

Università degli Studi Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria

Archivio Istituzionale dei prodotti della ricerca

Using random forest and multiple-regression models to predict changes in surface runoff and soil erosion after prescribed fire

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Using random forest and multiple-regression models to predict changes in surface runoff and soil erosion after prescribed fire / Zema, Da; Parhizkar, M; Plaza-Alvarez, Pa; Xu, Xz; Lucas-Borja, Me. - In: MODELING EARTH SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT. - ISSN 2363-6203. - 0:0(2024), pp. 1-19. [10.1007/s40808-023-01838-8]

Availability: This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/141562 since: 2024-11-22T11:11:06Z

Published DOI: http://doi.org/10.1007/s40808-023-01838-8 The final published version is available online at:https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40808-023-

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

Publisher copyright

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria (https://iris.unirc.it/) When citing, please refer to the published version.

1	This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:
2	
3	Zema, D.A., Parhizkar, M., Plaza-Alvarez, P.A., Xu, X., Lucas-Borja, M.E. 2024. Using
4	random forest and multiple-regression models to predict changes in surface runoff and soil
5	<i>erosion after prescribed fire</i> . Modeling Earth Systems and Environment (Springer),
6	
7	which has been published in final doi
8	
9	10.1007/s40808-023-01838-8
10	
11	(https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40808-023-01838-8)
12	
13	The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the
14	publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

15 Using Random Forest and Multiple-regression models to predict changes in surface runoff and soil erosion

16 after prescribed fire

17

18 Abstract

19

Prescribed fire is a viable practice to reduce the wildfire risk in forests, but its application may lead to increased 20 surface runoff and soil erosion. Several hydrological and erosive models have been proposed and evaluated to 21 predict the changes in soil hydrology and erosion after prescribed fire. However, the prediction capacity of machine 22 learning and Multiple-Regression models has scarcely been studied in sites treated with prescribed fire, despite of 23 the usefulness of these tools for landscape planners. This study aims to evaluate how a Random Forest, RF, 24 algorithm and Multiple-Regression, MR, and Partial Least Square Regression, PLS-R, equations can predict changes 25 in surface runoff and soil erosion after prescribed fire. This prediction capacity has been quantified through the 26 application of the models to 35 case studies reported in 18 academic papers selected from the international scientific 27 literature. The model predictions have been evaluated using common statistics and indexes (e.g., the coefficient of 28 29 Nash and Sutcliffe, NSE). The results show poor performance of the RF and PLS-R models in predicting runoff (NSE < 0 and < 0.31). However, the models' capacity to predict soil erosion was acceptable (NSE = 0.47 and 0.69, 30 respectively). The predictions by the MR equation were also acceptable for runoff (NSE < 0.69) and good for 31 erosion (NSE = 0.80). Furthermore, the MR equation offers a large applicability, since this simple model has been 32 tested using a database of hydrological observations in environments with different characteristics. The performance 33 34 of MR equations is encouraging when its broader use in runoff and erosion predictions in soils treated with prescribed fire. 35

36

37 **Keywords** Soil hydrology; wildfire risk; machine learning; regression analysis; hydrological modelling.

38

39 Introduction

40

Prescribed fire is an effective tool to reduce wildfire risk in rural areas (forests, pastures and croplands) and, as such, has been applied in several countries (Klimas et al. 2020). Prescribed fire treatments generally have a low severity and intensity, and the soil temperature is much lower compared to wildfires (Cawson et al. 2016). However, prescribed fire removes almost all litter cover and understory vegetation, leaving the soil exposed to rainfall erosivity (Hueso-González et al. 2018). Furthermore, the changes in some soil properties may be noticeable (e.g., reduction in organic matter content and thus hydraulic conductivity (Alcañiz et al. 2018)), and soil water repellency may occur or noticeably increase after a prescribed fire (Pierson et al. 2008; Cawson et al. 2016).

These impacts of prescribed fire on soil generally result in noticeable changes in runoff and erosion rates as well as alterations in the water quality of streams for some months after its application (Carrà et al. 2022; Beyene et al. 2023). For instance, Cawson et al. (2012) and Shakesby et al. (2015) report increases in runoff and erosion of one to two orders of magnitude when compared to unburned areas. These increases occur especially in the so-called 'window of disturbance', a period lasting some months from prescribed fire's application (Prosser and Williams 1998). In contrast, according to Coelho et al. (2004), and de Dios Benavides-Solorio and MacDonald (2005), prescribed fire generally results in minimal erosion. Furthermore, Keesstra et al. (2014) found lower erosion rates in sites burned with prescribed fire as compared to unburned forests. These contrasting results are mainly due to complex, highly dynamic and constantly changing hydrological processes in burned sites (Cao et al. 2022).

57 When they occur, the changes in soil hydrology after prescribed fire can induce severe flooding, erosion and

landslides. To control and mitigate the associated risks, accurate predictions of post-fire runoff and erosion in sites

treated with prescribed fire are essential (Morris et al. 2014). Computer-based models are generally able to predict

60 the changes in hydrological and erosive variables resulting from complex natural processes and land management 61 actions. These models may be of a different nature (e.g., empirical, physically-based and conceptual) and show

62 different complexity and variable requirements of the input data (Merritt et al. 2003; Aksoy and Kavvas 2005).

63 Therefore, choosing the most suitable model for a specific environment is difficult, and landscape managers and

- 64 hydrologists need practical guidance to make this choice. Their planning and management tasks are complex, due to
- 65 the large variability of environmental conditions.

66 Runoff and erosion in burned sites have been modelled using many prediction models in several environments (e.g.,

Rulli et al. 2013; Fernández and Vega 2016; Salis et al. 2019). Hydrological applications have tested empirical (e.g.,

- 68 SCS-CN and USLE-family models, Larsen and MacDonald 2007; Soulis 2018), semi-empirical (e.g., MMF,
- Hosseini et al. 2018; Vieira et al. 2018b), and more complex models (e.g., PESERA and WEPP models,
 Karamesouti et al. 2016; Fernández and Vega 2018) to predict the hydrological and erosive response of forest soils
- affected by wildfires. Studies showing modelling applications in sites treated with prescribed fire are much fewer
- 72 (e.g., Lucas-Borja et al. 2020; Zema et al. 2022). To summarize, Lucas-Borja et al. (2020) applied linear regression
- equations and the SCS-CN model to predict surface runoff in the pine forests of Central-Eastern Spain. In three
- forest stands in Southern Italy, Carrà et al. (2021) found accurate predictions of runoff and soil loss using the SCS-
- CN and USLE-M models, while the simulations by Horton and MUSLE equations were poor. Despite the encouraging results from when using these models, these studies are limited in number, to common empirical models and also confined to specific environments. In contrast, at least to the authors' best knowledge, no
- evaluations of more complex models, such as machine learning algorithms or Multiple-Regression techniques, are available in areas treated with prescribed fire. Compared to the empirical models, these prediction tools may better capture the complexity of post-fire soil hydrology and offer larger applicability in environments with different
- climatic, soil and vegetation characteristics.
 - To fill this gap, this study aims to evaluate whether changes in surface runoff and soil erosion after prescribed fire can be predicted worldwide using Random Forest (a machine learning algorithm), and Multiple-Regression and Partial Least Square Regression models (two multivariate statistical models). To this aim, these three models have been applied to a dataset of 35 case studies found in the international scientific literature.
 - 86

87 Materials and Methods

89 Paper selection

90

Comprehensive bibliographic research was carried out in late January2023 on Scopus[®], Web of Science[®] and Google[®] Scholar[®] databases, to find academic papers, relevant to prescribed fire and soil hydrology, published between the year2000 and the present. The following individual keywords or combination of keywords were used:

⁸⁸

- 94 'prescribed fire', 'prescribed burning', 'water infiltration', 'soil hydraulic conductivity', 'surface runoff', 'soil loss'
 95 and 'water erosion'. This bibliographic research returned 41 articles with 89 case studies.
- ⁹⁶ In order to identify the key drivers of the changes in surface runoff and erosion rates in burned soils, the following

97 'environmental characteristics' were identified according to the relevant literature (Neary et al. 1999; Certini 2005;

- Shakesby and Doerr 2006; Keeley 2009; Robichaud et al. 2010; Shakesby 2011; Moody et al. 2013; Alcañiz et al.
- 2018; Cole et al. 2020; Wagenbrenner et al. 2021; Agbeshie et al. 2022): (i) climate; (ii) soil slope; (iii) vegetation ;
- 100 (iv) soil burn severity; and (v) soil texture.
- 101 Of the 41 academic papers previously selected, only 21 (totalling 35 case studies) reported surface runoff and/or soil
- 102 erosion data in burned and unburned soils together with all the abovementioned environmental characteristics (Table
- 103 1).
- 104
- 105 Data collection
- 106

The 21 papers with the 35 case studies were carefully analysed, in order to compile a database in an Excel file. For each case study, this database reported the values of the environmental characteristics as well as those of the following quantitative variables: (i) rainfall depth (mm); (ii) water infiltration rate (mm/h); (iii) surface runoff volume (mm); and (iv) soil loss (tons/ha). Rainfall intensity, which is a key variable for erosion predictions (Wischmeier and Smith 1958; Liu et al. 2022), was excluded from the studied variables since the burned and unburned sites were subjected to very similar precipitation (the difference being lower than 5%).

