

Assessing the Predictive Skill of Global Climate Models for Long and Short Rains in the Greater Horn of Africa

Athanase Hafashimana

ahafashimana@aimsric.org

The African Centre of Excellence in Data Science <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5610-000X>

Mouhamadou Bamba Sylla

AIMS Research and Innovation Centre <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5566-0538>

Philibert Nsengiyumva

College of Science and Technology, University of Rwanda <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2044-4827>

Masilin Gudoshava

IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0315-9271>

Martin Kuradusenge

College of Science and Technology, University of Rwanda <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7741-8905>

Richard Kabanda

College of Business and Economic, University of Rwanda

Research Article

Keywords: Global Climate Models, Seasonal Forecasts, Short Rains, Long Rains, Machine Learning

Posted Date: September 8th, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7542175/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Assessing the Predictive Skill of Global Climate Models for Long and Short Rains in the Greater Horn of Africa

Athanase Hafashimana^{1,2*}, Mouhamadou Bamba Sylla^{2†},
Philibert Nsengiyumva^{3†}, Masilin Gudoshava^{4†},
Martin Kuradusenge⁵, Richard Kabanda⁶

^{1*}Data Science, African Centre of Excellence in Data Science,
University of Rwanda, KK 737, Kigali, P.O. Box: 4285, Rwanda.

²Climate Change Science, AIMS Research and Innovation Centre, Rue
KG590 ST 1, Kigali, P.O. Box: 6428, Rwanda.

³Electrical Engineering, College of Science and Technology, University
of Rwanda, KN 7, Kigali, P.O. Box: 3900, Rwanda.

⁴Climate Science, IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre,
Nairobi, P.O. Box: 10304-00100, Kenya.

⁵Information Systems, College of Science and Technology, University of
Rwanda, KN 7, Kigali, P.O. Box: 3900, Rwanda.

⁶Economics, College of Business and Economics, University of Rwanda,
KK 737, Kigali, P.O. Box: 4285, Rwanda.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): ahafashimana@aimsric.org;
Contributing authors: msylla@aimsric.org; p.nsengiyumva@ur.ac.rw;
Masilin.Gudoshava@igad.int; m.kuradusenge@ur.ac.rw;
r.kabanda@ur.ac.rw;

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Seasonal forecasts play a crucial role in delivering early warnings to various sectors, particularly the agricultural sector. The Greater Horn of Africa region depends on rainfed agriculture, hence the need for accurate forecasts. This study uses Global Climate Models (GCMs) and satellite precipitation observations to assess the predictability of observed precipitation by deploying traditional

machine learning algorithms and deep learning models. We compare the predictability of long and short rainy seasons in the region. The results highlight the challenges of forecasting the long rains season, with traditional machine learning algorithms showing low feature importance. In contrast, short rains can be predicted and achieved with high accuracy using both traditional machine learning models and deep learning architectures, particularly Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks. In this study, we used ten Global Climate Models as input features for seasonal climatological forecasts, with a single output feature derived from observations of the Global Precipitation Climatology Center (GPCC) over a 30-year period (1990-2019). We measured the level of explained variance of this set of GCMs. Regardless of the method, high explainable variability was achieved in short rains, and the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) was the best predictor in the region for long rains. On the other hand, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) was the most significant contributor to the predictions for short rains.

1 Introduction

Seasonal forecasting (SF) serves as valuable information for a number of climate sensitive sectors including agriculture, disaster risk management, water and health among others (Klemm & McPherson, 2017). These forecasts have been used for strategic planning by the different stakeholders. In addition, SF is used in policy and decision-making processes to inform stakeholders about predicted climate variability and change (Bruno Soares, Daly, & Dessai, 2018). It is evident that the productivity and profitability of agriculture depend on weather and SF information (Paparrizos, Atttoh, Sutanto, Snoeren, & Ludwig, 2023). Although SF plays an important role in agriculture, the interdependence of rainfall and surface temperature influences most practices, from the sowing stage to the harvest stage (J. Liu, Fu, & Liu, 2023; Talib, Ahmed, Naseer, Slusarczyk, & Popp, 2021; Zhang, Sun, Singh, & Chen, 2012). In different parts of the world, agricultural machinery such as irrigation is being used to increase agricultural productivity (Ringler, Mekonnen, Xie, & Uhunamure, 2020). This practice may be a game changer for rainfed agricultural regions, but poses a financial constraint for many African countries (Harmon, Jepson, & Lefore, 2023; Nhamo et al., 2024; Pfunzo, Bahta, & Jordaan, 2024). Therefore, SF is needed to inform both rainfed farmers and mechanized agricultural investors (Hounnou, Houessou, & Dedehouanou, 2023; Ingram, Roncoli, & Kirshen, 2002).

Although an SF is issued for different fields, including strategic planning of agricultural practices, timely data availability is a tangible asset for scientists in agrometeorological services (Bacci et al., 2023; Bacci, Ousman Baoua, & Tarchiani, 2020; Vuković Vimić et al., 2022). This availability is attributed to Global Climate Models (GCMs), which are physical representations of the interaction between land, ocean, and atmosphere to simulate a specific climate variable at each point on the grid in the world (Assamnew & Tsidu, 2020; Joshi, Gouda, & Goswami, 2020). In addition, reliable data sources are essential to generate accurate seasonal forecasts. Some of them

include the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S), which stores the output from the European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), Météorologie Nationale Française (Météo-France), Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD), Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC) (Calì Quaglia, Terzago, & von Hardenberg, 2022; Gebrechorkos, Pan, Beck, & Sheffield, 2022; Kim et al., 2021). Moreover, GCM data sets from the Columbia University International Research Institute for Climate and Society (IRI) Data Library serve to provide various outputs such as the NASA Global Earth Observing System Seasonal to Subseasonal Prediction System (NASA-GEOSS2S), Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory Seamless System for Prediction and Earth System Research (GFDL-SPEAR), Community Climate System Model Version 4 (CCSM4) (Ehsan et al., 2021; Giannini et al., 2020; Pakdaman, Babaieian, & Bouwer, 2022). Furthermore, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) has various GCMs. Some of them include the China Meteorological Administration (CMA), the Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos (CPTEC), the Korea Meteorological Administration (KMA), the Japan Meteorological Agency (JMA), in addition to those stated for the C3S and IRI data library (Reboita, Mattos, Capucin, de Souza, & de Souza Ferreira, 2024; Shu et al., 2021; Taguchi, 2018).

