

Supplementary Material: An Ensemble Empirical Mode Decomposition, Self-Organizing Map, and Linear Genetic Programming Approach for Forecasting River Streamflow

Jonathan T. Barge and Hatim O. Sharif

LGP-1–LGP-3

Table S1. Average impact and frequency of occurrence for of input parameters of models that used LGP as a standalone application.

| Variable | Freq. of Occ. | Average Impact | Variable | Freq. of Occ. | Average Impact |
|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| P(t) | 100% | 5.817% | Q($t-1$) | 100% | 85.175% |
| P($t-1$) | 100% | 1.167% | Q($t-2$) | 100% | 40.974% |
| P($t-2$) | 20% | 0.191% | Q($t-3$) | 83% | 4.360% |
| P($t-3$) | 27% | 0.034% | Q($t-4$) | 43% | 0.863% |
| P($t-4$) | 10% | 0.000% | Q($t-5$) | 17% | 0.000% |
| P($t-5$) | 7% | 0.135% | Q($t-6$) | 7% | 0.000% |
| P($t-6$) | 0% | 0.000% | Q($t-7$) | 7% | 0.000% |
| P($t-7$) | 7% | 0.000% | Q($t-8$) | 10% | 0.000% |
| P($t-8$) | 10% | 0.000% | Q($t-9$) | 3% | 0.000% |
| P($t-9$) | 0% | 0.000% | Q($t-10$) | 3% | 0.000% |

Table S2. Variables included in LGP standalone models.

| Model | Input Variables |
|---------|--|
| GP Int. | P(t), ..., P($t-9$), Q($t-1$), ..., Q($t-10$) |
| LGP 1 | Q($t-1$), Q($t-2$), Q($t-3$) |
| LGP 1.2 | P(t), P($t-1$), P($t-2$) |
| LGP 1.3 | P(t), Q($t-1$) |
| LGP 2 | P(t), Q($t-1$), Q($t-2$) |
| LGP 1.5 | P(t), Q($t-1$), Q($t-2$), Q($t-3$) |
| LGP 3 | P(t), P($t-1$), Q($t-1$), Q($t-2$), Q($t-3$) |
| LGP 1.7 | P(t), P($t-1$), P($t-2$), Q($t-1$), Q($t-2$), Q($t-3$) |

Table S3. Statistical parameters for LGP standalone models in S2.

| Model | | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|-----------------|------------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------|------------------|
| LGP Int. | Training | 22.386 | 0.943 | 0.971 | -0.008 | 0.387 | -9.932 | 0.666 |
| | Validation | 27.886 | 0.937 | 0.968 | -0.204 | 0.401 | 17.166 | 0.666 |
| LGP 1.1 | Training | 38.261 | 0.911 | 0.955 | -0.022 | 0.485 | -3.934 | 0.477 |
| | Validation | 38.305 | 0.901 | 0.949 | 0.083 | 0.502 | -3.530 | 0.477 |
| LGP 1.2 | Training | 346.284 | 0.379 | 0.615 | -2.581 | 1.283 | -8.690 | |
| | Validation | 372.838 | 0.364 | 0.603 | -3.937 | 1.274 | 23.371 | |
| LGP 1.3 | Training | 27.033 | 0.892 | 0.944 | -0.842 | 0.535 | -13.615 | 0.361 |
| | Validation | 28.529 | 0.888 | 0.942 | -1.173 | 0.535 | 1.865 | 0.407 |
| LGP-2 | Training | 17.223 | 0.943 | 0.971 | -0.828 | 0.387 | -12.740 | 0.666 |
| | Validation | 17.118 | 0.937 | 0.968 | -0.905 | 0.401 | 0.156 | 0.666 |
| LGP 1.5 | Training | 20.154 | 0.939 | 0.969 | 0.011 | 0.403 | -8.141 | 0.638 |
| | Validation | 19.852 | 0.934 | 0.966 | 0.137 | 0.411 | 7.828 | 0.650 |
| LGP-3 | Training | 22.026 | 0.942 | 0.970 | 0.615 | 0.393 | -14.663 | 0.656 |
| | Validation | 23.360 | 0.942 | 0.970 | 0.312 | 0.386 | 3.959 | 0.691 |
| LGP 1.7 | Training | 46.788 | 0.943 | 0.971 | 3.556 | 0.390 | -3.206 | 0.886 |
| | Validation | 50.239 | 0.936 | 0.967 | 2.896 | 0.405 | 14.815 | 0.886 |