113

114 Data processing

115

The specific soil's hydrological response to prescribed fire was expressed quantitatively considering the four major 116 processes (precipitation, infiltration, runoff, soil erosion and transport) of soil hydrology (Moody et al. 2013). In 117 118 both unburned and burned state of each site, the hydrological and erosive variables (observations of water infiltration, surface runoff, and soil loss) and environmental characteristics of the experimental sites were extracted 119 for the 35 case studies. In the case of burned sites this data was extracted at two dates: immediately after the 120 prescribed fire (hereafter 'short-term') and at the end of the monitoring period in the relevant study ('mid-term'). 121 This separation in extraction dates was done to consider the different soil's hydrological response to fire throughout 122 the window of disturbance and the following period, when the pre-fire soil properties and vegetation cover are 123 124 progressively recovering.

The site in unburned condition was assumed to be the 'reference' or 'baseline' value for each of the four investigated hydrological variables. For each case study, the so-called 'effect size' (e.g., Vieira et al. 2015; Girona-García et al. 2021) for the change between the burned and the unburned sites was calculated for both the short and mid-term. This effect size was estimated as the decimal logarithm (log) of the response ratio (Curtis and Wang 1998; Hedges et al. 1999) - hereafter 'log response ratio' (LRR) - using the following equation:

$$LRR = \log \frac{x_B}{x_{UB}} \tag{1}$$

where x_{B} is the mean value of the response variable measured in the site treated with prescribed fire (burned soil)

- and x_{UB} is the corresponding value measured in the unburned condition at the same site. The value of the LRRs
- 134 expresses the magnitude of the impact of prescribed fire on a given soil on a logarithmic scale (e.g., Kalies et al.
- 135 2010). More specifically, a positive LRR means that the related hydrological variable in the burned site is higher,
- and lower, if LRR is negative, as compared to the same variable at the unburned site. The exponent of LRR gives
- 137 the order of magnitude of the change. The four calculated LRRs are hereafter indicated as 'LRR(RF)' (for rainfall),
- 138 'LRR(WI)' (for water infiltration), 'LRR(SR)' (for surface runoff), and 'lnRR(SE)' (for soil erosion).
- 139 The wide range of site conditions and experimental observations, and the different methods adopted to measure the
- studied variables do not impact the results of this analysis, since the calculation of the size effect was made in both
- unburned and burned sites under the same conditions and monitoring period in each study (Vieira et al. 2015;
- 142 Girona-García et al. 2021).

143 The values of the environmental characteristics were grouped into classes to fix categorical variables, as follows:

144 (i) climate: continental; oceanic; temperate; semi-arid; tropical

145 (ii) soil slope (%): < 10; 10-20; 20-30; 30-40; 40-50; > 50

- 146 (iii) vegetation: grasses; shrubs; trees
- 147 (iv) soil burn severity: low; low to moderate; moderate; moderate to high; high
- 148 (v) soil texture: sandy; silty; clayey and combinations among these textural classes.
- 149

150 Short description of prediction methods

151

'Random Forests' or 'random decision forests' (hereafter 'RF') is a machine learning method used for the 152 classification and/or regression of variables of different types. For regression, RF predicts a quantitative dependent 153 variable based on: (i) independent quantitative and/or qualitative variables; (ii) continuous and discrete data. 154 The RF method creates a high number of so-called 'decision trees'. The latter is a structure, 155 where each internal node represents a test on an attribute, each branch represents the test result, 156 and each leaf represents a class label, that is a decision taken after computing all attributes. RF 157 consists of a combination of several decision trees that incorporate multiple bootstrap samples 158 from the observational data. Several input variables randomly participate in the construction of 159 each tree. Using the bootstrap method, many samples from the initial observations are 160introduced. Then, a tree is expanded based on a bootstrap sample. Each tree produces a class 161 prediction and the class obtaining more votes than others becomes the model's prediction. Once 162 each whole tree is built, several trees are used as inputs to estimate the output variable. The 163 average value of these estimates gives the final output of the model (Avand et al. 2019). More 164 precisely, the outcome is a rank expressed in terms of mean decrease accuracy (or mean increase 165 error, which is the sum of the squares) as a prediction error. A larger value of this error means 166

- that the importance of the related variable is higher for that model prediction (Mohammed et al. 167
- 2020). 168
- A multiple-regression model (hereafter 'MR') builds a linear equation between a set of independent ('predictor' or 169
- 'explanatory') variables on one side, and one dependent (or 'response') variable. The coefficients of the 170
- independent variables are estimated by a regression method, for instance, the Minimum Least Square method. The 171
- MR method develops a prediction equation under the following form: 172

$$LRR(SR) \text{ or } LRR(SE) = a + \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \cdot x_i$$
⁽²⁾

173 where:

- a = intercept174 $b_i = model coefficients$ 175 _
- $x_i = independent variables.$ 176
- 177

Partial Least Square Regression (hereafter 'PLS-R') is a regression method based on covariance, which is 178recommended when the explanatory variables are numerous and multi-collinearity among the variables is possible. 179 PLS-R, having in general a non-linear structure, reduces the input variables to a smaller set of predictors 180 181 ('component(s)'), which are used for regression.

A PLS-R method provides prediction equations under the following form: 182

$$LRR(SR) \text{ or } LRR(SE) = a + \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \cdot x_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_i \cdot x_j \cdot x_k$$
(3)

183 where:

-

- a = intercept184
- b_i and c_i = model coefficients _ 185
- x_i and x_k = independent variables ($x_i \cdot x_k$ representing the non-linear term). 186
- 187

188 Description of the case-studies

189

196

In the thirty-five case studies in the selected 21 papers reporting data of surface runoff and soil erosion, 22 values of 190 runoff were related to the short-term observations (measured from immediately after the prescribed fire until 2-3 191 months later), and just as many to the mid-term observations (that is, at least one year after the prescribed fire). For 192 erosion, 17 observations were related to the short term, and 25 to the mid-term. Some papers reported both short-193 term and mid-term observations, and many others both runoff and erosion values. All the categorical variables 194 195 related to the environmental characteristics for the 35 case studies are reported in Table 1.

Table 1 Main characteristics of the case studies used for modelling surface runoff and soil erosion by the three prediction methods

Case study	First author (year)	Journal	Country	Climate	Vegetation	Soil burn severity	Soil slope class (%)	Soil texture
1	González-Pelayo et al. (2010)	Geomorphology	Spain	Semi-arid	Shrubs	Low	21-30	Sandy loam
2	Cawson et al. (2013)	Forest Ecology and Management	Australia	Temperate	Trees	Low	41-50	Silty clay loam
3	Vega et al. (2005)	Land Degradation	Spain	Oceanic	Shrubs	Low	21-30	Sandy loam
4	(2003)	and Development	Spain	Oceanic	Shrubs	Low	21-30	Sandy loam
5	Morales et al.	Forest Ecology	Mexico	Temperate	Trees	Low	11-20	Sand
6	(2000)	and Management	Mexico	Temperate	Trees	Low	11-20	Sand
7	Townsend and	Journal of	Australia	Tropical	Trees	Low	< 10	Sandy loam
8	Douglas (2000)	Hydrology	Australia	Tropical	Trees	High	< 10	Sandy loam
9		Feelogical	Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	11-20	Loamy sand
10	Carrà et al. (2022)	Ecological	Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	11-20	Loamy sand
11		Lingineering	Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	21-30	Loamy sand
12	Lucas-Borja et al. (2019)	Science of the Total Environment	Spain	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	11-20	Clay
13	Cawson et al. (2016)	Geoderma	Australia	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	41-50	Silty clay loam

14	Fernández et al	Journal of	Spain	Semi-arid	Shrubs	Low	< 10	Sandy loam
15	(2012)	Environmental Management	Spain	Oceanic	Shrubs	Low	31-40	Sandy loam
16	Robichaud (2000)	Journal of	USA	Continental	Trees	Low	41-50	Loam
17	100101111111 (2000)	Hydrology	USA	Continental	Trees	Low	> 50	Loam
18	Pierson et al.	Earth Surface Processes and	USA	Continental	Shrubs	Moderate to high	41-50	Sandy loam
19	(2008)	Landforms	USA	Continental	Shrubs	Moderate to high	41-50	Sandy loam
20	Zavala et al. (2009)	Earth Surface Processes and Landforms	Spain	Semi-arid	Shrubs	Low	< 10	Sandy loam + clayey loam
21			USA	Semi-arid	Trees	Low to moderate	11-20	Sandy loam
22	Pierson et al.	Rangeland Ecology	USA	Semi-arid	Trees	Low to moderate	11-20	Sandy loam
23	(2014)	Management	USA	Semi-arid	Trees	Low to moderate	11-20	Sandy loam
24			USA	Semi-arid	Trees	Low to moderate	11-20	Sandy loam
25	Carrà et al. (2021)	Hydrology	Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	11-20	Loamy sand
26			Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	11-20	Loamy sand