We make use of the availability of data and the development of predictive algorithms. When predicting a single output feature for a given single input feature, simple linear regression is useful. Considering multiple features, other linear models with regularization properties, such as ridge and Lasso regression. As we move forward, we could even train traditional machine learning algorithms that have nonlinear objective functions. These methods include Random Forest, Decision Trees, Extreme Gradient Boosting, and Support Vector Regression with nonlinear kernels (Anwar, Winarno, Hadikurniawati, & Novita, 2021; Kumar, Kedam, Sharma, Khedher, & Alluqmani, 2023; Li et al., 2023; Sattari, Feizi, Samadianfard, Falsafian, & Salwana, 2021). Despite the ability of traditional machine learning algorithms to predict climate variables, an algorithm such as support vector regression struggles with nonlinear precipitation patterns (M. Wang et al., 2024). Moreover, traditional machine learning models often require meticulous feature engineering, yet only a few methods such as gradient boosting demonstrate relatively consistent success in capturing complex climate patterns (He, Li, DelSole, Ravikumar, & Banerjee, 2020). Furthermore, these methods face the challenge of handling the high-dimensional predictor matrix in the case of many features (Lin, Fan, Hou, & Wang, 2023). These limitations have led to the adoption of deep learning architectures, such as the Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). Since climate data are sequence-based records, neural networks such as Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) are useful. This technique relies on training weights with backpropagation to achieve better results. In predicting precipitation, a few layers are needed to achieve robust seasonal forecasts. Using stacking architectures beyond two layers diminishes the predictive skill of LSTM models in forecasting seasonal precipitation (Akbar, Darmawan, Wibowo, & Rahmat, 2024; Barrera-Animas et al., 2022).

The use of machine learning and deep learning models in weather and seasonal precipitation forecasts in different parts of the world is becoming a critical idea to define robustness in this field (Basha, Bhavana, Bhavya, & Sowmya, 2020; Jin et al., 2022).

116 In the prediction process, dynamical models provide different outputs under differ-
117 ent initial conditions. The beam formulated on averaging these candidate outputs can
118 better predict signals that stand out from the noise of individual weather events. This
119 led to the evolution of hybrid-based seasonal forecasting that combines the dynamical
120 ensemble output with statistical or machine learning approaches (Fuentes-Franco,
121 Giorgi, Pavia, Graef, & Coppola, 2018; Gibson et al., 2021). These hybrid-based seasonal
122 forecasts are fueled by the existence of multi-model ensembles from different
123 originating centers. Some of them are the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S),
124 and the North American Multimodel Ensemble (NMME) (Becker, Kirtman, & Pegion,
125 2020; Manzananas et al., 2019). Although machine learning approaches are widely used,
126 climate forecasters were aware of the minimum prediction bias when comparing the
127 average of the ensemble members with the target observation. According to (Kassem,
128 Gökgekuş, Çamur, & Esenel, 2021), the coefficient of determination (R^2) outperforms
129 bias-based metrics such as the root mean square error (RMSE) and the mean absolute
130 error (MAE) when evaluating the performance of traditional machine learning
131 and deep learning models.

132 Despite the fact that the average of the ensemble members can produce better
133 prediction metrics when dealing with hybrid-based seasonal precipitation forecasting,
134 seasonal variability may be a source of low explained variance (Izadi et al., 2021). Con-
135 sidering a specific region such as the Greater Horn of Africa (GHA), there are different
136 seasons for which we can have short rains that extend from October to December
137 (OND) and long rains that extend from March to May (MAM) (Schwarzwald, God-
138 dard, Seager, Ting, & Marvel, 2023). These definitions were introduced in the early
139 2000s based on climatological studies in East African countries. The term “long rains”
140 originated in Kenya to describe rainfall during the MAM season, which typically fea-
141 tures extended periods of more intense precipitation than the short rains of OND
142 (Camberlin & Philippon, 2002), while the term “short rains” originated in Uganda to
143 describe rainfall during OND season, which features shorter duration and less intense
144 received rainfall compared to the MAM season (Mubialiwo, Onyutha, & Abebe, 2020).
145 According to (Anyah & Qiu, 2012), the seasonal variability over the Greater Horn of
146 Africa (GHA) and the climatological characteristics of precipitation indicate that the
147 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) tends to overestimate the peak of
148 the October–November–December (OND) season. However, for the March–April–May
149 (MAM) season, the models incorrectly identify May as the peak month, which does
150 not align with the observations. This shift in the maximum value during the long
151 rains of the region could introduce challenges in precipitation prediction, as the signal
152 may not align at specific grid points. Consequently, the March–April–May (MAM)
153 season has been characterized by low forecast skill, limiting its usefulness for climate
154 services and decision-making (Antonio et al., 2025; Daron et al., 2025; Deman et al.,
155 2022; Ward et al., 2023). The Greater Horn of Africa (GHA) region may also experi-
156 ence significant seasonal variability influenced by large-scale climate teleconnections,
157 particularly El Niño and La Niña events (Mpelasoka, Awange, & Zerihun, 2018). The
158 October–December (OND) season is characterized by greater interannual variability
159 compared to the March–April–May (MAM) season in the Greater Horn of Africa
160 region. This variability is strongly influenced by large-scale climate phenomena such

as the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and the Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD) (Bowden & Semazzi, 2007; MacLeod, Graham, O’Reilly, Otieno, & Todd, 2021).

The influence of ENSO on rainfall over the Greater Horn of Africa is more pronounced during the short rains than the long rains (Palmer et al., 2023). Positive phases of the IOD, particularly when coinciding with El Niño events, are associated with substantial increases in precipitation, often resulting in extreme rainfall anomalies (Funk et al., 2018; Jiang, Zhou, Roundy, Hua, & Raghavendra, 2021; Nicholson, 2015). Conversely, the long rains exhibit a weaker and less consistent response to these climate drivers, suggesting a more complex interplay of regional and global factors. These findings indicate that the short rains are more sensitive to IOD and ENSO variability, offering greater potential for seasonal predictability (Kebacho, 2022a; Vellinga & Milton, 2018). In addition, there are local drivers of the variability of long and short rains in the Greater Horn of Africa. According to (Dyer & Washington, 2021; Kebacho, 2022b; Kilavi et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2021; Vellinga & Milton, 2018), Western Indian Ocean Sea Surface Temperature (SST) anomalies enhance both long and short rains by promoting atmospheric ascent. Positive SSTs drive over 95% of short rain increases and 9–26% of long rain variability. Tropical cyclones and Congo Basin westerlies, often linked to Madden–Julian Oscillation (MJO) phases 3–4, further influence rainfall patterns. Stronger zonal and surface westerlies correlate with wetter long rains, especially over Tanzania and Lake Victoria.

