Version of Record:<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0924796318300149> Manuscript_25d2e73cad4778ee5e4e29225fdb0846

Highlights

- We compared habitat classifiers based on satellite data or biophysically modeled data.
- Classifiers from modeled predictors performed similarly to those from satellite data.
- Modeled zooplankton did not improve accuracy over remotely sensed chlorophyll.
- Specificity was good but sensitivity was poor for both types of classifiers.
- Modeled predictors are useful to overcome cloud cover and for forecasting.

Abstract

Fish habitat models based on remotely-sensed data may be limited by satellite coverage and availability. We compared the fit and predictive power of Random Forest habitat classifiers that were developed using predictors derived from a coupled biophysical model (i.e., modeled predictors) versus similar classifiers that used remotely-sensed satellite data for two data sets (eggs and adults) and four species that occur widely in the California Current system. When tested on independent data, classifiers of spawning habitat that used derived predictors (derived classifiers) had nearly identical accuracies (0-2% difference) to similar classifiers based on satellite data (satellite classifiers). Accuracies of derived classifiers of adult habitat were within - 8% to +7% of comparable satellite classifiers. Accuracies of both types of classifiers on test data were much greater for Northern anchovy *Engraulis mordax* and Pacific hake *Merluccius productus* (0.75-0.97) than for jack mackerel *Trachurus symmetricus* and Pacific sardine *Sardinops sagax* (0.61-0.72), and generally were greater for classifiers of spawning habitat than for adult habitat. Specificity was very good for both types of classifiers, but sensitivity was poor, because classifiers identified potential habitat which was not fully occupied. Adults of all species used a broader range of habitat conditions during summer than during the spring spawning period. Derived classifiers have some advantages over satellite classifiers; they are not limited by cloud cover and they can make predictions in near real-time or the short-term future. However, there was no consistent improvement in the accuracy of derived predictors that included modeled zooplankton concentrations over comparable satellite classifiers that included reflectance/chlorophyll concentration.

Keywords: Fish, Habitat, Models, ROMS-CoSiNE, Satellite sensing, Random Forest, California Current System

1. Introduction

Fish habitat models are important for our scientific understanding and management of marine systems because habitat conditions affect fish population dynamics (Hayes et al., 1996; Vasconcelos et al., 2013), community interactions (Lindegren et al., 2016; Pecuchet et al., 2016), and spatial distribution in relation to marine reserves (Thompson et al., 2012) and harvest (Leitão, 2015; Tommasi et al., 2016). Habitat models are also used in the design of surveys to define the sampling frame and allocate sampling effort (Weber and McClatchie, 2010; Zwolinski et al., 2011).

Marine fish habitat models have frequently relied on remotely sensed-data from satellites as predictors. Although such models work well for some species, they have limitations. Cloud cover can result in large gaps in geographic coverage where no model prediction is possible for

some areas and times of year. Remotely sensed data must be collected and processed before use. Thus, it cannot be used for real-time or near-future prediction. A limited suite of predictor variables is available from satellite data (e.g., sea-surface temperature, chlorophyll, geostrophic current, wind speed, and, recently, salinity) which may not be adequate to characterize the niche of all species with great enough precision and accuracy to be useful. Finally, remotely sensed variables usually are entered directly as "snapshots" into statistical models, which may result in bias due to lack of process. For example, remotely sensed reflectance/chlorophyll predictors in fish habitat models usually are a proxy for secondary production that is available as prey for fish. However, instantaneous chlorophyll measurements may not accurately reflect the recent productivity of an area or the amount of production that has actually been transferred to higher trophic levels.

An alternative approach to understanding fish habitat associations is to analyze their spatial distributions as part of a much broader mechanistic model of the ecosystem. There has been much recent progress on "end-to-end" models that include hydrodynamics, nutrient flows, primary productivity, and higher trophic levels up to fish or even harvest (Rose et al., 2010; Kishi et al., 2011; Rose et al., 2015). Such models have some advantages over statistical habitat models. They include bottom-up and top-down biological interactions along with environmental conditions. Because they include population dynamics and animal movement, they may be better able to differentiate realized habitat from unoccupied potential habitat (Planque et al., 2007). Finally, such models could be run forward in time to make predictions in the near future. However, end-to-end models currently are most useful for understanding ecosystem interactions via simulation studies rather than for prediction. This is because they require more data than usually are available for adequate calibration and validation, and they are particularly subject to bias due to non-stationarity of the ecosystems they simulate (e.g., environmental regime shifts and changes in genetic structure of component species; Fulton, 2010). For example, a recently published end-to-end model of the California Current (Fiechter et al., 2015; Rose et al., 2015) produced dynamics in the abundance of northern anchovy *Engraulis mordax* and Pacific sardine *Sardinops sagax* that were qualitatively similar to historical data for a 45-year period but could not yet be parameterized to produce annual estimates suitable for "tactical" decision making.

A hybrid approach to modeling fish habitat that may overcome some of the limitations of both satellite-based statistical models and fully mechanistic models is to use a mechanistic model to provide variables such as environmental conditions and production of lower trophic levels, and then enter modeled conditions as predictors (hereafter derived predictors) into a statistical model or algorithm. Formally, modeled predictors are functions of the parameters used to create the underlying physical model, e.g., wind forcing, boundary conditions, and initial state of the system. They could be described as indices based on the calculations of the mechanistic model. In practice, using modeled variables from mechanistic models as if they were measured can provide a convenient and easily interpretable set of predictors for statistical modeling. There is a trade-off in potential sources of error using this approach. It implicitly incorporates the phenology of oceanic conditions into derived predictors because they are the product of an underlying physical model. However, the approach adds some bias to the statistical model because derived predictors do not perfectly reproduce the conditions they represent. Becker et al. (2016) used this approach to model the distributions of eleven cetacean species in the California Current system. They reported that generalized additive models that used derived predictors of

salinity, sea-surface temperature, and log-transformed surface chlorophyll concentration from an ocean circulation model produced nearly identical predictions to those of similar models based 141 on remotely sensed satellite data.