LGP-5**Table S4.** Input variables for models depicted separated Rising/Falling trends using LGP as a standalone application.

| Model | Input Variables | |
|----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| LGP-5.1 | Rising Trends | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2) |
| LGP-5.2 | Rising Trends | P(t), P(t-1), Q(t-1), Q(t-2) |
| LGP-5.3 | Falling Trends | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2) |
| LGP-5.4 | Falling Trends | P(t), P(t-1), Q(t-1), Q(t-2) |

Table S5. Statistical parameters for models depicted separated Rising/Falling trends using LGP as a standalone application as depicted in Table S4.

| Model | | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|----------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------|------------------|
| LGP-5.1 | Training | 32.230 | 0.963 | 0.981 | 1.782 | 0.295 | -11.411 | 0.766 |
| | Validation | 38.744 | 0.948 | 0.974 | -0.603 | 0.350 | -0.003 | 0.735 |
| LGP-5.2 | Training | 33.625 | 0.967 | 0.983 | 4.307 | 0.260 | -9.219 | 0.778 |
| | Validation | 43.952 | 0.959 | 0.979 | 1.385 | 0.296 | 9.016 | 0.775 |
| LGP-5.3 | Training | 13.505 | 0.970 | 0.985 | -2.721 | 0.275 | 1.946 | 0.850 |
| | Validation | 12.926 | 0.973 | 0.986 | -3.084 | 0.247 | -3.738 | 0.859 |
| LGP-5.4 | Training | 9.065 | 0.971 | 0.985 | -1.850 | 0.241 | -2.827 | 0.916 |
| | Validation | 8.511 | 0.968 | 0.984 | -1.974 | 0.236 | 1.590 | 0.907 |

Additional—Precipitation Error on LGP’s Ability to Capture Streamflow

Table S6. Input Variables for tested error in precipitation record using LGP as a standalone application.

| Model | Input Variables | |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| LGP-P _{err} | 50% Error | P(t), P(t-1), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3) |
| | 150% Error | P(t), P(t-1), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3) |

Table S7. Statistical parameters for tested error in precipitation record using LGP as a standalone application as depicted in Table S6.

| Model | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|----------------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|
| LGP-P _{err} | Training | 48.794 | 0.943 | 0.971 | 6.510 | 0.387 | -7.046 |
| | Validation | 33.720 | 0.926 | 0.962 | -2.264 | 0.434 | -0.324 |
| | Training | 18.353 | 0.943 | 0.971 | -3.011 | 0.389 | -16.410 |
| | Validation | 22.421 | 0.936 | 0.967 | 2.242 | 0.403 | 1.589 |

LGP-8

Table S8. Frequency and average impact of input variables from models using EEMD-LGP design to capture streamflow.

| Variable | Frequency | Average Impact | Variable | Frequency | Average Impact |
|------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| Q(t-1) | 100% | 91.953% | Imf 7(t-1) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Q(t-2) | 100% | 83.815% | Imf 7(t-2) | 3% | 0.126% |
| Q(t-3) | 17% | 1.705% | Imf 7(t-3) | 7% | 0.000% |
| P(t) | 73% | 0.036% | Imf 8(t-1) | 20% | 0.279% |
| P(t-1) | 7% | 0.000% | Imf 8(t-2) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 1(t-1) | 100% | 15.445% | Imf 8(t-3) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 1(t-2) | 100% | 0.712% | Imf 9(t-1) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 1(t-3) | 33% | 0.170% | Imf 9(t-2) | 3% | 0.022% |
| Imf 2(t-1) | 23% | 0.250% | Imf 9(t-3) | 7% | 0.012% |
| Imf 2(t-2) | 100% | 0.609% | Imf 10(t-1) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 2(t-3) | 43% | 0.259% | Imf 10(t-2) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 3(t-1) | 20% | 0.087% | Imf 10(t-3) | 3% | 0.000% |
| Imf 3(t-2) | 57% | 0.439% | Imf 11(t-1) | 13% | 0.053% |
| Imf 3(t-3) | 7% | 0.150% | Imf 11(t-2) | 3% | 0.000% |
| Imf 4(t-1) | 57% | 0.382% | Imf 11(t-3) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 4(t-2) | 30% | 0.207% | Imf 12(t-1) | 10% | 0.000% |
| Imf 4(t-3) | 20% | 0.360% | Imf 12(t-2) | 3% | 0.000% |
| Imf 5(t-1) | 7% | 0.109% | Imf 12(t-3) | 13% | 0.000% |
| Imf 5(t-2) | 10% | 0.000% | Res(t-1) | 17% | 0.031% |
| Imf 5(t-3) | 13% | 0.112% | Res(t-2) | 0% | 0.000% |
| Imf 6(t-1) | 3% | 0.020% | Res(t-3) | 17% | 0.000% |
| Imf 6(t-2) | 7% | 0.001% | | | |
| Imf 6(t-3) | 4% | 0.003% | | | |