Given that the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) recommended objective forecasting systems, we will use machine learning and deep learning approaches to determine which models are best suited for each season. The main objective of this study is to evaluate the performance of individual GCMs as features of prediction of the observed climatology for the MAM and OND seasons. Moreover, to determine the explained variance of the set of GCMs while predicting seasonal rainfall in the Greater Horn of Africa for the MAM and OND seasons. Furthermore, we quantify the contribution of each ensemble mean from the reporting centre to seasonal precipitation predictions, highlighting the representativeness and relative importance of individual GCMs across the seasons. In fact, we want to determine a suitable machine learning algorithm or deep learning architecture on regression tasks for a specific season over the set of predictive models considered.

2 Data and Study Area

2.1 Data

The data in Table 1 provide details about the ensemble members of a specific global climate model (GCM). The number of members in the forecast and hindcast ensemble are represented by **F_ENS** and **H_ENS** respectively. The lead time, horizontal resolution, and temporal resolution are represented by **L_T**, **H_Res**, and **T_Res** respectively. The GCMs originate from different sources. These include the International Research Institute for Climate and Society data library at Columbia University abbreviated as (IRI DL) and the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S). In the representation of GCM, all members contributed in the ensemble average. The GCMs were regridded with the observed data, Global Precipitation Climatology Center (GPCC), with

a resolution of $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$. According to (Devadarshini et al., 2024; Hartmann, 2025),
 regriding is always necessary for the actual matching of the grid points of two or
 more GCMs to be compared to the observed target precipitation reporting centre.

Table 1: Summary of the data used

Source	GCM	F_Ens	H_Ens	L_T	H_Res	T_Res
C3S	ECMWF	51	25	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
IRI DL	NASA	10	4	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
C3S	Météo France	51	25	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
IRI DL	GFDL_SPEAR	30	15	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
C3S	DWD	50	30	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
IRI DL	ColaCCSM4	10	10	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
C3S	CMCC	50	40	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
IRI DL	CanSIPS-IC4	40	40	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
C3S	NCEP	28	24	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
C3S	ECCC	21	10	3	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	Monthly
Source	Observation	-	-	-	-	-
C3S	GPCC	-	-	-	$0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$	Monthly

2.2 Study Area

Greater Horn of Africa is the region located in the eastern and some central parts of Africa. It is situated between $20^\circ E - 52^\circ E$ longitudes and $13.5^\circ S - 25^\circ N$ latitudes. It comprises 11 countries, such as Burundi, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Tanzania, South Sudan, Sudan, and Uganda. Most countries in the region are tropical and may experience heavy rains during their respective long rains. In addition, a country like Sudan that is part of the Sahel region can face the effect of the Sahara desert, such as limited moisture and humidity that leads to a very small amount of rainfall received compared to other countries that are not directly exposed (Mohamed, Maharana, Phartyal, & Dimri, 2024).

Taking into account the entire year, the percentage contribution of the MAM season appears to be the main contributor, followed by the OND, to the total annual rainfall received in the region (Misiani et al., 2025). The spatial signal may differ in amount and intensity due to various factors, such as topography. Some places may receive orographic rainfall; that cannot be the case in the lowlands (Basist, Bell, & Meentemeyer, 1994; Oettli & Camberlin, 2005; Shetty, Umesh, & Shetty, 2022). Moreover, the availability of large water bodies may cause the difference. If the region is directly exposed to the lake or ocean, it is expected to have a different rainfall pattern from arid areas such as the various parts of Sudan (Agbasi et al., 2023; Ibebuchi & Abu, 2023). Furthermore, vegetation cover in a specific region can influence the amount of rainfall received and is generally involved in the entire water cycle, mainly transpiration as part of the process (Jingyong, Wenjie, Congbin, & Lingyun, 2003). The veracity of both the water bodies and the vegetation cover can lead to an analysis

230 of received rainfall and evapotranspiration in the water cycle of the region (Kirchner
 231 & Allen, 2020). In the following **Figure 1**, we have a spatial representation of the
 232 countries that we designed using geographical boundaries in the shapefile of the region.




Fig. 1: Member countries of GHA

233

234 3 Study Setup and Methods

235 3.1 Conceptual Framework and Specification of the Setup

236 In this section, we explain the general setup of our experiment based on the stan-
 237 dard functional relationship between GCMs and satellite observations for the OND
 238 and MAM seasons. In fact, the theoretical framework for this study is based on the
 239 evaluation of the effect of GCM on the observed seasonal average of the total precip-
 240 itation rate through the relationship between GCMs, as independent variables, and
 241 the observed precipitation values of GPCC, as a dependent variable. Each predictive
 242 model is trained on 10 different input features. All features originate from the same
 243 forecasting centres throughout the two seasons detailed in Table 1. Spatial distribution
 244 of grid values for the input and output features is presented in the Figures 2 and 3.




Fig. 2: Grid values of GCMs considered as features of the OND season in (a) and observed values from GPCC in (b).




Fig. 3: Grid values of GCMs considered as features of the MAM season in (a) and observed values from GPCC in (b).

245 Figures 2 and 3 show the seasonal precipitation forecasts from GCMs as predictors
 246 of the observed short and long rains respectively. These features are the spatial dis-
 247 tribution of the precipitation rate values from the ensemble mean of all individual
 248 initializations from the respective reporting centers. This setup is inspired by three
 249 main ideas. Firstly, an established principle in forecasting asserts that a forecast is
 250 incomplete without an accompanying assessment of its skill. This idea comes from
 251 Henk Tennekes, who was a Dutch meteorologist. It underpinned the concept of fore-
 252 cast accuracy discussed by (Kalnay & Dalcher, 1987). Moreover, the growing literature
 253 describes the practice of combining forecasts, and their ensemble improves the accu-
 254 racy of the forecast (Sheikh & Coulibaly, 2024). Furthermore, recent
 255 advancements in applied machine learning have shown promise in enhancing seasonal
 256 forecast performance. This is evident in hybrid seasonal forecasting, which combines
 257 dynamical ensemble outputs with machine learning to enhance accuracy and reliabil-
 258 ity (Ahmadi, Aminnejad, & Sabatsany, 2023; He, Li, DelSole, Ravikumar, & Banerjee,
 259 2021; Qian, Jia, Lin, & Zhang, 2021).

3.2 Methods

Let X be a rectangular matrix of shape (n, d) where n is the number of grid points and d is the number of predictors. Let y be a vector of shape $(n, 1)$ that has the target precipitation values. Let w be a vector of shape $(d, 1)$ containing the weights of the individual features in X . In this case, X is the matrix of various GCMs described in Table 1, while y is the vector for GPCC containing the observed precipitation values.