27			Italy	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	21-30	Loamy sand
28	Shakesby et al. (2015)	Catena	Portugal	Oceanic	Shrubs	Low to moderate	31-40	Loamy sand
29			USA	Continental	Trees	Low	11-20	Silty loam
30	Singh et al. (2017)	Forests	USA	Continental	Trees	Low	21-30	Silty loam
31			USA	Continental	Trees	Low	21-30	Silty loam
32			USA	Continental	Trees	Low	21-30	Silty loam
33	de Koff et al. (2006)	Soil Science	USA	Semi-arid	Shrubs	Low	> 50	Loam
34	Lucas-Borja et al.	Journal of	Spain	Semi-arid	Trees	Low	21-30	Sandy loam
35	(2022)	Environmental Management	Spain	Semi-arid	Trees	High	21-30	Sandy loam

- 199 Application of prediction methods to the case studies
- 200

For all prediction methods, two response variables were set, namely LRR(SR) and LRR(SE). In the first case, the independent input parameters were the five categorical variables (climate, soil slope, soil burn severity, soil texture and vegetation) as well as two quantitative variables, that is LRR(RF) and LRR(WI). In the second case, predicting

204 LRR(SE), the quantitative variable LRR(SR) was added to the set of independent categorical parameters.

205 The RF algorithm was applied using the 'random input with replacement' method with the 'Mtry' parameter set to

10 on the entire sample size (35 observations of surface runoff and just as many for soil erosion). The "bagging"

- 207 method was used as a sample bootstrap, in order to train each tree on the different subsets of observations. The
- required number of trees in the forest was set to 100, which was equal to the number of trees built by the algorithm.
- The MR analysis was applied selecting the most accurate set of independent variables as the best predictors. To select the best model, the maximum r^2 was adopted as an objective function, and the Least Mean Square method was used to calculate the model coefficients (a and b_i of equation 2).

212 PLS-R was applied to the case studies, adopting the 'Jack-and-Knife' cross-validation method. Table 3SI reports the

variable importance in equation 3, as provided by this method. The algorithm selects a set of derivative variables

214 ('Components') from the input parameters. We calculated the cumulated r_{y}^{2} and r_{x}^{2} , which measure the correlations

between the explanatory (x) and dependent (y) variables with these components. The variable significance in the

216 projections was also estimated, to identify the influence of each input parameter on the two response variables.

217 The three models were implemented using XLSTAT[®] software (release 2019).

218

219 Evaluation of the model's accuracy

220

221 The prediction accuracy of the three models was analysed for 'goodness-of-fit' against the corresponding 222 observations adopting qualitative and quantitative approaches. The qualitative approach consisted of a visual comparison of pairs of 'observations' vs. 'predictions' of LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) using scatterplots. For the 223 quantitative evaluation of model accuracy, we used the following indicators, commonly adopted in the literature 224 (e.g., Willmott 1982; Loague and Green 1991; Legates and McCabe Jr 1999): (a) the main statistics (maximum, 225 minimum, mean and standard deviation of observed and simulated values); (b) coefficient of determination (r²); (c) 226 coefficient of efficiency of Nash and Sutcliffe (NSE, (Nash and Sutcliffe 1970)); (d) Root Mean Square Error 227 (RMSE); and (e) percentage bias (PBIAS). The studies by Van Liew and Garbrecht (2003), Krause et al. (2005) and 228 Moriasi et al. (2007) report the equations used to calculate the quantitative indicators mentioned above, while the 229 acceptance or optimal values are reported in Table 2. PBIAS, also known as the 'coefficient of residual mass 230 (CRM)' (Loague and Green 1991), is positive, when a model underestimates the observations, and negative in the 231 case of an overestimation (Gupta et al. 1999). 232

Table 2 Indexes, their range of variability and acceptance/optimal values to evaluate the prediction capacity of the

three prediction models

Index	Range of variability	Acceptance limits or optimal values					
r ²	0 to 1	$r^2 > 0.50$ (Santhi et al. 2001; Van Liew et al. 2003; Vieira et al. 2018b)					
NSE	-∞ to 1	Model accuracy: good, if NSE ≥ 0.75 ; satisfactory, if $0.36 \leq$ NSE < 0.75 ; unsatisfactory, if NSE < 0.36 (Van Liew et al. 2003)					
RMSE	0 to ∞	RMSE < 0.5 of observed SD (Singh et al. 2005)					
PBIAS	$-\infty$ to ∞	Model accuracy: fair, if PBIAS is 25% (for runoff) and < 55% (for erosion) (Moriasi et al. 2007)					
Results	Square Error; PBIAS = percentage bias. Results						
Characteriz	Characterization of changes in rainfall, infiltration, runoff and erosion in the case studies						
LRR(RF) sh 1) to a maxi study 20). I unburned si	nowed a very low mum of 0.32 (cas n six cases (of wl tes (shown by ne	variability in the selected case studies, from a minimum of -0.44 (case study 33, Table se studies 34 and 35). LRR(WI) was in the range of -0.30 (case study 18) to 0.22 (case hich three were in the short term), infiltration was lower in burned sites compared to gative LRRs), while, in the mid-term, water infiltration recovered the pre-fire levels.					
with three e	xceptions (case st	udies 24, 25 and 27) (Table 1 and Fig. 1).					





Fig. 1 Values of LRR (log response ratio) of rainfall, infiltration, runoff and erosion in the 35 case studies

The minimum LRR(SR) (-0.64) was found in case study 19, while case study 2 showed the maximum value (1.94). Surface runoff was always higher in burned sites compared to unburned sites in the short-term (positive LRRs),

except in three case studies (13, 23 and 26). In the mid-term, surface runoff was generally lower in burned sites
(case studies 18 to 20) (Fig. 1 and Table 1).

A similar pattern as that of the surface runoff was noticed in the short term for the changes in soil erosion. In more detail, LRR(SE) was always higher in burned sites compared to unburned sites (except for case study 23 in the short term and seven case studies in the mid-term). The lowest and highest values were found in the case studies 9 (-0.38) and 12 (3.19), respectively (Fig. 1 and Table 1).

262

264

Of the 100 decision trees built by the RF model, 45 trees for LRR(SR) and 42 for LRR(SE) were needed to get the

lowest and steady value of the minimum absolute error (MAE), which was on average 0.286 in the first case and
0.462 in the second case (Fig. 2a).

²⁶³ Model running





Fig. 2 Variability of the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) with the number of trees (a) and mean increase error (b), expressing the importance of each input variable, in the Random Forest model applied to the case studies

- 277 For LRR(SR) predictions the most important input variables (identified using the highest mean increase errors) were
- climate, LRR(RF), LRR(WI) and soil slope, while all the numerical variables (LRR of rainfall, infiltration and runoff) were the most influential to predict LRR(SE) (Fig. 2b).
- 280 Regarding the MR analysis, a noticeable number of input variables were needed as best predictors of LRR(SR) and
- LRR(SE). In more detail, the highest values of r^2 (0.516 for runoff and 0.674 for erosion) were achieved using 11
- variables (climate, vegetation and soil texture groups) and 16 variables (LRR(RF), LRR(WI), LRR(SR), climate,
- soil slope and soil texture), respectively (Table 3).

Table 3 Variability of the coefficient of determination (r²) with input variables in Equation (2) of the Multiple-Regression models applied to the case studies

285

Number	Croups of variables							
of variables	Groups of variables							
	LRR(SR)							
10	Climate / Soil texture	0.250						
11	Climate / Vegetation / Soil texture	0.516						
12	LRR(WI) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil texture	0.507						
13	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil texture	0.491						
14	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil burn severity / Soil texture	0.474						
18	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil burn severity / Soil slope / Soil texture	0.451						
	LRR(SE)							
6	LRR(SR) / Soil slope	0.514						
11	LRR(SR) / Climate / Soil texture	0.598						
12	LRR(RF) / LRR(SR) / Climate / Soil texture	0.651						
15	LRR(RF) / LRR(SR) / Climate / Soil slope / Soil texture	0.671						
16	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / LRR(SR) / Climate / Soil slope / Soil texture	0.674						
17	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / LRR(SR) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil slope / Soil texture	0.666						
19	LRR(RF) / LRR(WI) / LRR(SR) / Climate / Vegetation / Soil burn severity / Soil slope / Soil texture	0.659						

Note: the number in the first row indicates the total categorical or numeric variables of groups; the values in bold indicate the highest r² value with the selected input

287 variables.

- 288
- PLS-R selected only one derivative variable ('Component') from the selected dataset of input parameters. The cumulated r_y^2 and r_x^2 between the independent and dependent variables with this component were low for LRR(SR) (0.31 and 0.09, respectively), and higher (0.67 and 0.06) for LRR(SE).
- 292 The coefficients of the two regression (MR and PLS-R) models found respectively in equations 2 and 3 are reported
- in Tables 1SI and 3SI, while Table 2SI shows the variable importance in predictions using the PLS-R model. It is
- worth noting that only the PLS-R models used quantitative variables as input parameters, namely LRR(RF),
- 295 LRR(WI) and LRR(SR), while the MR analysis selected only categorical variables.
- 296
- 297 Prediction accuracy of the three models
- 298

Figs. 3a and 3b depict the predictions of LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) using the three models in comparison to the corresponding observations.