- The objective of this study was to compare the performance of fish habitat models that used derived predictors versus similar models that used remotely sensed satellite predictors, where the type of habitat model was a classification algorithm (i.e., fish presence or absence; hereafter a classifier). Specifically, we wanted to test whether classifiers based on derived predictors from a coupled bio-physical model that provided zooplankton concentrations were an improvement over similar classifiers that used remotely sensed environmental conditions and chlorophyll. That is, the mechanistic model included an ocean circulation model, which provided environmental predictors, coupled with a biological model that provided predictors of secondary production.
-

We tested classifier performance using four species that occur widely in the California Current system. They were northern anchovy (hereafter anchovy), Pacific hake *Merluccius productus* (hereafter hake), Jack mackerel *Trachurus symmetricus*, and Pacific sardine (hereafter sardine). These species provide good test cases because: 1) they have relatively large geographic ranges in which habitat conditions and species distributions fluctuate greatly; 2) they are important forage fish during all or part of their lifecycle and, thus, provide an important link between secondary production and higher trophic levels; and 3) They have been sampled extensively in scientific surveys as eggs and adults, thereby providing two data sets with which to test classifier performance. The four species occur from the Gulf of Alaska (Jack mackerel and sardine) or northern Vancouver Island (anchovy and hake) to the tip of Baja California and in the Gulf of California (MacCall and Stauffer, 1983; Cohen et al., 1990; Froese and Pauly, 2017). Anchovy usually are found within 20 nm of shore but may extend offshore as far as 250 nm (Froese and Pauly, 2017; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2017a). Hake are primarily restricted to the continental shelf, usually within 200 nm of shore (Cohen et al., 1990). Jack mackerel and sardine are more wide ranging with larger animals commonly moving more than 200 nm offshore (Macewicz and Abramenkoff, 1993; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2017a). All four species spawn during the late winter or spring and release free-floating eggs, which become buoyant shortly after fertilization. Eggs hatch within a few days and typically are captured within short distances of the spawning grounds. Thus, egg surveys of these species have been used with relatively good accuracy to characterize their spawning habitats (e.g., Checkley et al., 2000; Weber and McClatchie, 2010; Zwolinski et al., 2011). We tested classifier performance using relatively data-rich surveys of egg densities during spring and more data-sparse trawl surveys of adults conducted in spring and summer.

2. Materials and methods

-
- *2.1 Fish Data*

Eggs were collected using the continuous underway fish-egg sampler (CUFES; Checkley et al., 1997) during spring cruises offshore of the U.S. west coast and Vancouver Island from 2001 -2016 as part of the California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations program (CalCOFI; cf, McClatchie, 2014) and assessment cruises for coastal pelagic species by the U.S.

National Marine Fisheries Service. The CUFES collected eggs through a pump on the ship's hull 186 at a depth of 3 m and rate of 0.63 m³/min, using a sieve of 200-micron mesh. Samples were collected every 30 min as the ship was underway at cruising speeds of 9–12 knots. The area from $30-39°$ N (approximately from San Diego to San Francisco, California) and 117-126° W was sampled consistently, and additional sampling farther north occurred during some years (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2017a). Cruises occurred in March through May but usually were centered in April. The sampling depth was consistent with the near-surface distribution of anchovy, hake, Jack mackerel, and sardine eggs, which typically concentrate in the upper mixed layer (Ahlstrom, 1959). Eggs of these four species were enumerated and identified at sea based on the morphometric characteristics (Moser, 1996).

Adults were sampled by trawl as part of assessment cruises for coastal pelagic species by the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service in spring 2002-2015, as part of the cruises described above. Additional trawl samples were conducted in summer of 2003-2004, 2007-2008, and 2012-2015. Summer trawls were conducted primarily off the northwest coast of the U.S. from northern California to Washington state before 2008, and for the entire U.S. west coast from 2012-2015. Data were collected using a Nordic 264 surface trawl (NET Systems; Bainbridge Island, WA) with 3.0 m² XL-Lite foam-core alloy midwater doors and a working mouth opening of about 600 m² at towing speed. The trawl had variable-size mesh in the throat to retain a range of animal sizes and an 8-mm mesh liner in the codend. Since 2009, the trawl has been fitted with a marine-mammal excluder device to prevent the capture of dolphins and other large animals (Dotson et al., 2010). Trawls were towed at a target speed of four knots for 30 or 45 min between sunset and sunrise, when coastal pelagic species migrate to the surface to feed. Typically, two or three tows were conducted per night with spacing of at least ten nm. Trawls were targeted to areas where coastal pelagic species were likely to occupy based on acoustic data collected during the day (Zwolinski et al., 2017). That is, trawl samples were not random or necessarily representative of the range of conditions in the overall survey area.

2.2 ROMS-CoSiNE data

Ocean simulations were conducted using the Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2009). The ROMS is a free-surface primitive equation ocean model that is discretized in terrain-following curvilinear coordinates that has frequently been used for modeling transport of larvae. The Pacific basin-wide model used for this study was described by Wang and Chao (2004). It had 30 vertical 218 all layers and 1/8 degree horizontal resolution over a domain of approximately 45° S to 65° N latitude 219 and 100° E to 70° W longitude.

The Pacific Ocean ROMS was coupled with the Carbon, Silicate, Nitrogen Ecosystem model, known as CoSiNE (Chai et al., 2002; Liu and Chai, 2009). The CoSiNE model consisted of 13 state variables describing plankton (meso-zooplankton, micro-zooplankton, small phytoplankton and diatoms), nutrients (nitrate, silicate, ammonium, detritus nitrogen, detritus silicate, phosphate), and others (dissolved oxygen, total carbon dioxide and total alkalinity). The model was modified to simulate phyto-planktonic photo-acclimation and the dynamic carbon to chlorophyll and carbon to nitrogen ratios with different growth conditions (Xiu and Chai, 2012).

The coupled ROMS-CoSiNE model was initiated with climatological temperature,

228 salinity, and nutrients from the World Ocean Atlas 2001 database (Conkright et al., 2002), total carbon dioxide and total alkalinity from the Global Ocean Data Analysis Project database (Key et al., 2004). It was forced with climatological monthly heat and wind from National Centers for Environmental Prediction and National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCEP/NCAR) reanalysis (Kalnay et al., 1996) for 30 years as a spin-up period. Then the coupled ROMS-CoSiNE model was run from 1991-2016 with daily heat flux, evaporation and precipitation from 234 NCEP/NCAR reanalysis and daily sea surface wind (0.25° resolution) from National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration multiple-satellite blended sea surface winds (Zhang et al., 2006). No data assimilation was implemented in this ROMS configuration.