3.2.1 Regression Methods

• Linear Regression (LR)

Linear regression, introduced in the early 19th century through the least squares method and first applied to astronomical problems, became a fundamental tool in statistical modeling due to its interpretability and the computational challenges of non-linear modeling. It predicts quantitative outcomes by capturing the linear relationship between predictors and a response variable (James, Witten, Hastie, & Tibshirani, 2013). In ordinary least-squares linear regression, we find the value of w that minimizes the following term:

$$\min \|Xw - y\|^2 \quad (1)$$

The goal of linear regression is to minimize the squared difference between the predictions of the linear model (Xw) and the truth (y). The prediction Xw is obtained by multiplying each predictor by its associated weight and summing of these products. The assumptions and derivations of the solution to this method are the basis of these formulations (Huang, 2018).

• Ridge Regression (RidgeR): (L2 Regularization)

Ridge regression is a linear regression method that mitigates multicollinearity of predictive feature by adding an L2 penalty to shrink the coefficients of correlated predictors (Dar, Chand, Shabbir, & Kibria, 2023; Dar et al., 2023). As seen in Equation (1), with large weights, a small change in one of the predictors will lead to a large change in the forecast. Therefore, we amend linear regression to penalize large weights:

$$\min_w \|Xw - y\|_2^2 + \alpha \|w\|_2^2 \quad (2)$$

The term $\alpha > 0$ is a regularization parameter. This regularized form of linear regression is often used to prevent overfitting with additional advantages such as numerical stability, and model complexity control power (Hoerl & Kennard, 1970).

• Lasso Regression (L1 Regularization)

Lasso regression excels in handling high-dimensional datasets and performing feature selection, making it a fundamental method in supervised learning for regression modeling (Y. Wang, Zou, Xu, Xu, & Tang, 2025). It is an alternative to ridge regression introduced in Equation (2), which applies L1 regularization instead of L2:

$$\min_w \|Xw - y\|_2^2 + \lambda \|w\|_1 \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter and $\|w\|_1$ is the L1 norm of the weight vector. Lasso regression encourages sparsity, which means that some of the weights may become exactly zero, leading to feature selection. Unlike ridge regression, Lasso regression is sparse which has additional benefit in terms of computational efficiency, interpretability and model generalization (Tibshirani, 1996).

• Decision Tree Regression (DT)

Decision tree regression is a non-linear supervised method that predicts continuous targets by partitioning the feature space, and it captures complex relationships without assuming any specific data distribution while remaining highly interpretable (Blokkeel, Devos, Frénay, Nanfack, & Nijssen, 2023; Mienye & Jere, 2024). Given a data set $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, the decision tree splits the data to minimize variance within each region Breiman, Friedman, Olshen, and Stone (2017). The regression estimator is as follows:

$$\hat{f}(X) = \hat{y} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \right) I_R(X) \quad (4)$$

where R is the sample space (the region containing all input feature vectors X) and $I_R(X)$ is the indicator function for the region R , which equals 1 if $X \in R$ and 0 otherwise. This means that within the region R , we approximate the response by the average of all y_i values whose corresponding inputs fall within R . Initially, R is the entire input space, which we assume to be a rectangular region in the feature space. If X_i is a continuous variable, we choose a real number a as a threshold value and divide R into two subregions:

$$R_1 = \{x \in R : x_j \leq a\}, \quad R_2 = \{x \in R : x_j > a\} \quad (5)$$

In this case, R_1 consists of all input vectors for which the value of the i -th feature is less than or equal to a , and R_2 consists of those for which it is greater than a . This splitting process is repeated recursively to grow the tree, with the goal of minimizing the prediction error.

The division of R into R_1 and R_2 is chosen so that the sum of squared residuals of the estimator $\hat{f}$ is minimized. The sum of squared residuals to be minimized is defined below.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{f}(X_i))^2 \quad (6)$$

Stopping criteria include maximum depth and minimum samples per region, while pruning helps prevent overfitting (Miftachov & Reiß, 2025).

• Random Forest Regression (RF)

The Random Forests algorithm is an ensemble learning method that constructs multiple decision trees to enhance predictive accuracy and control overfitting and

333 amplify the importance of features (Breiman, 2001; Cutler, Cutler, & Stevens, 2012).
 334 Random forest regression combines predictions in trees formulated in Equation (4):

$$\hat{y} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_t(X) \quad (7)$$

335 where T is the number of trees and $f_t(X)$ is the prediction of each tree in the forest.

336 • **Support Vector Regression (SVR)**

337

338 SVR is a regression technique that is based on a constrained optimization problem.
 339 It minimizes the complexity of the model while tolerating small deviations within
 340 the tolerance margin ϵ of the actual values. This ϵ is an insensitive loss function.
 341 The optimization process disregards errors that fall within the margin of ϵ (Vapnik,
 342 Golowich, & Smola, 1996). The optimization problem is given below:

$$\min_{w, b, \xi_i, \xi_i^*} \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N (\xi_i + \xi_i^*) \quad (8)$$

343 subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i - (w^T \phi(x_i) + b) &\leq \epsilon + \xi_i \\ (w^T \phi(x_i) + b) - y_i &\leq \epsilon + \xi_i^* \\ \xi_i, \xi_i^* &\geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned}$$

344 Where $\phi(x_i)$ is a mapping to a high dimensional space, w is the weight vector, b is
 345 the bias term, ξ_i, ξ_i^* are slack variables that allow deviations beyond ϵ while C is a
 346 regularization parameter.

347 • **XGBoost Regression (XGBR)**

348

349 XGBoost is a tree ensemble model with regularization mechanisms. It can effectively
 350 maximize and sparsify data sets by determining optimal default paths (Chen &
 351 Guestrin, 2016). The following is the objective function:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n l(y_i, \hat{y}_i) + \sum_k \Omega(f_k) \quad (9)$$

352 where $l(y_i, \hat{y}_i)$ is a loss function and $\Omega(f_k)$ is a regularization term for the complexity
 353 of the tree. This regularization term can be written in detail in the following relation.

$$\Omega(f) = \gamma T + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|w\|_2^2$$

354 where T is the number of leaves, γ controls the complexity of the tree, λ is an L2
 355 regularization parameter.