Fig. 3 Prediction of LRR(SR) (a) and LRR(SE) (b) (mean \pm standard deviation) for each observation using three models (RF = Random forest; MR = Multiple-Regression; PLS-R = Partial Least Square Regression) applied to the case studies

302

(a)

(b)

309 The RF algorithm gave poor predictions of changes in surface runoff. This is shown not only by the large scattering

of the 'observation vs. prediction' pairs along the line of perfect agreement (Fig. 4), but also by the poor values of

 $_{311}$ the evaluation indexes. In more detail, r^2 was zero, NSE was negative, and RMSE was higher compared to half the

observed standard deviation (Table 2). Therefore, all these indexes were far from the acceptable limits of Table 1.

313 RF accurately predicted the mean LRR(SR) (difference of 5.6% compared to the observed value), while the errors in

simulating the minimum and maximum LRRs were much higher (-82.3% and -39.5%). The algorithm showed a

very slight tendency to overestimate the observations of runoff changes (PBIAS of -0.06) (Table 4).

316 The predictions of LRR(SE) given by the RF algorithm were more reliable than the estimations LRR(SR) and, in

317 general, acceptable, although not good (r² and NSE equal to 0.47). There was no evidence of any model's tendency

towards overestimation or underestimation (PBIAS = -0.01) (Table 4). Overall, the model was more reliable in

simulating LRRs of erosion (differences of 1.3%, mean, and -14.6%, maximum) compared to the runoff predictions.





Fig. 4 Scatterplot of observations vs. predictions of LRR(SR) (a) and LRR(SE) (b) using three models (RF = Random forest; MR = Multiple-Regression; PLS-R = Partial Least Square Regression) applied to the case studies

(b)

321 322

The MR equations reproduced the observed LRRs with a different accuracy for runoff and erosion. In more detail, 329 the scatterplot of LRR(SR) predicted by Eq. (2) shows a limited agreement between observations and predictions for 330

331 intermediate values, while the lowest and highest LRRs fall close to the line of perfect agreement (Fig. 4). While

RMSE got unsatisfactory values (0.28), r^2 and NSE values were satisfactory but not good (0.64 for both indexes). 332

333 PBIAS was zero, thus indicating no under- or over-estimation of LRRs. However, the differences in the mean and

maximum observed and predicted LRR(SR) were high (78.7% and 53.7%, respectively) (Table 4). In contrast, the 334

Multiple-Regression Eq. (2) showed a very good capacity to predict the post-fire changes in erosion rates. The 335 highest LRR(SE) was very close to the line of perfect agreement, and the same was noticed for most of the

- intermediate values (Fig. 4). Both r² and NSE were very high (0.80), PBIAS was zero (no under- or over-337
- estimation), and RMSE was relatively low (-0.42, < 0.5 std. dev. of observations) (Table 4). Moreover, the mean 338
- and maximum LRR(SE) difference was zero or very low (-5.8%). 339

340

Table 4 Indexes used to evaluate the LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) predictions using three models in the case studies

		LRR(SR)						
N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard deviation	r ²	E	PBIAS	RMSE
		•		Random F	Forest		1	1
Observation	0.297	-0.637	1.941	0.477	0.00	-0.29	-0.06	0.53
Prediction	0.314	-0.113	1.174	0.249	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00
		•		Multiple-Reg	gression			
Observation	0.227	0.247	0.070	0.050	0.64	0.64	0.00	0.28
Prediction	0.405	0.247	0.108	0.050	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.20
	Partial Least Square Regression						1	
Observation	0.297	-0.637	1.941	0.477	0.31	0.31	0.00	0.39
Prediction	0.297	-0.245	1.219	0.266	0.51	0.51	0.00	0.55
		•		LRR(S	E)			
				Random F	Forest			
Observation	0.821	-0.383	3.186	0.937	0.47	0.47	-0.01	0.68
Prediction	0.832	0.044	2.720	0.683		0.17	0.01	0.00
		•		Multiple-Reg	gression			
Observation	0.821	-0.383	3.186	0.937	0.80	0.80	0.00	0.42
Prediction	0.821	-0.446	3.000	0.838	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12
	Partial Least Square Regression							
Observation	0.821	-0.383	3.186	0.937	0.69	0.69	0.00	0.52
Prediction	0.821	-0.205	3.591	0.776		0.09	0.00	

343 Notes: r²: coefficient of determination; NSE: coefficient of efficiency of Nash and Sutcliffe; RMSE: Root Mean Square Error; PBIAS: coefficient of residual mass.

The simulations of runoff changes by PLS-R models were only acceptable, while a good prediction capacity was 345 noticed for LRR(SE). Regarding LRR(SR), r² and RMSE were poor (0.31 and 0.39, against a value of 0.48 of the 346 observed std. dev.) and NSE was positive but low (0.31). PBIAS was zero, indicating no under- or over-estimation of 347 LRRs, as also shown by the equal values of the observed and the predicted mean. In contrast, a noticeable 348 349 overestimation was observed for the minimum and maximum LRR values (-61.5% and -37.2%, respectively, Table 4), as seen also in the related scatterplot (Fig. 4). The PLS-R model showed satisfactory predictions of LRR(SE), which is 350 shown by the appreciable values of r^2 (0.69), NSE (0.69), PBIAS (0) and RMSE (0.52, very close to half observed std. 351 dev.). However, while the predicted and observed values of mean and maximum LRR(SE) were equal or low, the 352 predictions of the minimum LRR data showed a difference of -46.6% compared to the corresponding observations 353 (Table 4). 354

355

356 4. Discussion

357

Prescribed fire noticeably alters the soil's hydrological and erosive response to the rainfall input (Cawson et al. 2012). 358 However, the post-fire runoff and erosion rates are site-specific, since it depends on the peculiar climatic, soil and 359 vegetal characteristics of the treated environment (Úbeda et al. 2018). This specificity is proved by the large variability 360 in water infiltration as well as in runoff and erosion already present in the selected case studies. In more detail, water 361 infiltration may decrease (as generally observed) but also increase (in a few case studies) after a prescribed fire. In the 362 papers analysed, post-fire infiltration was up to 50% lower in some sites (Pierson et al. 2008) in the short term, but case 363 studies with enhanced post-fire infiltration (up to +65%) are also reported (Zavala et al. 2009). The reduction in water 364 infiltration is mainly due to the changes in the most important physical properties of soil, such as the aggregate stability 365 (e.g., Fox et al. 2007; Arcenegui et al. 2008; Varela et al. 2010) and the occurrence of soil water repellency, which 366 induces hydrophobicity (Letey 2001; Cawson et al. 2016). 367

In the selected case studies, surface runoff and erosion rates generally showed a dramatic increase of up to 87-fold (for 368 runoff, Cawson et al. 2013) and 1500-fold (for erosion, Lucas-Borja et al. 2019) the values measured in the unburned 369 sites. Only in a few case studies, post-fire runoff and erosion were lower in the burned sites compared to the unburned 370 sites. The increase in the hydrological and erosive response of soil following the prescribed fire application is caused by 371 several factors (Cawson et al. 2012; Vieira et al. 2018a). In addition to the changes in infiltration rates and 372 hydrophobicity mentioned above, the almost total removal of vegetation and the noticeable modifications in some 373 important physicochemical properties of soil due to burning noticeably influence post-fire runoff and erosion (Certini 374 375 2005; Shakesby 2011; Moody et al. 2013; Alcañiz et al. 2018; Agbeshie et al. 2022). Moreover, since these impacts are affected by high temporal variability, surface runoff and soil loss themselves are variable over time (Prosser and 376 Williams 1998). In this regard, the selected case studies showed a general recovery of the pre-fire values some years 377 after the fire, although in some case studies the mid-term runoff and erosion rates remained noticeably high, despite 378 379 being a long time since the fire application.

The variability in soil hydrology after a prescribed fire, and the unsteady character of the soil's hydrological response over time make the simulation of post-fire surface runoff and erosion processes particularly challenging (Vieira et al. 2015; Lopes et al. 2021; Girona-García et al. 2021). This difficulty explains the contrasting prediction accuracy shown by the three models evaluated in the selected case studies, with the RF algorithm showing a low prediction accuracy, and regression models performing much better.

