, J.B., Taylor, K.L. 1994. The relationship between species richness and community
434 biomass: The importance of environmental variables. *Oikos* 70, 271-279.

435 Guilford, T., Meade, J., Willis, J., Phillips, R.A., Boyle, D., Roberts, S., Collett, M., Freeman, R. and
436 Perrins, C.M., 2009. Migration and stopover in a small pelagic seabird, the Manx shearwater *Puffinus*
437 *puffinus*: insights from machine learning. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*
438 *Sciences*, pp.rspb-2008.

439 Guisan, A., Edwards Jnr, T.C., Hastie, T. 2002. Generalized linear and generalized additive models in
440 studies of species distributions: setting the scene. *Ecological Modelling* 157, 89-100.

441 Harrington, R., Fleming, R.A., Woiwod, I.P. 2001. Climate change impacts on insect management and
442 conservation in temperate regions: can they be predicted?. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 3, 233-
443 240.

444 Harrington, R., Clark, S.J., Welham, S.J., Verrier, P.J., Denholm, C.H., Hulle, M., Maurice, D., Rounsevell,
445 M.D., Cocu, N., 2007. Environmental change and the phenology of European aphids. *Global Change*
446 *Biology* 13, 1550-1564.

447 Holloway, P., Miller, J.A., Gillings, S. 2016. Incorporating movement in species distribution models:
448 how do simulations of dispersal affect the accuracy and uncertainty of projections?. *International*
449 *Journal of Geographic Information Science* 30, 2050-2074.

450 Irwin, M.E., Kampmeier, G.E., Weisser, W.W., 2007. Aphid movement: process and
451 consequences. *Aphids as crop pests*, pp.153-186. CAB International.

452 Knudby, A., LeDrew, E., Brenning, A. 2010. Predictive mapping of reef fish species richness, diversity
453 and biomass in Zanzibar using IKONOS imagery and machine-learning techniques. *Remote Sensing of*
454 *Environment* 114, 1230-1241.

455 Kuhn, M., Weston, S., Coulter, N., Quinlan, R. 2015. C50: C5.0 Decision Trees and Rule-Based Models.
456 - R package version 0.1.0-24. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=C50>

457 Lantz, B. 2013. Machine Learning with R. - Packt Publishing Ltd.

458 Lima, M., Harrington, R., Saldaña, S., Estay, S., 2008. Non-linear feedback processes and a latitudinal
459 gradient in the climatic effects determine green spruce aphid outbreaks in the UK. *Oikos* 117, 951-
460 959.

461 Lobo, J.M., Lumerat, J.P., Jay-Robert, P. 2002. Modelling the species richness distribution of French
462 dung beetles (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae) and delimiting the predictive capacity of different groups of
463 explanatory variables. *Global Ecology and Biology* 11, 265-277.

464 Miller, J.A., Holloway, P. 2015. Incorporating movement in species distribution models. *Progress in*
465 *Physical Geography* 39, 837-849.

466 Olden, J.D., Lawler, J.J., Poff, N.L. 2008. Machine learning methods without tears: a primer for
467 ecologists. *The Quarterly review of biology* 83, 171-193.

468 Price, B., McAlpine, C.A., Kutt, A.S., Ward, D., Phinn, S.R., Ludwig, J.A. 2013. Disentangling how
469 landscape spatial and temporal heterogeneity affects Savanna birds. *PLoS One* 8, p.e74333.

470 R Core Team (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. - R Foundation for
471 statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

472 Reside, A.E., VanDerWal, J.J., Kutt, A.S., Perkins, G.C. 2010. Weather, not climate, defines distributions
473 of vagile bird species. *PLoS One* 5, e13569.

474 Romanski, P., Kotthoff, L. 2016. FSelector: Selecting Attributes. - R package version 0.21.
475 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=FSelector>

476 Selwood, K.E., Thomson, J.R., Clarke, R.H., McGeoch, M.A., Mac Nally, R., 2015. Resistance and
477 resilience of terrestrial birds in drying climates: do floodplains provide drought refugia?. *Global*
478 *ecology and biogeography* 24, 838-848.

479 Sheppard, L.W., Bell, J.R., Harrington, R., Reuman, D.C. 2016. Changes in large-scale climate alter
480 spatial synchrony of aphid pests. *Nature Climate Change* 6, 610-613.