356 • **K-Nearest Neighbors Regression (KNN)**

357

358 KNN regression predicts the target value based on the average of the nearest neigh-
 359 bors k in the feature space using a distance function. The distance function and
 360 weighting methods may differ and lead to a different effectiveness (Cheng & Lin,
 361 1981; Watson, 1964). In traditional K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) regression, all K
 362 nearest neighbors have an equal influence on the predicted value. However, closer
 363 neighbors typically offer more valuable information. Distance-weighted KNN regres-
 364 sion improves this approach by giving greater weight to nearer neighbors, making
 365 predictions more accurate. In the following formulation, we define distance-weighted
 366 KNN using inverse distance weighting (IDW). The predicted value $\hat{y}$ is given by:

$$\hat{y} = \frac{\sum_{x_i \in N_K(x)} w_i y_i}{\sum_{x_i \in N_K(x)} w_i} \quad (10)$$

367 where $N_K(x)$ is a set of K closest neighbors of x , w_i is the weight assigned to
 368 neighbor x_i , y_i is the observed value for neighbor x_i . These assigned weights can be
 369 generalized in the following equation:

$$w_i = \frac{1}{(d(x, x_i) + \epsilon)^p}$$

370 where $d(x, x_i)$ is the distance between x and x_i , ϵ is a small positive constant to
 371 avoid division by zero, and p is a power parameter that controls how rapidly weights
 372 decay with distance. If $p = 0$, the method reduces to simple averaging (standard
 373 KNN regression), $p = 1$, we obtain a standard inverse distance weighting, while
 374 $p > 1$, weights decay more quickly, emphasizing only very close neighbors.

375 • **Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)**

376
 377 Given that seasonal rainfall forecasts are sequential data, LSTM handles long-range
 378 time series data by using memory structures to manage extended information and
 379 solve nonlinear time series problems (Xhabafti, Vika, & Sinaj, 2024). The advantage
 380 of LSTM is the memory cell which helps to overcome the problem of vanishing
 381 gradients by allowing important data to persist over multiple time steps (Hochreiter
 382 & Schmidhuber, 1997; Noh, 2021). To define how this memory cell works leading to
 383 the formation of LSTM, the cell is obtained after defining the input gate, the forget
 384 gate, and the output gate. The work in (Van Houdt, Mosquera, & Nápoles, 2020)
 385 derives the LSTM and how it can be trained. It assumes a network made up of N
 386 processing blocks and M inputs with two activation functions, such as the sigmoid
 387 and hyperbolic functions. The sigmoid activation function is defined below:

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{1-x}} \quad (11)$$

388 The hyperbolic tangent function is used as the block input and output activation
 389 function:

$$g(x) = \tanh(x) \quad (12)$$

390 The forward pass in this recurrent neural system is described below.

391 1. **Block input:** We start from this step. The input component of the block, which
 392 combines the current input $x^{(t)}$ and the output of this LSTM unit $y^{(t-1)}$ in the
 393 last iteration:

$$z^{(t)} = g(W_z x^{(t)} + R_z y^{(t-1)} + b_z) \quad (13)$$

394 where W_z and R_z are the weights associated with $x^{(t)}$ and $y^{(t-1)}$, respectively,
 395 while b_z stands for the bias weight vector.

396 2. **Input gate:** In this step, we update the input gate that combines the current
 397 input $x^{(t)}$, the output of the LSTM unit $y^{(t-1)}$, and the cell value $c^{(t-1)}$ in the
 398 last iteration. The following equation represents this procedure:

$$i^{(t)} = \sigma(W_i x^{(t)} + R_i y^{(t-1)} + p_i \odot c^{(t-1)} + b_i) \quad (14)$$

399 where $\odot$ denotes point-wise multiplication of two vectors, and W_i , R_i , and p_i
 400 are the weights associated with $x^{(t)}$, $y^{(t-1)}$, and $c^{(t-1)}$, respectively, while b_i
 401 represents the bias vector associated with this component.

402 In the previous steps, the LSTM layer determines which information should be
 403 retained in the cell states of the network $c^{(t)}$. This includes selecting the candidate
 404 values $z^{(t)}$ that could potentially be added to the cell states and the activation
 405 values $i^{(t)}$ of the input gates.

406 3. **Forget gate:** In this step, the LSTM unit determines which information should
 407 be removed from its previous cell states $c^{(t-1)}$. The activation values $f^{(t)}$ of the
 408 forget gates at time step t are calculated based on the current input $x^{(t)}$, the
 409 outputs $y^{(t-1)}$, and the state $c^{(t-1)}$ of the memory cells at the previous time step
 410 $(t-1)$, along with the peephole connections and the bias terms b_f of the forget
 411 gates. This is illustrated below:

$$f^{(t)} = \sigma(W_f x^{(t)} + R_f y^{(t-1)} + p_f \odot c^{(t-1)} + b_f) \quad (15)$$

412 where W_f , R_f , and p_f are the weights for $x^{(t)}$, $y^{(t-1)}$, and $c^{(t-1)}$, respectively,
 413 while b_f is bias weight vector.

414 4. **Memory Cell:** This step calculates the cell value by integrating the input of
 415 the block $z^{(t)}$, the input gate $i^{(t)}$, and the values of the forget gate, along with
 416 the value of the previous cell. The computation is shown below:

$$c^{(t)} = z^{(t)} \odot i^{(t)} + c^{(t-1)} \odot f^{(t)} \quad (16)$$

417 where $z^{(t)}$ is the block input, $i^{(t)}$ is the input gate, and $f^{(t)}$ is the forget gate.

418 5. **Output gate:** This is determined by combining the current input $x^{(t)}$, the pre-
 419 vious LSTM output $y^{(t-1)}$ and the cell value from the last iteration $c^{(t-1)}$. It is
 420 described below:

$$o^{(t)} = \sigma(W_o x^{(t)} + R_o y^{(t-1)} + p_o \odot c^{(t)} + b_o) \quad (17)$$

421 where W_o , R_o , and p_o are the weights associated with $x^{(t)}$, $y^{(t-1)}$, and $c^{(t)}$,
 422 respectively, while b_o denotes the bias weight vector.

423 6. **Block output:** It is finally computed by combining values of the current cell
 424 $c^{(t)}$ with the current output gate $o^{(t)}$:

$$y^{(t)} = g(c^{(t)}) \odot o^{(t)} \quad (18)$$

425 where $g(c^{(t)})$ is the activation function applied to the cell state.

426 • **Bidirectional LSTM (BiLSTM)**

427
 428 According to (Fan, Tang, Guo, & Wei, 2024; Hoseini & Notash, 2025), bidirectional
 429 Long Short-Term Memory (BiLSTM) networks are deep learning architectures that
 430 extend traditional LSTMs by processing data in both forward and backward direc-
 431 tions, capturing contextual information from past and future time steps. This
 432 bidirectional processing improves the model's ability to understand complex tempo-
 433 ral patterns, making BiLSTMs particularly effective for time series forecasting. The
 434 flowchart and equations for standard LSTM, based on the forward pass of infor-
 435 mation, have been established. Building on this, BiLSTM processes sequences in
 436 both forward and backward directions, capturing dependencies from past and future
 437 inputs. The work of (Schuster & Paliwal, 1997) illustrated the mathematical deriva-
 438 tions underlying BiLSTM, providing a formal representation of this bidirectional
 439 information flow.