In more detail, one of the main advantages of RF algorithms is reproducibility and high transparency of feature 385 importance (Wilder et al. 2021). However, the predictions of changes in runoff and erosion by the algorithms 386 developed in this study were poor in reproducing the first case and acceptable (but not optimal) for the second variable. 387 The poor RF performance in modelling post-fire runoff led to large overestimations of the measured variable. This 388 389 inaccuracy may be explained by two reasons. First, the algorithm may have found severe problems in modelling such a high number of categorical variables (presumably the addition of a third quantitative variable smoothed this model's 390 391 inaccuracy for erosion simulations). Second, the training dataset was limited. In contrast algorithms of artificial intelligence (AI) generally require many observations (Singh et al. 2016). Regarding previous applications of RF 392 algorithms tools to predict surface runoff and erosion (Wilder et al. 2021) showed that two RF models better predicted 393 the impacts of post-fire peak streamflow in small semi-arid watersheds compared to empiric methods, and these 394 algorithms helped to identify critical watershed characteristics driving the flooding risk. Moreover, Ghosh and Maiti 395 396 (2021) assessed the probability of severe erosion in sub-tropical watersheds using RF tools, showing its higher prediction accuracy compared to a logistic regression model. Furthermore, the results of the study by Mohammed et al. 397 (2020) carried out in Mediterranean semi-arid hillslopes affected by severe erosion showed the higher prediction 398 accuracy of RF algorithms compared to general linear models. RF models also performed better than other machine 399 learning techniques in predicting soil erosion in tropical plots (Tarek et al. 2023) and k-Nearest Neighbor Classifiers in 400 mapping gully erosion susceptibility in arid and semi-arid catchments (Avand et al. 2019). Past experiences of AI tools 401 used to model post-fire soil hydrology were scarce. Only Folharini et al. (2022) used RF and Support Vector Machine 402 algorithms for hydrological simulations in small burned catchments of Northern Portugal, and found a satisfactory 403 prediction accuracy in modelling soil erosion (r^2 between 0.54 and 0.68). In a pine forest in Central-Eastern Spain, 404 Zema et al. (2020) tested an Artificial Neural Network, which gave good predictions for both runoff and soil erosion 405 (NSE > 0.90).406

In this study, the prediction capacity of the MR and PLS-R models provided mixed results. In the case of runoff 407 predictions, the two models were not able to reproduce the mean and maximum values. This is a poor result since the 408 models are not able to estimate, as a minimum, the order of magnitude of changes in the runoff rates due to prescribed 409 fire application in a specific environment. Moreover, both models were inaccurate in trying to simulate every log 410 response ratio of runoff, and this limits the model transferability from one environment to another. These results 411 contrast with those achieved by Lucas-Borja et al. (2020), who reported a NSE of 0.60 (in sites burned by prescribed 412 fires) and 0.73 (in unburned soils) using MR linear equations to predict surface runoff in Mediterranean semi-arid 413 forests. In contrast, the PLS-R performed reasonably well and the MR equation was very accurate in modelling the 414 415 changes in post-fire erosion. The better prediction capacity shown by the two models for erosion simulations may be due to the addition of a third quantitative variable to the log response ratios of rainfall and infiltration used for runoff 416 modelling. The worse performance of the PLS-R model compared to the MR equation could be explained by the loss of 417 variance due to the need for the addition of non-linear terms in equation (3), which may have propagated measurement 418 419 errors in the model. In contrast, the MR model retained several categorical variables (without any errors). In the latter model, it is worth mentioning the importance of some key variables that drive the runoff and soil loss generation 420 mechanisms, such as the climate type and soil texture (for runoff and erosion) as well as the soil slope (for erosion). The 421 patterns of precipitation that turn to surface runoff change with site climate (e.g., Molinié et al. 2012; Li et al. 2022) and 422 soil texture (e.g., Cawson et al. 2012; Alcañiz et al. 2018). Climate governs rainfall erosivity (and thus an important 423 424 share of erosion), which is higher in dry climates and lower in oceanic and continental areas (e.g., Capolongo et al. 2008; Nearing et al. 2017) Soil slope is influential on the processes of soil detachment and transport (e.g., Wischmeier 425

and Smith (1978) and Lucas-Borja et al. 2020). However, in this analysis we must highlight the lack of measurements 426 in many of the studies reviewed, which did not report a key variable for runoff and generation mechanisms in burned 427 soils, such as the post-fire ground cover. Surface runoff and soil loss may result in very different rates between bare 428 soils and sites covered by plants. Vegetation intercepts rainwater, increases evapo-transpiration, reduces rainsplash 429 430 erosion, and slowdowns both overland and concentrated water flows (e.g., Shakesby and Doerr 2006; Zhang et al. 2023). This promotes the idea that this variable is essential for accurate predictions of both runoff and erosion. In other 431 432 words, the accuracy of the evaluated models may increase, if the post-fire ground cover is considered as an input variable by the algorithms or regression equations. The good prediction capacity of erosion that was found for the MR 433 model developed in this study agrees with the results of the study by Zema et al. (2022). These authors estimated runoff 434 coefficients and sediment concentrations (from which soil loss can be estimated) using two multiple-regression models 435 that adopted a limited set of input parameters related to ground cover (e.g., litter, shrub vegetation, ash, bare soil 436 percentage) and 'dummy' categorical variables. The quantitative evaluation of the prediction capacity of the models 437 gave NSE over 0.85 for runoff coefficients and 0.95 for soil losses, which are close to the values of the same index 438 calculated in this study. 439

440

441 **5. Conclusions**

442

This study has evaluated three models (a Random Forest algorithm and two Multiple-Regression and Partial Least Square Regression equations) applied to case studies selected from the international scientific literature, to predict the changes in surface runoff and soil erosion in sites treated with prescribed fire under different environmental characteristics.

The Random Forest showed a poor performance in simulating runoff, but an acceptable capacity to predict soil loss. The prediction capacity to simulate runoff shown by the Multiple-Regression and Partial Least Square Regression equations was satisfactory but not optimal, while the performance in simulating erosion was good using the Multiple-Regression equation.

The Random Forest model proposed in this study is a novelty in its application to areas treated with prescribed fire, and the potentiality of this machine learning tool for hydrological predictions deserves more research. The limited number of case studies of the modelling exercise in this study may have influenced the RF's poor performance.

The good performance of the Multiple-Regression model in simulating erosion in soils treated with prescribed fire is encouraging. Although the applicability of Multiple-Regression models in burned environments has been tested previously, their adaptation to the case studies in this study has shown how the parameters of their equations may be used for modelling purposes in areas with similar climatic and geomorphological characteristics as the experimental sites.

- Overall, considering the scarce applications of hydrological and/or erosive models in natural sites treated with prescribed fire that have been carried out on a global scale, this study helps land managers and hydrologists to select the most accurate prediction model to be adopted to control and mitigate the wildfire and hydrogeological risks in delicate environments, such as forest ecosystems.
- 463
- 464 References
- 465

- 466 Agbeshie AA, Abugre S, Atta-Darkwa T, Awuah R (2022) A review of the effects of forest fire on
- soil properties. Journal of Forestry Research 1–23
- 468 Aksoy H, Kavvas ML (2005) A review of hillslope and watershed scale erosion and sediment
- transport models. Catena 64:247–271
- 470 Alcañiz M, Outeiro L, Francos M, Úbeda X (2018) Effects of prescribed fires on soil properties: A
- review. Science of the Total Environment 613:944–957
- 472 Arcenegui V, Mataix-Solera J, Guerrero C, et al (2008) Immediate effects of wildfires on water
- repellency and aggregate stability in Mediterranean calcareous soils. Catena 74:219–226
- 474 Avand, Janizadeh, Naghibi, et al (2019) A Comparative Assessment of Random Forest and k-
- ⁴⁷⁵ Nearest Neighbor Classifiers for Gully Erosion Susceptibility Mapping. Water 11:2076.
- 476 https://doi.org/10.3390/w11102076
- 477 Beyene MT, Leibowitz SG, Dunn CJ, Bladon KD (2023) To burn or not to burn: An empirical
- assessment of the impacts of wildfires and prescribed fires on trace element concentrations in
- 479 Western US streams. Science of The Total Environment 863:160731.
- 480 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.160731
- 481 Cao X, Hu X, Han M, et al (2022) Characteristics and predictive models of hillslope erosion in
- ⁴⁸² burned areas in Xichang, China, on March 30, 2020. CATENA 217:106509.
- 483 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2022.106509
- 484 Capolongo D, Diodato N, Mannaerts Cm, et al (2008) Analyzing temporal changes in climate
- erosivity using a simplified rainfall erosivity model in Basilicata (southern Italy). Journal of
- 486 Hydrology 356:119–130
- 487 Carrà BG, Bombino G, Denisi P, et al (2021) Water Infiltration after Prescribed Fire and Soil
- 488 Mulching with Fern in Mediterranean Forests. Hydrology 8:95
- 489 Carrà BG, Bombino G, Lucas-Borja ME, et al (2022) Prescribed fire and soil mulching with fern in
- 490 Mediterranean forests: Effects on surface runoff and erosion. Ecological Engineering 176:106537
- ⁴⁹¹ Carra BG, Bombino G, Lucas-Borja ME, et al (2021) Modelling the Event-Based Hydrological
- 492 Response of Mediterranean Forests to Prescribed Fire and Soil Mulching with Fern Using the Curve
- Number, Horton and USLE-Family (Universal Soil Loss Equation) Models. Land 10:1166
- 494 Cawson JG, Nyman P, Smith HG, et al (2016) How soil temperatures during prescribed burning
- affect soil water repellency, infiltration and erosion. Geoderma 278:12–22.
- 496 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.05.002
- 497 Cawson JG, Sheridan GJ, Smith HG, Lane PNJ (2012) Surface runoff and erosion after prescribed
- ⁴⁹⁸ burning and the effect of different fire regimes in forests and shrublands: a review. International
- Journal of Wildland Fire 21:857–872