The performance of the Pacific Ocean ROMS-CoSiNE model has been evaluated and further constrained with different satellite and in-situ data (Bidigare et al., 2009; Chai et al., 2009; Liu and Chai, 2009; Xiu and Chai, 2011; Palacz and Chai, 2012). The model solutions for the central California Current System have been demonstrated to capture spatial variations in the annual means and seasonal cycles of temperature, nutrients, chlorophyll, and primary production based on comparisons with remote sensing (SeaWiFS) and *in situ* observations from CalCOFI (Guo et al., 2014). The mean annual difference between sea-surface temperatures measured at 244 sea in conjunction with CUFES sampling and coincident ROMS predictions was 0.01° C (± 0.01) 245 SE). The difference was 0.42 (± 0.01 SE) for salinity (PSS). Santora et al. (2013) also reported that the Pacific ROMS-CoSiNE model captured phytoplankton and zooplankton dynamics reasonably well in the central California Current System.

Three-day averaged model output from the ROMS-CoSiNE model in the California Current area was used to provide predictors for the classification algorithm. A subset of discrete solutions from the ROMS-CoSiNE model was extracted as a three-dimensional array at 5 m depth for each year and environmental variable, where environmental variables were small phytoplankton (< 5 μm diameter), diatoms, microzooplankton, mesozooplankton, salinity, temperature, dissolved oxygen concentration, the zonal component of the current, and the meridional component of the current. The depth component was interpolated from the ROMS vertical layers using the Python module 'roppy' (Ådlandsvik, 2016). The spatial dimensions of 256 the study were 300 latitudes and 144 longitudes that encompassed the area $20-50°N$ and 110-257 130°W. The values of environmental variables to which eggs or adults were exposed were estimated by linear interpolation between the nearest values in space and time.

- *2.3 Satellite Data*
-

We obtained remotely sensed satellite data for the same geographic area as the ROMS model from the U.S. NOAA-Fisheries Coastwatch ERDDAP data server (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2017b) and European Commission Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Service (CMEMS; 2017). Sea-surface temperature (SST) measurements for the period 2001- 2012 were obtained from the "Pathfinder Ver 5.2 (L3C), Day and Night, Global, 0.0417°, Science Quality (Monthly Composite)" data set, Coastwatch ID "erdPH2sstamday". For the period 2013-2016, we used the "SST, POES AVHRR, GAC, Global, Day and Night (Monthly Composite), Lon+/-180" data set, Coastwatch ID "erdAGsstamday_LonPM180". Chlorophyll-estimates based on surface reflectance were obtained from the "Chlorophyll-a, Orbview-2 SeaWiFS, R2014.0, 0.1°, Global (Monthly Composite)", Coastwatch data set, ID "erdSW1chlamday", for the period 2001-2002, and "Chlorophyll-a, Aqua MODIS, NPP, L3SMI,

Global, 4km, Science Quality (Monthly Composite)", Coastwatch data set ID "erdMH1chlamday" for the period 2003-2016. Bottom depth measurements were obtained from the "SRTM30+ Version 6.0, 30 arc second, Global" Coastwatch data set, ID "usgsCeSrtm30v6" (Becker et al., 2009). Surface currents were obtained from the "Global Observed Ocean Physics Temperature Salinity Heights Geostrophic Currents Sea Surface Salinity and Sea Surface Density Reprocessing" data set, with CMEMS identifier "GLOBAL_REP_PHY_001_021" (Mulet et al., 2012). Sample values were estimated from satellite data by linear interpolation.

2.4 Random Forests

We used the Random Forest algorithm (Breiman, 2001) to predict two types of habitat responses as a function of two types of predictors for each species (i.e., four classifiers for each of the four species). The random forest algorithm is an ensemble technique that produces predictions based on a collection of classification or regression trees (the "forest"). It is particularly appropriate for fitting a descriptive model of habitat use because the technique can capture simple interactions among predictors without the user explicitly specifying them, is relatively robust to the inclusion of correlated variables, and tends to avoid over fitting. The response variables were the presence of eggs in CUFES samples or adults in trawl samples (hereafter, positive predictions are interpreted to be suitable spawning habitat or adult habitat, respectively). The two predictor types were derived variables from the ROMS-CoSiNE model or remotely sensed satellite data.

The derived predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model were sea-surface salinity, sea-surface temperature, and concentrations of diatoms, dissolved oxygen, micro-zooplankton, meso-zooplankton, and small phytoplankton, as described above. An additional predictive variable, eddy kinetic energy (EKE), was calculated from the zonal (*U*) and meridional (*V*) components of the ROMS model as:

298
$$
EKE = \frac{U^2 + V^2}{2} (1)
$$

The EKE predictor was a measure of turbulent flow used in the sardine habitat model of Nieto et al. (2014), and very similar to the gradient in sea-surface height used by Zwolinski et al. (2011). We also included bottom depth in the ROMS-CoSiNE random forest classifiers. For ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers where trawl captures were the response, month of sample was included as a predictor to fit potential changes in habitat over the relatively long sampling period (spring through summer).

The predictors for random forests based on satellite data were bottom depth, EKE, the natural log of chlorophyll concentration, and sea-surface temperature. Month of sample was also included in classifiers where trawl captures were the response variable. The zonal and meridional components of the current that were used to calculate EKE in the satellite-based classifiers were from the CMEMS data rather than modeled ROMS data.

Hereafter, we refer to the random forest classifiers of spawning habitat based on CUFES data that used derived predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model as CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers and similar random forests that were based on remotely sensed satellite data as CUFES-satellite classifiers. Similarly, we refer to random forest classifiers of adult habitat based on trawls as trawl-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers or trawl-satellite classifiers.