Table S9. Input variables for all tested EEMD-LGP models.

| Model | Input Variables |
|------------|--|
| LGP 8.1 | P(t), P(t-1), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), *imf set 1 |
| LGP 8.2 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), *imf set 1 |
| LGP 8.3 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), *imf set 1 |
| LGP 8.4 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), Q(t-6), *imf set 1 |
| LGP 8.5 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), *imf set 3 |
| LGP 8.6 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), *imf set 3 |
| LGP 8.7 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imf set 3 |
| LGP 8.8 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imf set 4 |
| LGP 8.9 | P(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imf set 2 IMF 1(t-1), IMF 1(t-2), IMF 1(t-3), IMF 2(t-1), IMF 2(t-2), IMF 3(t-1), IMF 3(t-2), IMF 3(t-3), IMF 4(t-1), IMF 4(t-2), IMF 4(t-3), IMF 5(t-1), IMF 5(t-2), IMF 5(t-3), IMF 6(t-1), IMF 6(t-2), IMF 6(t-3), IMF 7(t-1), IMF 7(t-2), IMF 7(t-3), IMF 8(t-1), IMF 8(t-2), IMF 8(t-3), IMF 9(t-1), IMF 9(t-2), IMF 9(t-3), IMF 10(t-1), IMF 10(t-2), IMF 10(t-3), IMF 11(t-1), IMF 11(t-2), IMF 11(t-3), IMF 12(t-1), IMF 12(t-2), IMF 12(t-3), Residue(t-1), Residue(t-2), Residue(t-3) |
| *imf set 1 | *imf set 1, but only IMF 1(t-1) to IMF 4(t-3) |
| *imf set 3 | *imf set 1, but only IMF 1(t-1) to IMF 5(t-3) |
| *imf set 4 | *imf set 1, but only IMF 1(t-1) to IMF 6(t-3) |

Table S10. Statistical parameters for EEMD-LGP models depicted in Table S9.

| Model | | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|---------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------|------------------|
| LGP 8.1 | Training | 15.909 | 0.982 | 0.991 | 0.763 | 0.133 | -1.674 | 0.893 |
| | Validation | 17.463 | 0.979 | 0.989 | 1.139 | 0.234 | -0.558 | 0.886 |
| LGP 8.2 | Training | 15.295 | 0.980 | 0.990 | -1.064 | 0.230 | -4.510 | 0.882 |
| | Validation | 16.277 | 0.978 | 0.989 | -0.985 | 0.239 | -6.825 | 0.881 |
| LGP 8.3 | Training | 14.483 | 0.981 | 0.991 | 0.476 | 0.227 | -4.868 | 0.885 |
| | Validation | 14.566 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.819 | 0.227 | -6.702 | 0.883 |
| LGP 8.4 | Training | 19.440 | 0.981 | 0.990 | 0.037 | 0.227 | -3.443 | 0.885 |
| | Validation | 21.152 | 0.976 | 0.988 | 0.952 | 0.249 | -9.031 | 0.871 |
| LGP 8.5 | Training | 13.454 | 0.984 | 0.992 | -0.987 | 0.207 | -1.500 | 0.905 |
| | Validation | 14.232 | 0.981 | 0.991 | -0.449 | 0.220 | -7.653 | 0.899 |
| LGP 8.6 | Training | 16.877 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.664 | 0.230 | -4.938 | 0.883 |
| | Validation | 18.348 | 0.976 | 0.988 | 1.273 | 0.247 | -9.295 | 0.873 |
| LGP 8.7 | Training | 12.800 | 0.982 | 0.991 | 0.225 | 0.219 | -7.769 | 0.893 |
| | Validation | 13.570 | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.590 | 0.234 | -8.534 | 0.887 |
| LGP 8.8 | Training | 14.316 | 0.982 | 0.991 | 0.589 | 0.219 | -7.302 | 0.894 |
| | Validation | 15.290 | 0.978 | 0.989 | 0.886 | 0.235 | -9.209 | 0.886 |
| LGP 8.9 | Training | 19.259 | 0.982 | 0.991 | 1.200 | 0.220 | -3.755 | 0.893 |
| | Validation | 20.576 | 0.977 | 0.988 | 1.818 | 0.240 | -13.072 | 0.880 |