- 481 Stoner, K.J., Joern, A. 2004. Landscape vs. local habitat scale influences to insect communities from
482 tallgrass prairie remnants. *Ecological Applications* 14: 1306-1320.
- 483 Thackeray, S.J., Henrys, P.A., Hemming, D., Bell, J.R., Botham, M.S., Burthe, S., Helaouet, P., Johns,
484 D.G., Jones, I.D., Leech, D.I., Mackay, E.B. 2016. Phenological sensitivity to climate across taxa and
485 trophic levels. *Nature* 535, 241-245.
- 486 van de Pol, M., Bailey, L.D., McLean, N., Rijdsdijk, L., Lawson, C.R., Brouwer, L. 2016. Identifying the best
487 climatic predictors in ecology and evolution. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 7, 1246-1257.
- 488 Watt, A.D., Dixon, A.F.G. 1981. The role of cereal growth stages and crowding in the induction of alatae
489 in *Sitobion avenae*. *Ecological Entomology* 6, 441-447.
- 490 Westgarth-Smith, A. R., Leroy, S.A., Collins, P.E., Harrington, R. 2007. Temporal variations in English
491 populations of a forest insect pest, the green spruce aphid (*Elatobium abietinum*), associated with the
492 North Atlantic Oscillation and global warming. *Quaternary International* 173, 153-160.
- 493 Wisz, M.S., Pottier, J., Kissling, W.D., Pellissier, L., Lenoir, J., Damgaard, C.F., Dormann, C.F.,
494 Forchhammer, M.C., Grytnes, J.A., Guisan, A., Heikkinen, R.K., 2013. The role of biotic interactions in
495 shaping distributions and realised assemblages of species: implications for species distribution
496 modelling. *Biological Reviews* 88, 15-30. Wood, S.N. 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood
497 and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized models. *Journal of the Royal
498 Statistical Society (B)* 73, 3-36.
- 499 Zhou, X., Perry, J.N., Woivod, I.P., Harrington, R., Bale, J.S., Clark, S.J., 1997. Temperature change and
500 complex dynamics. *Oecologia* 112, 543-550.

501

502 **Tables**

503 Table 1. Information gain for different accumulated degree day (ADD) temperature thresholds
 504 calculated at a range of temporal extents for first flight of *Myzus persicae* for both maximum
 505 temperature and mean temperature, and for winter harshness measures. Maximum information gain
 506 for each variable depicted by grid border.

	<i>Days Prior</i>	ADD11	ADD12	ADD13	ADD14	ADD15	ADD16
Max Temp	7	0.140	0.143	0.144	0.158	0.152	0.135
	14	0.147	0.191	0.181	0.155	0.147	0.143
	21	0.172	0.181	0.180	0.156	0.151	0.158
	28	0.155	0.162	0.167	0.201	0.206	0.174
	60	0.167	0.170	0.174	0.185	0.178	0.186
	90	0.131	0.133	0.142	0.166	0.161	0.170
	120	0.070	0.086	0.091	0.101	0.117	0.123
	180	0.038	0.041	0.042	0.043	0.043	0.044
	364	0.000	0.000	0.036	0.041	0.035	0.034
	<i>Days Prior</i>	ADD11	ADD12	ADD13	ADD14	ADD15	ADD16
Mean Temp	7	0.150	0.112	0.100	0.084	0.062	0.048
	14	0.176	0.132	0.115	0.091	0.069	0.048
	21	0.153	0.142	0.129	0.108	0.074	0.057
	28	0.185	0.152	0.141	0.112	0.073	0.057
	60	0.146	0.146	0.129	0.111	0.082	0.062
	90	0.098	0.106	0.096	0.094	0.060	0.050
	120	0.057	0.054	0.053	0.053	0.000	0.033
	180	0.063	0.065	0.063	0.067	0.057	0.048
	364	0.044	0.060	0.052	0.050	0.000	0.000
	<i>Months Prior</i>	NAO	Pressure	MeanTemp	MaxTemp	MinTemp	
Winter	6-2	0.000	0.027	0.131	0.127	0.155	
	6-3	0.000	0.025	0.164	0.173	0.139	
	6-4	0.000	0.000	0.146	0.179	0.186	
	6-5	0.000	0.000	0.177	0.179	0.186	
	5-2	0.000	0.062	0.110	0.094	0.114	
	5-3	0.000	0.034	0.183	0.119	0.126	
	5-4	0.000	0.000	0.195	0.163	0.145	

507

508 *North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), Accumulated Degree Day (ADD).

510 Table 2. Accuracy (proportion correctly classified - PCC) of decision tree models fit on baseline
 511 variables (accumulated degree days - ADD above 16°C for 60 days prior and North Atlantic Oscillation
 512 - NAO for 6-2 months prior) and entropy selected accumulated degree days (ADD) and winter
 513 variables. *depicts ADD calculated from mean temperature and no annotation depicts ADD calculated
 514 from maximum temperature. Days (d) and Months (m) depicted within extent. Monoecious and
 515 heteroecious alternations refer to non-host and host alternating aphid phenology respectively. Some
 516 of the biggest differences between model accuracies were recorded for *Betulaphis quadrituberculata*,
 517 *Capitophorus similis* and *Rhopalosiphum maidis*.