We reserved data from four years, 2003, 2007, 2012, and 2015, as a test data set to evaluate the extent to which the random forest out-of-bag estimates of classifier fit successfully predicted classifier performance on independent data. This left 12 years of CUFES data available for model development, and 11 years of trawl data, including four years of trawl data that were sampled during summer. Available sample sizes were somewhat smaller for satellite-based classifiers than for ROMS-CoSiNE based classifiers due to cloud cover and lack of predictions for nearshore samples. A total of 12,550 CUFES samples were used to develop the CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers, and 4,196 to test them. Only 10,401 samples were available to develop the CUFES-satellite classifiers, and 3,735 samples to test them. For trawl-based classifiers, 1,000 development samples and 507 test samples were available for the trawl-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers. There were 745 development samples, and 407 test samples available for the trawl-satellite classifiers.

We fitted the random forest classifiers with 5,000 trees using the "ranger" package version 0.9.11 (Wright and Ziegler, 2017) in the R statistical computing environment version 3.5.0 (R Core Team, 2018). Each classifier was tuned using several steps before conducting a final fitting. First, we selected the number of predictors sampled for splitting at each node (i.e., used for a particular tree; ranger parameter "mtry") by optimizing with respect to out-of-bag error using the "train" function of R package "caret" version 6.0-79 (Kuhn, 2008). Next, we performed predictor selection for each classifier using the Boruta algorithm (Kursa and Rudnicki, 2010), as implemented in in R package "Boruta" version 5.3.0. The Boruta algorithm identifies relevant predictor variables from a candidate set by comparing their predictive abilities to "shadow" variables that are obtained by randomly shuffling the values of original variables across objects. Shadow variables can have non-zero importance only due to random fluctuation (where importance is the normalized mean decrease in accuracy of all random forests without the variable). Variables that have significantly greater importance than the best shadow variable over all permutations are judged to be relevant. We performed the selection using function "Boruta" with 5,000 trees and the "mtry" parameter determined as described above. Variables identified as unimportant were dropped from final classifiers. For all species and gear types, the number of samples where eggs or adults were absent was much greater than the number of samples where they were present. Therefore, we adjusted the "sample.fraction" parameter of the "ranger" function to reduce the number of samples with absences used in each bootstrap resample until the algorithm produced nearly equal numbers of false positives and false negatives. That is, we tuned the model so that the two types of misclassification errors had equal importance (Berk, 2008).

Classifiers were evaluated using three statistics: accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity (Yerushalmy, 1947; Trevethan, 2017). Accuracy was calculated as the proportion of correct classifications as:

-
-

(True positives + True negatives) / Number samples (2)

Sensitivity, also known as probability of detection or ability to detect a true positive, was calculated as:

True positives / (True positives + False negatives) (3)

Specificity, also known as the true negative rate or ability to detect a true negative, was calculated as:

True negatives / (True negatives + False positives) (4)

3. Results

All candidate predictor variables were accepted for use in random forest classifiers except one case (Figure 1). The EKE predictor for hake in the satellite-trawl classifier was rejected as having no greater predictive ability than the randomly shuffled shadow variables (as measured by normalized mean decrease in accuracy) and, thus, excluded from the classifier. The EKE predictor was also a relatively weak, but included, predictor for anchovy and sardines in the trawl-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers. Variable importance estimates for the ROMS-CoSiNE-based classifiers were much more precise than those for satellite-based classifiers due to the larger sample sizes available. Sea-surface temperature was a relatively important predictor for all species. The effects of bottom-up production, as represented by the chlorophyll predictor, were very important in most of the satellite-based classifiers. However, the effects of primary and secondary production were partitioned among the diatom, micro-zooplankton, meso-zooplankton, and small phytoplankton variables in the ROMS-CoSiNE-based models.

Accuracies of ROMS-CoSiNE based classifiers generally were similar to those of their satellite-based counterparts. Accuracies of CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers were all within 386 2% of CUFES-satellite classifiers for the same species when applied to the test data (Figure 2A). The trawl-ROMS-CoSiNE classifiers performed somewhat worse on test data than comparable trawl-satellite classifiers for anchovy and hake (2-8% less accuracy), but somewhat better for Jack mackerel and sardine (4-7%; Figure 2B). Classifiers of adults captured in trawls generally were less accurate than comparable classifiers of spawning habitat from CUFES data, regardless of predictor type. All classifiers had greater out-of-bag accuracies than test accuracies. However, there were relatively large species-specific differences among classifiers. The decline in accuracy between out-of-bag and test estimates was greatest for Jack mackerel and sardine (4-19%) and least for anchovy and hake (1-14%).

The presence of anchovy and hake could be predicted with greater accuracy than the presence of Jack mackerel or sardine for both CUFES and trawl data sets. The CUFES-based classifiers had accuracy greater than 0.90 for anchovy and hake but only 0.66-0.87 for Jack mackerel and sardine. The trawl-based classifiers had accuracies of 0.75-0.95 for anchovy and hake but 0.61-0.75 for Jack mackerel and sardine.

Specificity (i.e., ability to detect a true negative) was very good for most classifiers that used either ROMS-CoSiNE or satellite data (Figure 2) but sensitivity (i.e., probability of detection or ability to detect a true positive) was poor (0.00-0.61 for the test data set). A few classifiers for anchovy and hake had sensitivity values at or near zero with corresponding specificities at or near one. These were the results of very few captures. That is, the classifiers correctly predicted that the species tested would not occur in nearly all samples because the samples occurred in habitat that was poor for these species. However, the classifiers did not correctly predict the species' presence in the small number of samples that occurred within suitable habitat.

The spatial patterns in habitat predicted by the CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE and CUFES-satellite classifiers generally were similar for the test data set (Figure 3). Predicted habitats for Jack mackerel and sardine were relatively large and extended far offshore. Lack of satellite coverage due to cloud cover was substantial in 2003 and 2007, and likely precluded the satellite classifiers from identifying some habitat for Jack mackerel and sardine. Predicted habitats for anchovy and hake were constricted to small areas near the coast, with almost no spawning habitat for hake occurring by mid-April. However, the classifiers exhibited some differences for anchovy when extrapolating to the south into unsampled areas along Baja California. The CUFES-satellite classifier for anchovy predicted that suitable habitat extended south along most of Baja California where none was predicted by the CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifier in three of four test years. These differences could not be evaluated with the existing data. No strong trend in the spatial distribution of classifier errors (false positives versus false negatives) was evident for anchovy, Jack mackerel or sardine for any classifier type (Figure 4). Most false positives for hake occurred off the central California coast or in the Southern California Bight. However, there were too few false negatives for hake to evaluate their spatial distribution.