- 500 Cawson JG, Sheridan GJ, Smith HG, Lane PNJ (2013) Effects of fire severity and burn patchiness
- on hillslope-scale surface runoff, erosion and hydrologic connectivity in a prescribed burn. Forest
- 502 Ecology and Management 310:219–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.08.016
- ⁵⁰³ Certini G (2005) Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: a review. Oecologia 143:1–10
- ⁵⁰⁴ Coelho C de OA, Ferreira AJD, Boulet A-K, Keizer JJ (2004) Overland flow generation processes,
- ⁵⁰⁵ erosion yields and solute loss following different intensity fires. Quarterly Journal of Engineering
- 506 Geology and Hydrogeology 37:233–240
- 507 Cole RP, Bladon KD, Wagenbrenner JW, Coe DBR (2020) Hillslope sediment production after
- wildfire and post fire forest management in northern California. Hydrological Processes 34:5242-
- 509 5259. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13932
- 510 Curtis PS, Wang X (1998) A meta-analysis of elevated CO2 effects on woody plant mass, form, and
- 511 physiology. Oecologia 113:299–313. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050381
- de Dios Benavides-Solorio J, MacDonald LH (2005) Measurement and prediction of post-fire
- erosion at the hillslope scale, Colorado Front Range. International Journal of Wildland Fire 14:457–
 474
- de Koff JP, Graham RC, Hubbert KR, Wohlgemuth PM (2006) Prefire and postfire erosion of soil
- nutrients within a chaparral watershed: Soil Science 171:915–928.
- 517 https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ss.0000235231.02063.c2
- 518 Fernández C, Vega JA (2016) Evaluation of RUSLE and PESERA models for predicting soil
- erosion losses in the first year after wildfire in NW Spain. Geoderma 273:64–72.
- 520 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.03.016
- 521 Fernández C, Vega JA (2018) Evaluation of the rusle and disturbed wepp erosion models for
- predicting soil loss in the first year after wildfire in NW Spain. Environmental Research 165:279–
- 523 285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.04.008
- 524 Fernández C, Vega JA, Fonturbel T (2012) The effects of fuel reduction treatments on runoff,
- infiltration and erosion in two shrubland areas in the north of Spain. Journal of Environmental
- 526 Management 105:96–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.03.048
- 527 Folharini S, Vieira A, Bento-Gonçalves A, et al (2022) Soil Erosion Quantification using Machine
- Learning in Sub-Watersheds of Northern Portugal. Hydrology 10:7.
- 529 https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology10010007
- 530 Fox DM, Darboux F, Carrega P (2007) Effects of fire induced water repellency on soil aggregate
- stability, splash erosion, and saturated hydraulic conductivity for different size fractions.
- 532 Hydrological Processes: An International Journal 21:2377–2384

- 533 Ghosh A, Maiti R (2021) Soil erosion susceptibility assessment using logistic regression, decision
- tree and random forest: study on the Mayurakshi river basin of Eastern India. Environmental Earth
- 535 Sciences 80:1–16
- 536 Girona-García A, Vieira DCS, Silva J, et al (2021) Effectiveness of post-fire soil erosion mitigation
- treatments: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Earth-Science Reviews 217:103611.
- 538 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2021.103611
- 539 González-Pelayo O, Andreu V, Gimeno-García E, et al (2010) Rainfall influence on plot-scale
- runoff and soil loss from repeated burning in a Mediterranean-shrub ecosystem, Valencia, Spain.
- 541 Geomorphology 118:444–452
- 542 Gupta HV, Sorooshian S, Yapo PO (1999) Status of automatic calibration for hydrologic models:
- 543 Comparison with multilevel expert calibration. Journal of hydrologic engineering 4:135–143

544 Hedges LV, Gurevitch J, Curtis PS (1999) The meta-analysis of response ratios in experimental

- ecology. Ecology 80:1150–1156. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-
- 546 9658(1999)080[1150:TMAORR]2.0.CO;2
- 547 Hosseini M, Nunes JP, Pelayo OG, et al (2018) Developing generalized parameters for post-fire
- ⁵⁴⁸ erosion risk assessment using the revised Morgan-Morgan-Finney model: A test for north-central
- ⁵⁴⁹ Portuguese pine stands. CATENA 165:358–368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2018.02.019
- 550 Hueso-González P, Martínez-Murillo JF, Ruiz-Sinoga JD (2018) Prescribed fire impacts on soil
- ⁵⁵¹ properties, overland flow and sediment transport in a Mediterranean forest: A 5 year study. Science
- ⁵⁵² of The Total Environment 636:1480–1489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.05.004
- 553 Kalies EL, Chambers CL, Covington WW (2010) Wildlife responses to thinning and burning
- treatments in southwestern conifer forests: a meta-analysis. Forest Ecology and Management
- 555 259:333-342
- 556 Karamesouti M, Petropoulos GP, Papanikolaou ID, et al (2016) Erosion rate predictions from
- 557 PESERA and RUSLE at a Mediterranean site before and after a wildfire: Comparison &
- ⁵⁵⁸ implications. Geoderma 261:44–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.06.025
- 559 Keeley JE (2009) Fire intensity, fire severity and burn severity: a brief review and suggested usage.
- 560 International journal of wildland fire 18:116–126
- 561 Keesstra SD, Maroulis J, Argaman E, et al (2014) Effects of controlled fire on hydrology and
- ⁵⁶² erosion under simulated rainfall. Cuadernos de Investigación Geográfica 40:269–294
- 563 Klimas K, Hiesl P, Hagan D, Park D (2020) Prescribed fire effects on sediment and nutrient exports
- in forested environments: A review. J environ qual 49:793-811. https://doi.org/10.1002/jeq2.20108
- 565 Krause P, Boyle DP, Bäse F (2005) Comparison of different efficiency criteria for hydrological
- ⁵⁶⁶ model assessment. Advances in geosciences 5:89–97

- Larsen IJ, MacDonald LH (2007) Predicting postfire sediment yields at the hillslope scale: Testing
- 568 RUSLE and Disturbed WEPP: PREDICTING POSTFIRE SEDIMENT YIELDS. Water Resour
- 569 Res 43:. https://doi.org/10.1029/2006WR005560
- 570 Legates DR, McCabe Jr GJ (1999) Evaluating the use of "goodness of fit" measures in
- ⁵⁷¹ hydrologic and hydroclimatic model validation. Water resources research 35:233–241
- 572 Letey J (2001) Causes and consequences of fire induced soil water repellency. Hydrological
- 573 Processes 15:2867–2875
- Li J, Sun R, Chen L (2022) Assessing the accuracy of large-scale rainfall erosivity estimation based on climate zones and rainfall patterns. Catena 217:106508
- Liu J, Liang Y, Gao G, et al (2022) Quantifying the effects of rainfall intensity fluctuation on runoff
- and soil loss: From indicators to models. Journal of Hydrology 607:127494
- 578 Loague K, Green RE (1991) Statistical and graphical methods for evaluating solute transport
- ⁵⁷⁹ models: overview and application. Journal of contaminant hydrology 7:51–73
- Lopes AR, Girona García A, Corticeiro S, et al (2021) What is wrong with post fire soil erosion
- modelling? A meta analysis on current approaches, research gaps, and future directions. Earth
- 582 Surf Process Landforms 46:205–219. https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.5020
- Lucas-Borja ME, Bombino G, Carrà BG, et al (2020) Modeling the Soil Response to Rainstorms
- after Wildfire and Prescribed Fire in Mediterranean Forests. Climate 8:150.
- 585 https://doi.org/10.3390/cli8120150
- ⁵⁸⁶ Lucas-Borja ME, de las Heras J, Moya Navarro D, et al (2022) Short-term effects of prescribed
- 587 fires with different severity on rainsplash erosion and physico-chemical properties of surface soil in
- 588 Mediterranean forests. Journal of Environmental Management 322:116143.
- 589 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116143
- ⁵⁹⁰ Lucas-Borja ME, Plaza-Álvarez PA, Gonzalez-Romero J, et al (2019) Short-term effects of
- ⁵⁹¹ prescribed burning in Mediterranean pine plantations on surface runoff, soil erosion and water
- quality of runoff. Science of The Total Environment 674:615–622
- ⁵⁹³ Merritt WS, Letcher RA, Jakeman AJ (2003) A review of erosion and sediment transport models.
- 594 Environmental modelling & software 18:761–799
- 595 Mohammed S, Al-Ebraheem A, Holb IJ, et al (2020) Soil management effects on soil water erosion
- and runoff in central Syria—A comparative evaluation of general linear model and random forest
 regression. Water 12:2529
- ⁵⁹⁸ Molinié G, Ceresetti D, Anquetin S, et al (2012) Rainfall regime of a mountainous Mediterranean
- region: Statistical analysis at short time steps. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology
- 600 51:429-448