Species	Alternation	Baseline	Entropy	ADD Entropy Variable		Winter Entropy Variable	
				ADD	Extent	Winter	Extent
<i>Acyrtosiphon pisum</i>	monoecious	0.842	0.832	15	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Anoecia corni</i>	heteroecious	0.831	0.814	12*	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Aulacorthum solani</i>	monoecious	0.918	0.871	16	60d	Mean	5-4m
<i>Betulaphis quadrituberculata</i>	monoecious	0.767	0.942	13	21d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Brachycaudus helichrysi</i>	heteroecious	0.861	0.889	14	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i>	monoecious	0.816	0.804	11	21d	Min	6-5m
<i>Capitophorus hippophaes</i>	monoecious	0.818	0.832	13	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Capitophorus similis</i>	heteroecious	0.767	0.880	11	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Cavariella aegopodii</i>	heteroecious	0.803	0.850	12	60d	Min	6-5m
<i>Cavariella archangelicae</i>	heteroecious	0.860	0.785	12*	21d	Max	6-5m
<i>Cavariella pastinacae</i>	heteroecious	0.887	0.907	13	60d	Mean	6-4m
<i>Cavariella theobaldi</i>	heteroecious	0.847	0.875	15	90d	Mean	6-4m
<i>Ceruraphis eriophori</i>	heteroecious	0.794	0.846	14	90d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Cryptomyzus galeopsidis</i>	heteroecious	0.852	0.836	11*	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Drepanosiphum platanoidis</i>	monoecious	0.852	0.912	11	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Elatobium abietinum</i>	monoecious	0.841	0.872	14	28d	Max	6-5m
<i>Eriosoma patchiae</i>	heteroecious	0.765	0.752	11	120d	Mean	5-2m
<i>Eriosoma ulmi</i>	heteroecious	0.888	0.915	11	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Eucallipterus tiliae</i>	monoecious	0.832	0.839	11*	90d	Max	6-5m
<i>Euceraphis punctipennis</i>	monoecious	0.859	0.862	13	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Hyadaphis foeniculi</i>	heteroecious	0.919	0.926	12*	60d	Min	6-5m
<i>Hyalopterus pruni</i>	heteroecious	0.871	0.908	11*	28d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Hyperomyzus lactucae</i>	heteroecious	0.857	0.882	13	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Macrosiphum euphorbiae</i>	heteroecious	0.812	0.851	11	28d	Max	6-4m
<i>Macrosiphum rosae</i>	heteroecious	0.650	0.713	13	7d	Min	6-5m
<i>Metopolophium dirhodum</i>	heteroecious	0.754	0.800	11	28d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Metopolophium festucae</i>	monoecious	0.803	0.818	15	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Microlophium carnosum</i>	monoecious	0.840	0.892	11	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Myzocallis castanicola</i>	monoecious	0.903	0.908	16	28d	Max	6-5m
<i>Myzocallis coryli</i>	monoecious	0.911	0.912	13*	60d	Min	6-5m
<i>Myzus ascalonicus</i>	monoecious	0.838	0.887	14*	180d	Max	6-4m
<i>Myzus persicae</i>	heteroecious	0.807	0.801	15	28d	Mean	5-4m
<i>Myzus cerasi</i>	heteroecious	0.854	0.872	11*	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Myzus lythri</i>	heteroecious	0.825	0.925	12	60d	Min	6-4m
<i>Ovatus crataegarius</i>	heteroecious	0.913	0.923	12	60d	Max	6-5m

<i>Periphyllus testudinaceus</i>	monoecious	0.851	0.918	11	60d	Max	6-3m
<i>Phorodon humuli</i>	heteroecious	0.879	0.938	13	90d	Mean	6-4m
<i>Phyllaphis fagi</i>	monoecious	0.850	0.902	15	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Pterocallis alni</i>	monoecious	0.840	0.866	11*	90d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Rhopalosiphum insertum</i>	heteroecious	0.852	0.885	11	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Rhopalosiphum maidis</i>	heteroecious	0.676	0.739	12	14d	Max	6-5m
<i>Rhopalosiphum padi</i>	heteroecious	0.790	0.803	15	28d	Max	6-5m
<i>Sitobion avenae</i>	monoecious	0.822	0.837	13	28d	Max	6-5m
<i>Sitobion fragariae</i>	heteroecious	0.836	0.862	14	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Tetraneura ulmi</i>	heteroecious	0.862	0.911	14*	90d	Max	6-5m
<i>Thecabius affinis</i>	heteroecious	0.815	0.848	11	120d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Thelaxes dryophila</i>	monoecious	0.914	0.944	12*	60d	Min	6-5m
<i>Tuberculatus annulatus</i>	monoecious	0.888	0.924	11*	60d	Max	6-5m
<i>Tuberculatus borealis</i>	monoecious	0.894	0.927	11*	60d	Mean	6-5m
<i>Utamphorophora humboldti</i>	heteroecious	0.827	0.779	15	21d	Max	5-4m
<i>Wahlgreniella arbuti</i>	heteroecious	0.779	0.823	11	60d	Min	6-4m