The temporal patterns in habitat use differed somewhat for adults sampled in trawls. Month of sampling was a moderate to weakly important predictor in the trawl-based classifiers (Figure 1). However, the fact that it was sufficiently important to be retained as a predictor variable indicates that adults occurred in waters with somewhat different habitat conditions during spring versus summer. The distribution of predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model where adults were captured (Figure 5) indicated that all species tended to occupy a narrower range of bottom depths in generally shallower water during summer, but a broader range of conditions otherwise. The summer distributions of adults from all species tended to occur in waters with somewhat greater dissolved oxygen, mesozooplankton concentrations, and sea-surface temperatures, but lower sea-surface salinities.

4. Discussion

The generally similar accuracies between derived classifiers and those of comparable satellite-based classifiers (Figure 2) indicates that derived classifiers may be a useful tool where the limitations of satellite-based classifiers prevent their application. Derived classifiers may be useful where cloud cover severely limits satellite coverage or no lost pixels can be tolerated. The ability to create real-time or near future predictions may be particularly useful for adaptively planning long surveys and dynamic management of fisheries (Becker et al., 2016). These results are consistent with the development process for ocean circulation models. Measured data from satellites and other sensors commonly are used to evaluate the performance of ocean circulation models, as they were for the ROMS-CoSiNE model (*cf*., section 2.2). Derived predictors were close to their measured counterparts, and produced similar classifiers, because the underlying mechanistic model reproduced measured environmental conditions well. The use of ocean circulation models to predict habitat has now been demonstrated for fish (this study) and cetaceans (Becker et al., 2016).

The fact that derived classifiers did not have consistently greater accuracies than comparable satellite-based classifiers indicates there was no particular advantage to using zooplankton predictors in the coupled biological portion of the ROMS-CoSiNE model over primary production, as measured by satellite. We hypothesized that the small- and large-zooplankton predictors might provide derived classifiers with greater accuracy than comparable satellite predictors because zooplankton is a more direct measure of fish habitat than chlorophyll. This is because the species tested consume plankton directly, although hake and Jack mackerel switch to piscivory in larger sizes (MacGregor, 1966; Rexstad and Pikitch, 1986). There are several non-exclusive explanations for the lack of model improvement. Inadequate precision of zooplankton predictors may have offset potential gains. Biological interactions may have created differences between the true and predicted concentrations of zooplankton available because modeled zooplankton predictors were calculated based on bottom-up trophic conditions only. Top-down and community interactions also may have been more important in determining habitat conditions than zooplankton. The consistently high importance of variables in trawl models that are not directly consumed by adults (e.g., diatoms) suggests that production variables were, in part, indexing other non-modeled habitat conditions that affected fish distribution rather than prey availability directly. However, we note that importance of predictors related to bottom-up productivity relative to each other (Figure 2) should be interpreted with caution because they are partly correlated and interacting with each other (Kursa and Rudnicki, 2010).

The degree to which models were overfit, as measured by the decrease in accuracy between out-of-bag- and test-data statistics for comparable classifiers, varied greatly by species, predictor type, and gear (Figure 2). Classifiers for anchovy and hake captured in the CUFES showed little overfitting, as evidenced by declines of 1-4% (e.g., the CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifier for anchovy had out-of-bag accuracy of 0.95 and accuracy on test data of 0.91). To the contrary, Jack mackerel and sardine captured in the CUFES exhibited the greatest degree of overfitting, with declines in accuracy of 4-19%. The pattern for classifiers based on trawl data was opposite that of the CUFES classifiers. Anchovy and hake exhibited the greatest declines in accuracy (7-14%) for trawl-based classifiers, and Jack mackerel and sardine the least (4-7%). These results suggest the degree to which overfitting occurred may have been a function of the number and type of predictors, sample sizes, and species distributions. Even for a relatively long time period with considerable variation in conditions (12,550 observations and 12 years of developmental data over a 16-year period for CUFES data), the algorithm may be fitting false correlations because too few animals have been captured over the entire range of values needed to characterize their tolerance for some predictors. (i.e., the edges of a species' tolerance; Myers, 1998). Thus, it may not be obvious when overfitting is likely to be a problem when creating a habitat model or classifier for a novel species. We note that the expected accuracy of a classifier with no predictive ability (i.e., a random guess) is 0.50. A decline in accuracy from 0.87 to 0.68 such as that found for sardine in the CUFES-ROMS-CoSiNE classifier is the difference between a very good predictive algorithm and a poor one. These results suggest independent data may be needed to realistically quantify the predictive power of fish habitat models or algorithms if they are to be used for prediction.

Habitat models that predict animal presence based on environmental conditions have some limitations regardless of whether the predictors are measured or modeled. Even if all important habitat conditions that define a species niche are included in a model, its accuracy will not be perfect because the model predicts potential habitat rather than realized habitat (Planque et al., 2007). The effect of unoccupied potential habitat was evident in this study because classifiers generally had poor sensitivity (i.e., probability of detection) but good specificity (i.e., true negative prediction rate). To achieve greater accuracy, it may be necessary to include animal births, deaths, and movement that determine the subset of appropriate habitat that actually is occupied. The hybrid approach to modeling habitat that uses derived predictors from a mechanistic model could be further refined by including additional population dynamics to the mechanistic model. For example, starting locations of fish could be estimated based on a previous survey, and then movement and survival could be included to improve model accuracy. The limitations of habitat models also have implications for their use in survey design. We assumed that both types of classification errors, false positive or false negative, were equally important in this study and tuned the random forests to balance them (via the sample fractions selected in each class; cf. Methods 2.4). However, if sensitivity is likely to be poor in any case because the model is predicting potential rather than realized habitat, it may be better to train classifiers to maximize specificity at the expense of sensitivity and then stratify by predicted habitat conditions. That is, minimize the area of the stratum in which good habitat exists, and in which the greatest sampling effort is required.