440 1. **Forward LSTM (Processing from 1 to N):**

$$\begin{aligned} \overrightarrow{z}^{(t)} &= \tanh(W_z x^{(t)} + R_z \overrightarrow{y}^{(t-1)} + b_z) \\ \overrightarrow{i}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_i x^{(t)} + R_i \overrightarrow{y}^{(t-1)} + p_i \odot \overrightarrow{c}^{(t-1)} + b_i) \\ \overrightarrow{f}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_f x^{(t)} + R_f \overrightarrow{y}^{(t-1)} + p_f \odot \overrightarrow{c}^{(t-1)} + b_f) \\ \overrightarrow{c}^{(t)} &= \overrightarrow{z}^{(t)} \odot \overrightarrow{i}^{(t)} + \overrightarrow{c}^{(t-1)} \odot \overrightarrow{f}^{(t)} \\ \overrightarrow{o}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_o x^{(t)} + R_o \overrightarrow{y}^{(t-1)} + p_o \odot \overrightarrow{c}^{(t)} + b_o) \\ \overrightarrow{y}^{(t)} &= \tanh(\overrightarrow{c}^{(t)}) \odot \overrightarrow{o}^{(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

441 2. **Backward LSTM (Processing from N to 1):**

$$\begin{aligned} \overleftarrow{z}^{(t)} &= \tanh(W_z x^{(t)} + R_z \overleftarrow{y}^{(t+1)} + b_z) \\ \overleftarrow{i}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_i x^{(t)} + R_i \overleftarrow{y}^{(t+1)} + p_i \odot \overleftarrow{c}^{(t+1)} + b_i) \\ \overleftarrow{f}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_f x^{(t)} + R_f \overleftarrow{y}^{(t+1)} + p_f \odot \overleftarrow{c}^{(t+1)} + b_f) \\ \overleftarrow{c}^{(t)} &= \overleftarrow{z}^{(t)} \odot \overleftarrow{i}^{(t)} + \overleftarrow{c}^{(t+1)} \odot \overleftarrow{f}^{(t)} \\ \overleftarrow{o}^{(t)} &= \sigma(W_o x^{(t)} + R_o \overleftarrow{y}^{(t+1)} + p_o \odot \overleftarrow{c}^{(t)} + b_o) \end{aligned}$$

$$\overleftarrow{y}^{(t)} = \tanh(\overleftarrow{c}^{(t)}) \odot \overleftarrow{o}^{(t)} \quad (20)$$

3. Final BiLSTM Output:

The output at each time step t is the concatenation of forward and backward hidden states. This is given by the following relation, where $\oplus$ denotes the concatenation of the outputs in Equations 19 and 20.

$$y^{(t)} = \overrightarrow{y}^{(t)} \oplus \overleftarrow{y}^{(t)} \quad (21)$$

• Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KAN)

Kolmogorov-Arnold networks (KAN) are a type of neural network based on the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem, which states that any multivariate continuous function can be written as the sum of continuous functions of a single variable. This concept was developed by Andrey Kolmogorov and Vladimir Arnold. Unlike MLPs, which use fixed activation functions at the nodes (neurons), KANs apply learnable activation functions to the edges (weights) (Z. Liu et al., 2024). These are learnable spline-based functions instead of fixed activation functions. This approach enables more flexible and interpretable representations of high-dimensional functions (Somvanshi, Javed, Islam, Pandit, & Das, 2024). The KAN foundation theorem states that any continuous multivariable function can be expressed as a finite superposition of continuous univariate functions $f(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$. The mathematical formulation is described below.

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \phi_q \left(\sum_{p=1}^n \varphi_{q,p}(x_p) \right) \quad (22)$$

where $\phi_q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_{q,p} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous univariate functions, the inner sum $\sum_{p=1}^n \varphi_{q,p}(x_p)$ represents the transformation of individual input variables x_p through the function $\varphi_{q,p}$, which maps each x_p into a new space, and the outer sum $\sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \phi_q$ then combines these transformed inputs to approximate the target function $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

3.2.2 Metrics

• Bias and Explainable Variability

There are various evaluation metrics for regression tasks. In this study, we are using bias quantification metrics such as the root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE). On the other hand, we quantified the goodness of fit using the determination coefficient R^2 , which indicates how much of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables (Chicco, Warrens,

473 & Jurman, 2021).

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2} \quad (23)$$

$$MAE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \quad (24)$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (25)$$

474 From equations (23), (24) and (25), y_i represents the actual values; $\hat{y}_i$ for the
 475 predicted values; $\bar{y}$ for the mean of the actual values; while N is the number of
 476 observations.

477 • Feature Importance

478 In this study, we are using values of **SHAP** (SHapley Additive exPlanations). SHAP
 479 assigns each characteristic an importance value for a particular prediction to mea-
 480 sure the importance of specific features in observed predictions for local and global
 481 attributions. This method is an unbiased method to estimate the importance of fea-
 482 tures in regression and classification tasks (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). This method
 483 requires retraining the model on all subsets of features $S \subseteq F$, where F represents
 484 the entire set of features. The importance assigned to each feature reflects its effect
 485 on the prediction of the model. If $f_{S \cup \{i\}}$ is a model that includes the feature and f_S
 486 is a model that excludes the feature, the contribution of the feature i is computed as:

$$f_{S \cup \{i\}}(x_{S \cup \{i\}}) - f_S(x_S) \quad (26)$$

487 where x_S represents the values of the features in S . Since this effect depends on inter-
 488 actions with other features, it is calculated for all possible subsets $S \subseteq F \setminus \{i\}$. We
 489 are using mean absolute **SHAP** values to quantify the importance of global features.
 490 Shapley values are computed as a weighted average of all possible contributions:

$$\phi_i = \sum_{S \subseteq F \setminus \{i\}} \frac{|S|!(|F| - |S| - 1)!}{|F|!} [f_{S \cup \{i\}}(x_{S \cup \{i\}}) - f_S(x_S)] \quad (27)$$

491 This formulation ensures a fair distribution of the importance of features by
 492 considering all possible feature interactions (Anoye & Alatinga, 2024)

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Bias and Explainable Variability in Classical Machine Learning Algorithms

This section presents the evaluation of linear and nonlinear models for seasonal rainfall prediction.




Fig. 4: RMSE, MAE, R², and deviations for OND (a) and MAM (b) seasons.