- Moody JA, Shakesby RA, Robichaud PR, et al (2013) Current research issues related to post-
- wildfire runoff and erosion processes. Earth-Science Reviews 122:10–37
- Morales HA, Návar J, Domínguez PA (2000) The effect of prescribed burning on surface runoff in
- a pine forest stand of Chihuahua, Mexico. Forest Ecology and Management 137:199–207.
- 605 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(99)00328-X
- Moriasi DN, Arnold JG, Van Liew MW, et al (2007) Model evaluation guidelines for systematic
- quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. Transactions of the ASABE 50:885–900
- Morris RH, Bradstock RA, Dragovich D, et al (2014) Environmental assessment of erosion
- 609 following prescribed burning in the Mount Lofty Ranges, Australia. Int J Wildland Fire 23:104.
- 610 https://doi.org/10.1071/WF13011
- Nash JE, Sutcliffe JV (1970) River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I—A
- discussion of principles. Journal of hydrology 10:282–290
- ⁶¹³ Nearing MA, Yin S, Borrelli P, Polyakov VO (2017) Rainfall erosivity: An historical review.
- 614 Catena 157:357–362
- ⁶¹⁵ Neary DG, Klopatek CC, DeBano LF, Ffolliott PF (1999) Fire effects on belowground
- sustainability: a review and synthesis. Forest ecology and management 122:51–71
- ⁶¹⁷ Pierson FB, Robichaud PR, Moffet CA, et al (2008) Soil water repellency and infiltration in coarse-
- textured soils of burned and unburned sagebrush ecosystems. CATENA 74:98–108.
- 619 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2008.03.011
- Pierson FB, Williams CJ, Kormos PR, Al-Hamdan OZ (2014) Short-Term Effects of Tree Removal
- on Infiltration, Runoff, and Erosion in Woodland-Encroached Sagebrush Steppe. Rangeland
- 622 Ecology & Management 67:522–538. https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-13-00033.1
- Prosser IP, Williams L (1998) The effect of wildfire on runoff and erosion in native Eucalyptus
- 624 forest. Hydrological processes 12:251–265
- Robichaud PR (2000) Fire effects on infiltration rates after prescribed fire in Northern Rocky
- Mountain forests, USA. Journal of Hydrology 231–232:220–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022 1694(00)00196-7
- Robichaud PR, Ashmun LE, Sims BD (2010) Post-fire treatment effectiveness for hillslope
- 629 stabilization. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station,
- 630 Ft. Collins, CO
- Rulli MC, Offeddu L, Santini M (2013) Modeling post-fire water erosion mitigation strategies.
- 632 Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 17:2323–2337. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-2323-2013

- 633 Salis M, Giudice LD, Robichaud PR, et al (2019) Coupling wildfire spread and erosion models to
- quantify post-fire erosion before and after fuel treatments. Int J Wildland Fire 28:687–703.
- 635 https://doi.org/10.1071/WF19034
- 636 Santhi C, Arnold JG, Williams JR, et al (2001) Validation of the swat model on a large rwer basin
- with point and nonpoint sources 1. JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association
 37:1169–1188
- 639 Shakesby RA (2011) Post-wildfire soil erosion in the Mediterranean: review and future research
- directions. Earth-Science Reviews 105:71–100
- 641 Shakesby RA, Bento CPM, Ferreira CSS, et al (2015) Impacts of prescribed fire on soil loss and
- soil quality: An assessment based on an experimentally-burned catchment in central Portugal.
- 643 CATENA 128:278–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2013.03.012
- 644 Shakesby RA, Doerr SH (2006) Wildfire as a hydrological and geomorphological agent. Earth-
- 645 Science Reviews 74:269–307
- 646 Singh A, Thakur N, Sharma A (2016) A review of supervised machine learning algorithms. In:
- 647 2016 3rd International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development
- 648 (INDIACom). Ieee, pp 1310–1315
- 649 Singh G, Schoonover J, Monroe K, et al (2017) Prescribed Burning and Erosion Potential in Mixed
- Hardwood Forests of Southern Illinois. Forests 8:112. https://doi.org/10.3390/f8040112
- 651 Singh J, Knapp HV, Arnold JG, Demissie M (2005) Hydrological modeling of the Iroquois river
- watershed using HSPF and SWAT 1. JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources
- 653 Association 41:343–360
- 654 Soulis KX (2018) Estimation of SCS Curve Number variation following forest fires. Hydrological
- 655 Sciences Journal 63:1332–1346. https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2018.1501482
- Tarek Z, Elshewey AM, Shohieb SM, et al (2023) Soil Erosion Status Prediction Using a Novel
- Random Forest Model Optimized by Random Search Method. Sustainability 15:7114.
- 658 https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097114
- Townsend SA, Douglas MM (2000) The effect of three fire regimes on stream water quality, water
- 660 yield and export coefficients in a tropical savanna (northern Australia). Journal of Hydrology
- 661 229:118–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00165-7
- 662 Úbeda X, Pereira P, Badía D (2018) Prescribed fires. Science of The Total Environment 637-
- 663 638:385–388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.272
- ⁶⁶⁴ Van Liew MW, Arnold JG, Garbrecht JD (2003) Hydrologic simulation on agricultural watersheds:
- 665 Choosing between two models. Transactions of the ASAE 46:1539

- ⁶⁶⁶ Van Liew MW, Garbrecht J (2003) Hydrologic simulation of the little Washita river experimental
- watershed using SWAT 1. JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association 39:413–
 426
- ⁶⁶⁹ Varela ME, Benito E, Keizer JJ (2010) Effects of wildfire and laboratory heating on soil aggregate
- stability of pine forests in Galicia: The role of lithology, soil organic matter content and water
 repellency. Catena 83:127–134
- ⁶⁷² Vega JA, Fernández C, Fonturbel T (2005) Throughfall, runoff and soil erosion after prescribed
- ⁶⁷³ burning in gorse shrubland in Galicia (NW Spain): THROUGHFALL, RUNOFF AND EROSION
- AFTER BURNING. Land Degrad Dev 16:37–51. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.643
- ⁶⁷⁵ Vieira DCS, Fernández C, Vega JA, Keizer JJ (2015) Does soil burn severity affect the post-fire
- runoff and interrill erosion response? A review based on meta-analysis of field rainfall simulation
- data. Journal of Hydrology 523:452–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.01.071
- ⁶⁷⁸ Vieira DCS, Malvar MC, Martins MAS, et al (2018a) Key factors controlling the post-fire
- hydrological and erosive response at micro-plot scale in a recently burned Mediterranean forest.
- 680 Geomorphology 319:161–173
- ⁶⁸¹ Vieira DCS, Serpa D, Nunes JPC, et al (2018b) Predicting the effectiveness of different mulching
- techniques in reducing post-fire runoff and erosion at plot scale with the RUSLE, MMF and
- PESERA models. Environmental Research 165:365–378.
- 684 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.04.029
- ⁶⁸⁵ Wagenbrenner JW, Ebel BA, Bladon KD, Kinoshita AM (2021) Post-wildfire hydrologic recovery
- in Mediterranean climates: A systematic review and case study to identify current knowledge and
- opportunities. Journal of Hydrology 126772
- ⁶⁸⁸ Wilder BA, Lancaster JT, Cafferata PH, et al (2021) An analytical solution for rapidly predicting
- 689 post fire peak streamflow for small watersheds in southern California. Hydrological Processes
- 690 35:. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13976
- 691 Willmott CJ (1982) Some comments on the evaluation of model performance. Bulletin of the
- American Meteorological Society 63:1309–1313
- ⁶⁹³ Wischmeier WH, Smith DD (1958) Rainfall energy and its relationship to soil loss. Eos,
- Transactions American Geophysical Union 39:285–291
- ⁶⁹⁵ Wischmeier WH, Smith DD (1978) Predicting rainfall erosion losses: a guide to conservation
- ⁶⁹⁶ planning. Department of Agriculture, Science and Education Administration
- ⁶⁹⁷ Zavala LM, Jordán A, Gil J, et al (2009) Intact ash and charred litter reduces susceptibility to rain
- splash erosion post-wildfire. Earth Surf Process Landforms 34:1522–1532.
- 699 https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.1837

- Zema DA, Carrà BG, Lucas-Borja ME (2022) Exploring and Modeling the Short-Term Influence of
- Soil Properties and Covers on Hydrology of Mediterranean Forests after Prescribed Fire and
- Mulching. Hydrology 9:21. https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology9020021
- Zema DA, Lucas-Borja ME, Fotia L, et al (2020) Predicting the hydrological response of a forest
- after wildfire and soil treatments using an Artificial Neural Network. Computers and Electronics in
- 705 Agriculture 170:105280
- Zhang Y, Yuan C, Chen N, Levia DF (2023) Rainfall partitioning by vegetation in China: A
- 707 quantitative synthesis. Journal of Hydrology 617:128946.
- 708 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2022.128946

710 Supplementary Information

711

Table 1SI Values of the coefficients a and b in equation 2 of the Multiple-Regression model used to predict LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) in the case studies