Classifiers of adults suggested that a broader range of habitat conditions were used during summer than during the spring spawning period for all species (Figures 1 and 5). The effect was most subtle for sardines, whose migration pattern allows them to use similar habitat throughout the year despite seasonal changes (Zwolinski et al., 2011). The other three species tested also stay in appropriate habitat via migration to varying extents. Thus, it has sometimes been assumed that environmental conditions in the spawning habitat represent the same habitat conditions used by the species throughout the year. Our results indicate that habitat models based on spawning habitat (egg presence) should be used with caution to predict the species' presence outside of the spawning season.

Our ability to identify adult habitat outside of the spawning season was relatively poor for the species tested because trawl-based classifiers were less accurate than CUFES-based classifiers (Figure 2). This problem could partly be solved with additional trawl sampling. The trawl data set was much sparser than the CUFES data set, and the non-random selection of trawl locations likely reduced the range of habitat conditions sampled (cf. Methods 2.1). However, classifiers based on trawl samples may inherently suffer from worse sensitivity than CUFES-based classifiers because adults actively avoid the trawl to some extent. Classifier accuracy also was relatively poor for the two species with greatest range and mobility, Jack mackerel and sardine. In combination, trawl-based classifiers for Jack mackerel and sardine probably were not accurate enough for most applications. For example, the trawl-satellite classifier for sardine (0.61 accuracy) performed only somewhat better than a random choice with expected accuracy of 0.50. It may be most cost effective to survey these species during the spawning season because they are likely to be aggregated in areas that can be better identified *a priori*.

- **5. Conclusions**
-

Habitat classifiers developed using derived (modeled) predictors from a coupled biophysical model had similar predictive ability to those of similar satellite-based classifiers for four species of fish. However, there was no improvement in the accuracy of derived predictors that included modeled zooplankton concentrations, which are not available from satellite data, over comparable satellite classifiers that included reflectance/chlorophyll concentration. Derived- and satellite-based classifiers both tended to have good specificity (i.e., ability to identify true negatives) but poor sensitivity (i.e., ability to detect a true positive) because classifiers identified potential habitat which was not fully occupied. Classifiers for two most wide ranging and mobile species tested, Jack mackerel and sardine, were less accurate than those of the species with more restricted ranges of habitat, anchovy and hake. Derived classifiers have advantages over satellite classifiers that make them well suited for dynamic species management and survey planning. They are not limited by cloud cover and they can make predictions in near real-time or the short-term future.

Acknowledgements

We thank G. DiNardo, T. Garfield, E. Hofmann, S. McClatchie, and one anonymous reviewer for reviewing the manuscript. This research was supported by the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Remote Sensing Solutions, Inc., and the University of Maine. Development of the ROMS-CoSiNE has previously been supported by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology, U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, U.S. National Science Foundation, and others, as described in the cited references.