Fig. 5: Goodness of fit comparison for the OND and the MAM seasons across machine learning algorithms

Figures 4 and 5 show the results of the three linear models, such as linear regression (LR) and its two regularized extensions, which penalize the model for learning the large feature weights. These models scored similarly in terms of bias and coefficient of determination (R²). We also deployed nonlinear models on the data set, and

502 results are reported in a contrasting manner for the seasons. Nonlinear models outper-
 503 formed linear models during the OND season, attaining a goodness of fit above 89%.
 504 Among these, the random forest model achieved the highest performance, with a 96.7%
 505 mean cross-validated explainable variability over 10 folds and the lowest error metrics
 506 (RMSE and MAE). These results highlight the superiority of nonlinear approaches
 507 for OND season prediction. The values in CV_RMSE & CV_MAE represent cross-
 508 validated $RMSE$ and MAE . Moreover, std_RMSE , std_MAE , and std_R^2 , represent
 509 the standard deviations of mean cross-validated RMSE, MAE, and R^2 , respectively.

510 In contrast, both models performed poorly on MAM season, but linear were slightly
 511 better. These results suggest that classical machine learning algorithms can perform
 512 well during the OND season but struggle when applied to the data for the MAM
 513 season. This highlights the complexity of modeling rainfall during the MAM season in
 514 the region.

515 4.2 Sample Predictions of Random Forest and Their Feature 516 Importance Compared to Linear Model Weights (OND)

517 The Random Forest outperformed other traditional machine learning algorithms in
 518 predicting the seasonal rainfall of OND. The results presented in Figure 6 describe the
 519 learnable weights of the features in multiple regression tasks. Fortunately, the impor-
 520 tance of each feature in random forests is amplified, which is not the case for linear
 521 models. In both linear and ridge regression, half of the features exhibited negative coef-
 522 ficients, while the remaining half had positive coefficients. In contrast, Lasso regression
 523 identified only four weighted features, three with positive coefficients and one with a
 524 negative coefficient. The results of Lasso stressed the feature selection capability as
 525 discussed by (Heilemann et al., 2024; Song & Zhang, 2024).




Fig. 6: Random Forest predictions for OND (a) with feature importance, and linear model predictions (b) with feature weights.

526 Irrespective of the specific variant, linear models consistently allocate larger abso-
 527 lute weights to predictors compared to tree-based models, such as random forest, and

528 this disparity is rooted in the underlying mathematical structure of linear estima-
 529 tors, including Lasso and ridge regression. These formulations introduce regularization
 530 terms to penalize large feature weights, thereby constraining the model and improving
 531 generalization while reducing overfitting. These weights do not necessarily indicate fea-
 532 ture importance. Feature importance is assessed by generating predictions excluding
 533 the target feature and evaluating its attribution through all possible global interactions
 534 involving that feature.

535 4.3 Feature Importance

536 The contribution of features to prediction is season-specific. Figure 7 displays the
 537 importance of features, calculated using mean absolute **SHAP** values. For the OND
 538 season, the feature importance magnitudes are high overall, reflecting the substantial
 539 weights contributing to the model predictions.





Fig. 7: Feature importance for OND (a) and MAM (b)

540 Given that the features are ordered in descending order of importance, NASA is
 541 the best predictor of the region among the global circulation models (GCMs) con-
 542 sidered for OND. Moreover, ECMWF is the major contributing feature in the model

543 predictions for MAM. The least contributing feature for the OND season is Météo
 544 France, whereas for the MAM season, it is ECCC. The level of explainability influ-
 545 ences the mean absolute SHAP values since the importance in OND is of a higher
 546 amplitude compared to that of the MAM season. This is evident, as classical machine
 547 learning algorithms performed poorly on the MAM season during this experiment. In
 548 summary, ECMWF and NASA consistently appear among the top three contribut-
 549 ing features in predictions regardless of the season. Furthermore, ECCC, NCEP, and
 550 DWD consistently rank among the four least contributing features across all seasons.

551 4.4 Features Percentage Contribution in Predicted Values

552 The contribution of GCMs varies with the seasons. Figure 8 shows the percentage
 553 contributions for OND (a) and MAM (b), respectively. These results describe the
 554 situation of simulating various precipitations over time. The fact that the GCM is
 555 critically dominant in one season does not necessarily mean that it will hold this record
 556 for the other seasons.



557 **Fig. 8:** Feature percentage contributions for OND (a) and MAM (b).

558 The percentage contribution across the seasons is compared, and the results show
 559 that NASA has taken a lead of about 56.9%, which is greater than the remaining por-
 560 tions of the 9 GCMs considered in MAM. This is not closer to an even contribution
 561 of individual predictors. In contrast, ECMWF is the leading GCM for OND, account-
 562 ing for 21.4% of the total contribution, while the remaining nine GCMs share the
 563 other 78.6%. This distribution crucially highlights the close agreement among GCMs
 564 used for the OND season in predicting observed rainfall over GHA. It underscores the
 565 value of multi-model ensemble approaches in capturing regional precipitation patterns
 566 accurately.

567 ECMWF, NASA, Météo France, and GFDL_SPEAR account for over 53.44% of the
 total percentage contributions in MAM. In OND, ECMWF, NASA, CanSipsIC4, and

GFDL_SPEAR together contribute 80.02%. ECMWF and NASA consistently appear among the top three performing GCMs across the seasons.

4.5 Bias and Explainable Variability in Deployed Deep Learning Architectures

The predictions of deep learning models are season-specific. Figure 9 shows the level of biases and explained variability in the training of LSTM, BiLSTM, and KAN in the OND and MAM seasons. We trained a one-layer model LSTM on unscaled data (1L_Unscaled_LSTM), and the rest of the architectures were all trained on scaled data.




Fig. 9: Comparison of RMSE, MAE, and R^2 for deep learning architectures in OND (a) and MAM (b).

The performance of LSTM architectures is excellent in both seasons. The best architecture for OND is the 1L_Scaled_LSTM, a model with one hidden layer trained on scaled data, achieving a coefficient of determination of 99.97%, an MAE of 0.0024, and an RMSE of 0.0026. It is worth noting that the scaler that maps data values between 0 and 1 for faster computations is used. On the other hand, the MAM season is well predicted with a two-layer bidirectional LSTM on scaled data (2L_Scaled_BiLSTM) with 99.9963% of explainable variability, 0.0097 RMSE, and 0.0088 MAE.

The MAM season demonstrates persistent predictive challenges, as both KAN architectures struggled to produce accurate predictions. We may attribute the good performance of the LSTM models to the fact that there is a memory cell in them. It retains the historical dependencies within the prediction process. This capability is absent in classical machine learning algorithms and some deep learning architectures, such as a simple KAN.