Average

combined	0.836	0.863
heteroecious	0.824	0.851
monoecious	0.852	0.881


518

519

520



523
524 Figure 1. The average accuracy score of the predictive models measured across the 51 aphid species
525 when decision tree models fit with baseline variables were compared with general additive models fit
526 with the same baseline variables. Baseline variables were North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) for the
527 dynamic 6-2 months prior to a first flight observation and accumulated degree days above 16°C
528 (ADD16) for 60 days prior a first flight observation. On average, the decision tree model recorded
529 significantly higher evaluation scores in five out of the six metrics (measured to an $\alpha \leq 0.01$ using
530 paired sample t-tests). Accuracy statistics included Area Under the Curve (AUC), Sensitivity, Specificity,
531 Proportion Correctly Classified (PCC), True Skill Statistic (TSS), and Kappa. Readers are directed to
532 Franklin (2009) for a discussion on these evaluation metrics.




534

535 Figure 2: Frequency distribution of the variables attaining the highest information gain measured using entropy for each of the 51 species. The variables
 536 representative of spring development were a) accumulated degree days (ADD) above certain temperature thresholds, and these were calculated at a number
 537 of different b) dynamic temporal extents. The variables representative of winter harshness were c) North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), Pressure, and Minimum,
 538 Mean, and Maximum Temperature, and these were calculated at a number of different d) dynamic temporal extents.

539


540



541

542 Figure 3: Illustration of the different resolutions that were used within the decision tree models to
543 predict aphid first flight. Resolutions include a) fine-scale daily data, b) intermediate-scale weekly data,
544 c) coarse-scale monthly data, and d) a mix of resolutions, including daily data going back 60 days,
545 weekly data back until six months, and monthly data for the remainder of the year. These resolutions
546 were used to fit decision tree models, and e) shows the frequency of a decision tree model to produce
547 the highest accuracy (Proportion Correctly Classified – PCC) among models fit using these different
548 resolutions, as well as both baseline variables (North Atlantic Oscillation – NAO at 6-2 months and
549 Accumulated Degree Days – ADD above 16°C) and entropy selected variables for the 51 aphid species.

550



551

552 Figure 4: A decision tree for *Myzus persicae* fit using temperature data of mixed resolutions. The aim of a decision tree is to classify the response data correctly
 553 as either first flight (FF) or no flight (NF). The tree begins with the root node, that separates training data based on whether the mean temperature for the
 554 twelfth month prior to an observation was \leq or $>$ 9.4°C . For values with a mean temperature $\leq 9.4^{\circ}\text{C}$, the tree moves to the second node, which splits the
 555 response data based on whether the maximum temperature for the eleventh month prior was \leq or $>$ 20.2°C . Node 3 is a terminal node, whereby if the
 556 maximum temperature recorded was $\leq 20.2^{\circ}\text{C}$, then the observation is classified as no flight. Based on our data, this was a pure node, with 145 observations
 557 classified as NF and 0 as FF. Temporal resolutions contained within the model are daily (D), weekly (W), and monthly (M). The tree continues in such a manner
 558 until all terminal nodes are reached (final node is 71). We only illustrate the tree up to split 17 in order to highlight the main decisions and the ability of
 559 decision tree modelling to predict hierarchical ecological systems.




Figure 5: Illustration and results of the application of filters to the environmental variables in predicting aphid first flight. a) A two-year period of daily temperature data preceding a first flight or no flight recording at day 0, with a 0-day (red) and 56-day (blue) filter applied to the temperature data used to generated predictor variables. All models fit on these new environmental variables are predicting first flight or no flight at day x . b) the average Area Under the Curve (AUC) score of decision tree models fit on temperature data (at four different resolutions) with the filters applied for the 51 species. As the number of filtered days applied to the environmental variable generation increases, the recorded AUC value subsequently decreases; however this decrease is minimal. The largest recorded difference in AUC between a 0-day and a 364-day filter is 0.0286 for the monthly resolution decision tree.