References

- Ådlandsvik, Bjorn. 2016. Roppy ROMS post-processing tools in python.
- https://github.com/bjornaa/roppy. Accessed 4/20/2016.
- Ahlstrom, E. H. 1959. Vertical Distribution of Pelagic Fish Eggs and Larvae, Off California and Baja California. Fishery Bulletin of the Fish and Wildlife Service, 60: 107-143.
- Becker, E. A., Forney, K. A., Fiedler, P. C., Barlow, J., Chivers, S. J., Edwards, C. A., Moore, A. M., et al. 2016. Moving Towards Dynamic Ocean Management: How Well Do Modeled Ocean Products Predict Species Distributions? Remote Sensing, 8: 26.
- Becker, J. J., Sandwell, D. T., Smith, W. H. F., Braud, J., Binder, B., Depner, J., Fabre, D., et al. 2009. Global Bathymetry and Elevation Data at 30 Arc Seconds Resolution: SRTM30_PLUS. Marine Geodesy, 32: 355-371.
-
- Berk, R. A. 2008. Statistical Learning from a Regression Perspective*,* Springer.
- Bidigare, R. R., Chai, F., Landry, M. R., Lukas, R., Hannides, C. C. S., Christensen, S. J., Karl, D. M., et al. 2009. Subtropical ocean ecosystem structure changes forced by North Pacific climate variations. Journal of Plankton Research, 31: 1131-1139.
- Breiman, L. 2001. Random forests. Machine Learning, 45: 5-32.
- Chai, F., Dugdale, R. C., Peng, T. H., Wilkerson, F. P., and Barber, R. T. 2002. One-dimensional ecosystem model of the equatorial Pacific upwelling system. Part I: model development and silicon and nitrogen cycle. Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography, 49: 2713-2745.
- Chai, F., Liu, G. M., Xue, H. J., Shi, L., Chao, Y., Tseng, C. M., Chou, W. C., et al. 2009. Seasonal and Interannual Variability of Carbon Cycle in South China Sea: A Three-Dimensional Physical-Biogeochemical Modeling Study. Journal of Oceanography, 65: 703-720.
- Checkley, D. M., Dotson, R. C., and Griffith, D. A. 2000. Continuous, underway sampling of eggs of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) and northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*) in spring 1996 and 1997 off southern and central California. Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography, 47: 1139-1155.
- Checkley, D. M., Ortner, P. B., Settle, L. R., and Cummings, S. R. 1997. A continuous, underway fish egg sampler. Fisheries Oceanography, 6: 58-73.
- Cohen, D. M., Inada, T., Iwamoto, T., and Scialabba, N. 1990. FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 10. Gadiform fishes of the world (Order Gadiformes). An annotated and illustrated catalogue of cods, hakes, grenadiers and other gadiform fishes known to date. FAO Fisheries Synopsis No. 125(10). Rome, FAO. 442 pp.
- Conkright, M. E., Locarnini, R. A., H. E. Garcia, T. D. O. B., Boyer, T. P., and C. Stephens, J. I. A. 2002. World Ocean Atlas 2001: Objective Analyses, Data Statistics, and Figures, CD-ROM Documentation. p. 17. National Oceanographic Data Center, Silver Spring, MD.
- Dotson, R. C., Griffith, D. A., King, D. L., and Emmett, R. L. 2010. Evaluation of a Marine Mammal Excluder Device (MMED) for a Nordic 264 Midwater Rope Trawl. ICES Document NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-455. 14 pp.
- Fiechter, J., Rose, K. A., Curchitser, E. N., and Hedstrom, K. S. 2015. The role of environmental controls in determining sardine and anchovy population cycles in the California Current: Analysis of an end-to-end model. Progress in Oceanography, 138: 381-398.
- Froese, R. and D. Pauly, editors. 2017. FishBase. www.fishbase.org. Accessed 8/19/2017.
- Fulton, E. A. 2010. Approaches to end-to-end ecosystem models. Journal of Marine Systems, 81: 171-183.
- Guo, L., Chai, F., Xiu, P., Xue, H. J., Rao, S., Liu, Y. G., and Chavez, F. P. 2014. Seasonal dynamics of physical and biological processes in the central California Current System: A modeling study. Ocean Dynamics, 64: 1137-1152.
- Hayes, D. B., Ferreri, C. P., and Taylor, W. W. 1996. Linking fish habitat to their population dynamics. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 53: 383-390.
- Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., et al. 1996. The NCEP/NCAR 40-Year Reanalysis Project. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 77: 437-471.
- Key, R. M., Kozyr, A., Sabine, C. L., Lee, K., Wanninkhof, R., Bullister, J. L., Feely, R. A., et al. 2004. A global ocean carbon climatology: Results from Global Data Analysis Project (GLODAP). Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 18: 23.
- Kishi, M. J., Ito, S., Megrey, B. A., Rose, K. A., and Werner, F. E. 2011. A review of the NEMURO and NEMURO.FISH models and their application to marine ecosystem investigations. Journal of Oceanography, 67: 3-16.
- Kuhn, M. 2008. Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package. Journal of Statistical Software, 28: 1-26.
- Kursa, M. B., and Rudnicki, W. R. 2010. Feature Selection with the Boruta Package. Journal of Statistical Software, 36: 1-13.
- Leitão, F. 2015. Time series analyses reveal environmental and fisheries controls on Atlantic horse mackerel (*Trachurus trachurus*) catch rates. Continental Shelf Research, 111: 342- 352.
- Lindegren, M., Checkley, D. M., Jr., Ohman, M. D., Koslow, J. A., and Goericke, R. 2016. Resilience and stability of a pelagic marine ecosystem. Proc Biol Sci, 283.
- Liu, G., and Chai, F. 2009. Seasonal and interannual variability of primary and export production in the South China Sea: a three-dimensional physical-biogeochemical model study. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 66: 420-431.
- MacCall, A. D., and Stauffer, G. D. 1983. Biology and Fishery Potential of Jack Mackerel (*Trachurus Symmetricus*). California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations Reports, 24: 46-56.
- Macewicz, B. J., and Abramenkoff, D. N. 1993. Collection of Jack Mackerel, *Trachurus symmetricus*, off Southern California during 1991 Cooperative U.S.-U.S.S.R. Cruise. p. 14. Ed. by N. O. a. A. A. U.S. Department of Commerce. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, California.
- MacGregor, J. S. 1966. Synopsis of the Biology of the Jack Mackerel (*Trachurus symmmetricus*). p. 16. U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Washington, D.C., USA.
- McClatchie, S. 2014. Regional Fisheries Oceanography of the California Current System*,* Springer, New York. 235 pp.
- Moser, H. G. 1996. The Early Stage of Fishes in the California Current Region*,* Southwest Fisheries Science Center. 1505 pp.
- Mulet, S., Rio, M. H., Mignot, A., Guinehut, S., and Morrow, R. 2012. A new estimate of the global 3D geostrophic ocean circulation based on satellite data and in-situ measurements. Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography, 77-80: 70-81.
- Myers, R. A. 1998. When do environment—recruitment correlations work? Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries, 8: 285-305.
- Nieto, K., McClatchie, S., Weber, E. D., and Lennert-Cody, C. E. 2014. Effect of mesoscale eddies and streamers on sardine spawning habitat and recruitment success off Southern and central California. Journal of Geophysical Research. C. Oceans, 119: 6330-6339.
- Palacz, A. P., and Chai, F. 2012. Spatial and temporal variability in nutrients and carbon uptake during 2004 and 2005 in the eastern equatorial Pacific Ocean. Biogeosciences, 9: 4369- 4383.
- Pecuchet, L., Tornroos, A., and Lindegren, M. 2016. Patterns and drivers of fish community assembly in a large marine ecosystem. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 546: 239-248.
- Planque, B., Bellier, E., and Lazure, P. 2007. Modelling potential spawning habitat of sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*) and anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*) in the Bay of Biscay. Fisheries Oceanography, 16: 16-30.
- R Core Team 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Version 3.5.0. Vienna, Austria.
- Rexstad, E. A., and Pikitch, E. K. 1986. Stomach Contents and Food-Consumption Estimates of Pacific Hake, *Merluccius productus*. Fishery Bulletin, 84: 947-956.
- Rose, K. A., Allen, J. I., Artioli, Y., Barange, M., Blackford, J., Carlotti, F., Cropp, R., et al. 2010. End-To-End Models for the Analysis of Marine Ecosystems: Challenges, Issues, and Next Steps. Marine and Coastal Fisheries, 2: 115-130.
- Rose, K. A., Fiechter, J., Curchitser, E. N., Hedstrom, K., Bernal, M., Creekmore, S., Haynie, A., et al. 2015. Demonstration of a fully-coupled end-to-end model for small pelagic fish using sardine and anchovy in the California Current. Progress in Oceanography, 138: 348-380.
- Santora, J. A., Sydeman, W. J., Messie, M., Chai, F., Chao, Y., Thompson, S. A., Wells, B. K., et al. 2013. Triple check: Observations verify structural realism of an ocean ecosystem model. Geophysical Research Letters, 40: 6.
- Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Service. 2017. http://marine.copernicus.eu. Accessed 8/11/2017.
- Shchepetkin, A. F., and McWilliams, J. C. 2005. The regional oceanic modeling system (ROMS): a split-explicit, free-surface, topography-following-coordinate oceanic model. Ocean Modelling, 9: 347-404.
- Shchepetkin, A. F., and McWilliams, J. C. 2009. Ocean forecasting in terrain-following coordinates: Formulation and skill assessment of the regional ocean modeling system (vol 227, pg 3595, 2008). Journal of Computational Physics, 228: 8985-9000.
- Thompson, A. R., Watson, W., McClatchie, S., and Weber, E. D. 2012. Multi-Scale Sampling to Evaluate Assemblage Dynamics in an Oceanic Marine Reserve. Plos One, 7: 12.
- Tommasi, D., Stock, C. A., Pegion, K., Vecchi, G. A., Methot, R. D., Alexander, M. A., and Checkley, D. M. J. 2016. Improved Management of Small Pelagic Fisheries Through Seasonal Climate Prediction. Ecological Applications, 27: 378-388.
- Trevethan, R. 2017. Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Values: Foundations, Pliabilities, and Pitfalls in Research and Practice. Front Public Health, 5: 307.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atomospheric Administration. 2017a. Egg Distribution Maps for Sardine, Anchovy, and Jack Mackerel.
- https://swfsc.noaa.gov/textblock.aspx?Division=FRD&id=1121. Accessed 8/16/2017.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atomospheric Administration. 2017b. NOAA Coastwatch West Coast Regional Node. http://coastwatch.pfeg.noaa.gov/. Accessed 8/11/2017.
- Vasconcelos, R. P., Eggleston, D. B., Le Pape, O., and Tulp, I. 2013. Patterns and processes of habitat-specific demographic variability in exploited marine species. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 71: 638-647.
- Wang, X. C., and Chao, Y. 2004. Simulated Sea Surface Salinity variability in the tropical Pacific. Geophysical Research Letters, 31.
- Weber, E. D., and McClatchie, S. 2010. Predictive models of northern anchovy *Engraulis mordax* and Pacific sardine *Sardinops sagax* spawning habitat in the California Current. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 406: 251-263.
- Wright, M. N., and Ziegler, A. 2017. ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random Forests for High Dimensional Data in C plus plus and R. Journal of Statistical Software, 77: 1-17.
- Xiu, P., and Chai, F. 2011. Modeled biogeochemical responses to mesoscale eddies in the South China Sea. Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans, 116.
- Xiu, P., and Chai, F. 2012. Spatial and temporal variability in phytoplankton carbon, chlorophyll, and nitrogen in the North Pacific. Journal of Geophysical Research, 117.
- Yerushalmy, J. 1947. Statistical Problems in Assessing Methods of Medical Diagnosis, with Special Reference to X-Ray Techniques. Public Health Reports, 62: 1432-1449.
- Zhang, H.-M., Bates, J. J., and Reynolds, R. W. 2006. Assessment of composite global sampling: Sea surface wind speed. Geophysical Research Letters, 33.