Variables (x and x in equation 1)	Model coefficients			
variables $(x_i \text{ and } x_j \text{ in equation } 1)$	LRR(SR)	LRR(SE)		
Intercept (a in equation 1)	-0.374	1.591		
LRR(RF)	0	1.862		
LRR(WI)	0	1.686		
LRR(SR)	0	2.064		
Climate(Continental)	-1.058	-0.819		
Climate(Oceanic)	-0.784	-0.600		
Climate(Semiarid)	0.153	-0.632		
Climate(Temperate)	2.315	-3.373		
Climate(Tropical)	0	0		
Vegetation (Shrubs)	0.983	0		
Vegetation(Trees)	0	0		
Soil burn severity(Low)	0	0		
Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	0	0		
Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	0	0		
Soil burn severity(High)	0	0		
Soil slope(< 10%)	0	-1.110		
Soil slope(11%-20%)	0	-0.783		
Soil slope(21%-30%)	0	-0.608		
Soil slope(31%-40%)	0	0.392		
Soil slope(41%-50%)	0	0.731		
Soil slope(> 50%)	0	0		
Soil texture(Sand)	-1.495	0		
Soil texture(Loam)	1.721	0		
Soil texture(Clay)	0.309	1.065		
Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.419	-0.325		
Soil texture(Sandy loam)	0.422	-0.517		
Soil texture(Silty loam)	0	0		

Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	0	0
Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	-0.482	-0.213

Variables (x, and x, in equation 1)	Model coefficients			
\mathbf{v} arradies (\mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j in equation 1)	LRR(SR)	LRR(SE)		
Intercept (a in equation 1)	0.287	0.822		
LRR(RF)	-0.036	0.025		
LRR(WI)	-0.012	-0.030		
LRR(SR)	0	0.164		
Climate(Continental)	-0.103	0.003		
Climate(Oceanic)	-0.022	0.081		
Climate(Semiarid)	-0.011	-0.062		
Climate(Temperate)	0.205	0.574		
Climate(Tropical)	-0.106	-0.168		
Vegetation(Shrubs)	0.055	0.133		
Vegetation(Trees)	-0.055	-0.133		
Soil burn severity(Low)	0.104	0.082		
Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	-0.048	-0.108		
Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	-0.145	0.012		
Soil burn severity(High)	-0.117	-0.022		
Soil slope(< 10%)	-0.002	-0.097		
Soil slope(11%-20%)	-0.048	-0.146		
Soil slope(21%-30%)	0.105	0.071		
Soil slope(31%-40%)	-0.078	0.176		
Soil slope(41%-50%)	-0.003	0.140		
Soil slope(> 50%)	-0.060	0.001		
Soil texture(Sand)	0.067	0.000		
Soil texture(Loam)	-0.004	0.001		
Soil texture(Clay)	-0.089	0.212		
Soil texture(Loamy sand)	-0.056	-0.014		
Soil texture(Sandy loam)	-0.002	-0.080		

Table 2SI Values of the coefficients a, b and c in equation 3 of the Partial Least Square Regression model used to predict LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) in the case studies

Soil texture(Silty loam)	-0.006	-0.006
Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	0.240	0.355
Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	-0.007	-0.064
LRR(RF) • LRR(WI)	0.067	0
LRR(RF) • LRR(WI)	0.492	0
LRR(RF) • LRR(SR)	-0.457	0
LRR(RF) • Climate(Continental)	-0.058	0
LRR(RF) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.027	0
LRR(RF) • Climate(Semiarid)	0.030	0
LRR(RF) • Climate(Temperate)	-9.602	0
LRR(RF) • Climate(Tropical)	-0.504	0
LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Shrubs)	0.001	0
LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Trees)	0.077	0
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Low)	0.021	0
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	0.032	0
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	-0.202	0
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(High)	0.026	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope (< 10%)	-0.441	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(11%-20%)	0.605	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(21%-30%)	0.002	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(31%-40%)	0.026	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(41%-50%)	-2.307	0
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(> 50%)	0	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Loam)	0	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Clay)	0.553	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.028	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Sandy loam)	-0.001	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Silty loam)	0.099	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture-Sandy loam + clayey loam	1.055	0
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	-5.898	0

LRR(WI) • LRR(SR)	0.046	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Continental)	-0.040	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.063	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Semiarid)	-0.026	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Temperate)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Tropical)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Vegetation(Shrubs)	-0.029	0
LRR(WI) • Vegetation(Trees)	-0.036	0
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Low)	-0.016	0
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	-0.036	0
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	-0.040	0
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(High)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope (< 10%)	-0.022	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(11%-20%)	-0.036	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(21%-30%)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(31%-40%)	0.063	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(41%-50%)	-0.040	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(> 50%)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Clay)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Loam)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Sandy loam)	-0.033	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Silty loam)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	0.000	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	-0.025	0
LRR(SR) • Climate(Continental)	0.161	0
LRR(SR) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.177	0
LRR(SR) • Climate(Semiarid)	0.170	0

Table 3SI Variable importance in predictions using equation 3 of the Partial Least Square Regression model used to predict LRR(SR) and LRR(SE) in the case studies

Variable	LRR(SR)	Variable	LRR(SE)
LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Shrubs)	2.392	LRR(SR)	3.740
Climate(Temperate)	2.271	LRR(RF) • LRR(SR)	2.697
Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	1.739	LRR(SR) • Climate(Semiarid)	2.566
Soil burn severity(Low)	1.657	LRR(RF) • Soil slope(11%-20%)	2.479
Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	1.451	LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Clay)	2.204
Soil slope(21%-30%)	1.407	Climate(Temperate)	2.000
LRR(RF) • Climate(Semiarid)	1.274	LRR(RF) • Climate(Temperate)	2.000
LRR(RF)	1.235	LRR(RF) • Climate(Continental)	1.736
Climate(Continental)	1.231	Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	1.731
LRR(RF) • Climate(Continental)	1.231	LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	1.725
Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.865	Soil slope(11%-20%)	1.609
Vegetation (Shrubs)	0.853	Vegetation(Shrubs)	1.469
Vegetation(Trees)	0.853	Vegetation(Trees)	1.469
Soil slope(11%-20%)	0.834	Soil slope(41%-50%)	1.121
Climate(Tropical)	0.769	LRR(RF) • Soil slope(41%-50%)	1.114
LRR(RF) • Climate(Tropical)	0.769	Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	1.054
LRR(RF) • Climate(Temperate)	0.755	Soil slope(31%-40%)	1.037
Soil texture(Sand)	0.667	Soil texture(Clay)	1.030

Soil texture(Clay)	0.646	LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Trees)	0.996
Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	0.643	Soil burn severity(Low)	0.929
Soil burn severity(High)	0.610	Soil texture(Sandy loam)	0.918
LRR(WI)	0.429	Climate(Tropical)	0.819
LRR(RF) • LRR(WI)	0.429	LRR(RF) • Climate(Tropical)	0.819
Soil slope(31%-40%)	0.404	LRR(WI) • LRR(SR)	0.779
Soil slope(> 50%)	0.314	Soil slope(21%-30%)	0.751
LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Trees)	0.210	LRR(RF) • Soil slope (< 10%)	0.742
Climate(Oceanic)	0.191	Soil slope(< 10%)	0.721
LRR(RF) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.191	Climate(Semiarid)	0.690
Climate(Semiarid)	0.187	LRR(WI) • LRR(SR)	0.679
Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	0.053	LRR(WI)	0.679
Soil slope(41%-50%)	0.037	LRR(WI) • Climate(Continental)	0.635
Soil texture(Sandy loam)	0.035	LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Moderate)	0.635
Soil texture(Loam)	0.025	LRR(WI) • Soil slope(41%-50%)	0.635
Soil slope(< 10%)	0.017	LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	0.622
		LRR(WI) • Vegetation(Shrubs)	0.618
		Climate(Oceanic)	0.601
		LRR(RF)	0.582
		LRR(RF) • Climate(Semiarid)	0.558
		LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	0.423
		LRR(WI) • Climate(Semiarid)	0.406

LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.382
LRR(RF) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.356
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(31%-40%)	0.349
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Low)	0.347
LRR(SR) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.324
Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	0.310
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	0.310
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Sandy loam + clayey loam)	0.310
LRR(WI) • Soil slope (< 10%)	0.301
LRR(WI) • Vegetation(Trees)	0.286
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Low to moderate)	0.286
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(11%-20%)	0.286
LRR(WI) • Climate(Oceanic)	0.238
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(31%-40%)	0.238
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(High)	0.231
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(Low)	0.225
Soil burn severity(High)	0.129
Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0.126
LRR(RF) • Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	0.082
Soil burn severity(Moderate to high)	0.082
Soil texture(Silty loam)	0.040
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Silty loam)	0.040

LRR(WI) • Climate(Continental)	0.031
Climate(Continental)	0.031
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(21%-30%)	0.023
LRR(RF) • Vegetation(Shrubs)	0.019
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Sandy loam)	0.013
Soil slope(> 50%)	0.003
Soil texture(Loam)	0.003
LRR(RF) • Soil slope(> 50%)	0.003
LRR(RF) • Soil texture(Loam)	0.003
LRR(WI) • Climate(Temperate)	0
LRR(WI) • Climate(Tropical)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil burn severity(High)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(21%-30%)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil slope(> 50%)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Clay)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Loam)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Loamy sand)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Silty clay loam)	0
LRR(WI) • Soil texture(Silty loam)	

Note: the values in bold indicate the highest values (over a limit of 0.80).