LGP-10**Table S11.** Output and input variables for LGP as standalone application for predicting ahead.

| Model | Time-Step | Input Variable |
|----------|-----------|---|
| LGP 10.1 | $Q(t+1)$ | $P(t), P(t-1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3)$ |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | $P(t), P(t-1), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3)$ |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | $P(t), P(t-1), Q_{pred}(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3)$ |

Table S12. Statistical parameters for LGP standalone models for predicting ahead as depicted in Table S11.

| Model | Time-Step | | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|----------|-----------|------------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------|------------------|
| LGP 10.1 | $Q(t+1)$ | Training | 40.293 | 0.811 | 0.901 | -3.463 | 0.706 | -0.0450 | 0.277 |
| | | Validation | 40.921 | 0.814 | 0.902 | -0.205 | 0.689 | 12.788 | 0.371 |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | Training | 64.614 | 0.631 | 0.794 | 0.415 | 0.989 | -4.823 | 0.084 |
| | | Validation | 63.781 | 0.619 | 0.787 | 0.533 | 0.986 | 0.321 | 0.115 |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | Training | 115.428 | 0.424 | 0.651 | 1.751 | 1.236 | -9.053 | 0.032 |
| | | Validation | 112.681 | 0.421 | 0.649 | 2.206 | 1.215 | -15.141 | 0.055 |

Table S13. Output and input variables for LGP as standalone with updated precipitation record to account for delays between actual and predicted streamflow (forecasted rainfall would need to be used).

| Model | Time-Step | Input Variables |
|----------|-----------|--|
| LGP 10.2 | $Q(t+1)$ | $P(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | $P(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | $P(t+3), Q_{pred}(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |
| | $Q(t+4)$ | $P(t+4), Q_{pred}(t+3), Q_{pred}(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |
| | $Q(t+5)$ | $P(t+5), Q_{pred}(t+4), Q_{pred}(t+3), Q_{pred}(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |
| | $Q(t+6)$ | $P(t+6), Q_{pred}(t+5), Q_{pred}(t+4), Q_{pred}(t+3), Q_{pred}(t+2), Q_{pred}(t+1), Q_{pred}(t), Q(t-1)$ |

Table S14. Statistical parameters for models described in Table S13 which used LGP as a standalone application to predict streamflow multiple time-steps ahead.

| Model | Time-Step | | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|----------|-----------|------------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------------------|
| LGP 10.2 | $Q(t+1)$ | Training | 41.603 | 0.849 | 0.921 | -1.127 | 0.633 | -5.617 | 0.428 |
| | | Validation | 41.553 | 0.830 | 0.911 | -2.624 | 0.659 | -0.737 | 0.432 |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | Training | 57.834 | 0.801 | 0.895 | -0.307 | 0.727 | 3.985 | 0.359 |
| | | Validation | 60.346 | 0.754 | 0.868 | -2.900 | 0.792 | 17.662 | 0.329 |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | Training | 64.342 | 0.779 | 0.883 | -4.433 | 0.765 | 14.674 | 0.406 |
| | | Validation | 62.845 | 0.724 | 0.854 | -8.633 | 0.839 | 62.446 | 0.348 |
| | $Q(t+4)$ | Training | 74.116 | 0.772 | 0.879 | 1.925 | 0.778 | 18.85 | 0.317 |
| | | Validation | 76.987 | 0.742 | 0.861 | -1.423 | 0.811 | 24.972 | 0.290 |
| | $Q(t+5)$ | Training | 88.018 | 0.769 | 0.877 | 1.097 | 0.784 | 11.981 | 0.325 |
| | | Validation | 93.604 | 0.736 | 0.860 | -1.833 | 0.821 | 37.554 | 0.253 |
| | $Q(t+6)$ | Training | 99.644 | 0.771 | 0.878 | 1.918 | 0.780 | 9.356 | 0.325 |
| | | Validation | 104.973 | 0.739 | 0.859 | -0.593 | 0.816 | 44.896 | 0.286 |

Table S15. Output and input variables EEMD-LGP models predicting ahead.

| Model | Time-Step | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| LGP 10.3 | $Q(t+1)$ | $P(t), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | $P(t), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | $P(t), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+4)$ | $P(t), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+3), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| $*imfs$ | | IMF 1($t-1$), IMF 1($t-2$), IMF 1($t-3$), IMF 2($t-1$), IMF 2($t-2$), IMF 2($t-3$), IMF 3($t-1$), IMF 3($t-2$), IMF 3($t-3$), IMF 4($t-1$), IMF 4($t-2$), IMF 4($t-3$), IMF 5($t-1$), IMF 5($t-2$), IMF 5($t-3$) | | | | | | |