Zwolinski, J. P., Demer, D. A., Macewicz, B. J., Mau, S., Murfin, D., Palance, D., Renfree, J. S., et al. 2017. Distribution, Biomass, and Demography of the Central Stock of Northern Anchovy During Summer 2016, Estimated From Acoustic-Trawl Sampling. ICES Document NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-572. 18 pp.

Zwolinski, J. P., Emmett, R. L., and Demer, D. A. 2011. Predicting habitat to optimize sampling of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). ICES Journal of Marine Science, 68: 867-879.

Figure Captions

 Figure 1. Box plots of normalized variable importance (decrease in variable importance when the variable is not present divided by its standard deviation) for predictors in 5,000 trees to predict the presence of four species. Black boxplots were included in final classifiers; gray boxplots were not. The area inside each box represents the first and third quartiles. Whiskers extend to the data range. Predictor variables were derived predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model (A and B) or remotely sensed satellite data (C and D). Rows A and C indicate Random Forest classifiers to predict the presence of eggs from CUFES samples, and rows (B and D) the presence of adults from trawl samples. The Shadow Min, Mn, And Max columns are the minimum, mean, and maximum distributions of the shadow variables used to perform variable selection. The shadow variable is the best performing randomly shuffled variable whose values were obtained from the original predictors (Kursa and Rudnicki, 2010). That is, they represent the distribution of a variable that has no predictive value. Note the scales of y axes differ.

Figure 2. Accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity of Random Forests to predict the presence of eggs 747 from CUFES samples (A) and adults in trawls (B) for classifiers of four species (Anch=anchovy, J Mack=Jack mackerel, Sard=sardine) using derived predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model or remotely sensed satellite data (Sat). Areas of gray boxes are proportional to the magnitude of the statistic in each cell. The OOB rows indicate statistics for out-of-bag samples in the developmental data sets. The test rows indicate statistics for the independent test data set, years 2002, 2006, 2011, and 2015.

Figure 3. Predicted spawning habitat for four species on April 16 of each year in the test data set (2002, 2006, 2011, and 2015) for Random Forest classifiers using either predictors derived from the ROMS-CoSiNE model or remotely sensed satellite data. The color scale indicates the predicted probability of capturing one or more eggs in a CUFES sample. White areas indicate classifier predictions < 0.5, i.e., no eggs predicted. Blue indicates areas where no prediction could be made for satellite-based classifiers because of cloud coverage or proximity to shore.

Figure 4. Spatial distribution of classification errors for Random Forests to predict the presence of eggs from CUFES samples applied to the test data set (years 2002, 2006, 2011, and 2015) for four species using derived predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model or remotely sensed satellite data. The upper right map in each panel indicates egg presences, and the lower left indicates negative samples. Purple indicates a correct classifier prediction and red indicates an incorrect prediction. Thus, upper purple = true positive, lower purple = true negative, upper red = false negative, and lower red = false positive.

- 769 Figure 5. Distributions of habitat predictors from the ROMS-CoSiNE model for adults captured
770 in trawls during spring (Spr) and summer (Sum). Half violin plots depict a boxplot in black and 770 in trawls during spring (Spr) and summer (Sum). Half violin plots depict a boxplot in black and kernel density estimate of distribution in gray for each predictor and season.
- kernel density estimate of distribution in gray for each predictor and season.

Figure 2 774

Sensitivity
Probability of Detection or

Figure 5