Table S16. Statistical parameters for models described in Table S15 which used a EEMD-LGP design and the known precipitation record to predict streamflow multiple time-steps ahead.

| Model | Time-Step | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E_{per} |
|----------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---------|------------------|
| LGP 10.3 | $Q(t+1)$ Training | 23.993 | 0.964 | 0.982 | -0.682 | 0.308 | -10.986 | 0.780 |
| | Validation | 24.045 | 0.958 | 0.979 | 0.581 | 0.329 | -15.684 | 0.771 |
| | $Q(t+2)$ Training | 33.696 | 0.927 | 0.963 | -1.432 | 0.439 | -12.001 | 0.601 |
| | Validation | 33.027 | 0.923 | 0.961 | -0.269 | 0.442 | -9.817 | 0.639 |
| $Q(t+3)$ | Training | 48.708 | 0.901 | 0.949 | -1.185 | 0.512 | -11.448 | 0.539 |
| | Validation | 47.832 | 0.889 | 0.943 | 0.333 | 0.531 | -15.804 | 0.522 |
| $Q(t+4)$ | Training | 54.059 | 0.863 | 0.929 | -1.572 | 0.604 | -14.151 | 0.412 |
| | Validation | 53.799 | 0.838 | 0.915 | 0.587 | 0.643 | -21.699 | 0.368 |

Table S17. Output and input variables for EEMD-LGP models that would require forecasted precipitation.

| Model | Time-Step | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| LGP 10.4 | $Q(t+1)$ | $P(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+2)$ | $P(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+3)$ | $P(t+3), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+4)$ | $P(t+4), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+3), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+5)$ | $P(t+5), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+4), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+3), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| | $Q(t+6)$ | $P(t+6), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+5), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+4), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+3), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+2), Q_{\text{pred}}(t+1), Q_{\text{pred}}(t), Q(t-1), Q(t-2), Q(t-3), Q(t-4), Q(t-5), *imfs$ | | | | | | |
| $*imfs$ | | IMF 1($t-1$), IMF 1($t-2$), IMF 1($t-3$), IMF 2($t-1$), IMF 2($t-2$), IMF 2($t-3$), IMF 3($t-1$), IMF 3($t-2$), IMF 3($t-3$), IMF 4($t-1$), IMF 4($t-2$), IMF 4($t-3$), IMF 5($t-1$), IMF 5($t-2$), IMF 5($t-3$) | | | | | | |

Table S18. Statistical parameters for models in Table S17 which used a EEMD-LGP design to predict streamflow multiple time steps ahead while requiring forecasted precipitation data.

| Model | Time-Step | AARE | E | R | NMBE | NRMSE | %MF | E _{per} |
|----------|-----------------|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|
| LGP 10.4 | Q(<i>t</i> +1) | Training | 25.575 | 0.963 | 0.981 | -0.214 | 0.312 | -12.988 |
| | | Validation | 25.715 | 0.954 | 0.977 | 0.104 | 0.342 | -11.459 |
| | Q(<i>t</i> +2) | Training | 30.872 | 0.917 | 0.958 | -3.112 | 0.469 | -14.582 |
| | | Validation | 30.092 | 0.911 | 0.954 | -2.641 | 0.560 | -2.806 |
| | Q(<i>t</i> +3) | Training | 54.125 | 0.896 | 0.947 | -3.366 | 0.526 | -7.299 |
| | | Validation | 54.363 | 0.877 | 0.936 | -2.641 | 0.561 | -2.806 |
| | Q(<i>t</i> +4) | Training | 58.362 | 0.876 | 0.936 | -6.096 | 0.574 | -9.468 |
| | | Validation | 59.621 | 0.845 | 0.919 | -5.067 | 0.629 | 7.249 |
| | Q(<i>t</i> +5) | Training | 63.922 | 0.859 | 0.927 | -6.310 | 0.612 | -4.615 |
| | | Validation | 66.684 | 0.816 | 0.903 | -5.462 | 0.684 | -6.478 |
| | Q(<i>t</i> +6) | Training | 51.661 | 0.850 | 0.922 | -1.927 | 0.633 | 6.473 |
| | | Validation | 51.945 | 0.811 | 0.901 | -0.664 | 0.695 | -1.090 |