4.6 Selection of the Best Model Based on its Predictive Performance

This section presents the criteria and evaluation of deep learning architectures for seasonal rainfall prediction. The models were assessed based on explainable variability and bias metrics, including RMSE and MAE.




Fig. 10: Goodness of fit for OND (a) and MAM (b) across different deep learning architectures.




Fig. 11: Bias–variance relationships for the OND (a) and MAM (b) seasons across deep learning architectures.

Figures 10 and 11 illustrate the criteria used to select the best prediction model. We wanted to have a machine learning or deep learning architecture that has a high level of explainable variability and a very low level of bias quantification metrics in terms of root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE). We compared all of the algorithms deployed to find that the higher the bias, the lower the coefficient of determination, and the converse is also true. The performance of deep learning architectures is significantly positive in the OND season. Moreover, the depth of the neural network is shallow to achieve better predictions. In most cases, a single-layer network demonstrated superior performance compared to two-hidden-layer architectures employing multilayer perceptron-based models, including BiLSTM. The same is true for the deep learning architecture that had trainable functions at the edges, which is KAN. This implies that the function that models the OND precipitation forecasts has a low complexity. On the other hand, the MAM season was very complex to model using GCMs as features of prediction in either classical machine learning algorithms or KAN. Better predictions can only be achieved by using deep learning architectures with the memory cell, such as LSTM and BiLSTM.

It is worth noting that the best prediction architecture is the BiLSTM two-layer architecture, implying that BiLSTM architectures achieved better performance by adding the new hidden layer (deeper training).

On the other hand, one-layer LSTM was the second-best predicting architecture. This shows the difference in perception of thinking that deeper training may lead to better prediction. It demonstrates how architecture-specific it is.

In fact, these are inherent characteristics of functions exhibiting high complexity in modeling tasks. Predicting MAM rainfall is likely to incur substantial biases when based solely on prediction features such as GCMs, particularly when employing traditional machine learning models. These results also provide more details on the relationship between bias and explainable variability in the search for a better prediction architecture. There is an inverse relationship between bias and explainable variability. In fact, the LSTM architecture's predictions show minimal variation across all considered seasons. Moreover, they consistently achieved the highest predictive performance across all seasons, positioning them as the preferred models for accurate seasonal forecasting in the region. This level of low variance in errors is essential for informing agricultural decision-making and optimizing practices.

4.7 Trainability of the Best Model and Effect of Extending the Forecasting Window

Training and test loss curves are season-specific, and we trained different models to determine that deep learning architectures yield the best results. Moreover, the performance of these architectures is also season-specific, highlighting the importance of tailoring model selection to each seasonal dataset.




Fig. 12: Panel (a): training/test loss; panel (b): OND forecast (1L.Scaled.LSTM) model.

Figures 12 and 13 display the training and testing loss curves over 100 training epochs. Moreover, the right-hand side of the figures gives more details about the forecasting window elongation on top-performing architectures. The OND model's test loss indicates an almost perfect mapping, with a maximum value below 0.02. However, such a low value may indicate overfitting. This is supported by the observation that the test loss curve starts at a point not aligned with the training loss curve.

When we extend the forecast window, it tends to produce near-perfect predictions but may be less practical due to fluctuations in atmospheric conditions that induce the water cycle and rainfall in particular. Furthermore, most agricultural activities occur during the rainy seasons, making accurate rainfall prediction especially important. The best predicting architecture for MAM is working better than the best predicting architecture for OND in terms of explainable variability.

The training and test losses for MAM follow almost the same pattern, which indicates a good generalization ability. The act of extending the forecasting window tends to produce perfect predictions, and the model is relatively stable in explainable variability with a very small change in bias metric scores. In fact, the best architecture for OND is too fast to generalize, whereas the best architecture for MAM takes time to generalize.




Fig. 13: Panel (a): training/test loss; panel (b): MAM forecast (2L_Scaled_BiLSTM) model.

5 Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

We started this study with the specific goal of identifying the performance of global climate models (GCMs) in simulating the seasonal rainfall forecast in the Greater Horn of Africa (GHA). The main idea was to evaluate the performance of GCMs on short and long rains with critical interest in long rains because of the low skill of seasonal forecasts in this season of MAM. To do so, we began with the season that exhibits higher forecast skill in the region: OND (“short rains”). The results of the deployed methods indicate the potential for accurate predictions during the OND season. This is particularly evident when applying classical machine learning algorithms. Among these, tree-based approaches, such as decision trees and random forests, demonstrate strong predictive performance. Moreover, methods such as support vector regression and XGBoost are also serving the good purpose of this task.

The best classical machine learning algorithm was the random forest, with a very small difference from the predictions of XGBoost. Since this season was somehow easy to predict by classical machine learning algorithms, deep learning architectures such as LSTM and BiLSTM outperformed them with a high level of explained variability and less prediction bias. The KAN model (1L_KAN) managed to outperform linear models. The best prediction model was found to be a one-layer LSTM on scaled data. This highlights that we do not need to increase the depth of deep learning architecture to have better predictions for OND. We can also highlight the top three contributing GCMs in predictions, such as NASA, ECMWF, and GFDL_SPEAR. On the other hand, classical machine learning algorithms performed poorly in the MAM rainfall seasonal forecasts of the region with an insignificant level of explainable variability. The KAN deep learning architecture also performed poorly in this case.

676 The only credible architectures to predict MAM seasonal rainfall from deployed
677 models are memory cell-based architectures such as LSTM and BiLSTM. The findings
678 suggest that training LSTM or BiLSTM architectures has the potential to enhance
679 prediction accuracy. However, increasing the depth of these networks may introduce
680 overfitting or instability, thereby reducing the robustness of predictions. This trade-off
681 underscores the importance of optimizing network architecture to balance accuracy
682 and generalization.

683 The best prediction architecture was found to be a two-layer BiLSTM on scaled
684 data. We may also highlight the three main contributing features in a multi-model
685 ensemble prediction for MAM, which are ECMWF, Météo France, and NASA.

686 This study builds on prior approaches that used the arithmetic mean of individual
687 GCM outputs as predictors by advancing a more systematic framework for construct-
688 ing multi-model ensemble predictions. It highlights that the predictive skill of a given
689 algorithm is season-dependent, as methods that perform well in one season may not
690 yield comparable accuracy in another. These variations are linked to the differing
691 complexities of atmospheric and oceanic processes that drive rainfall variability across
692 seasons in the Greater Horn of Africa.

693 Overall, the multi-model ensemble prediction methodology sustains the hybrid-
694 based approach to seasonal rainfall forecasting, integrating diverse models to enhance
695 predictive reliability. By combining multiple sources of information, it strengthens the
696 accuracy and resilience of forecasts across varying climatic conditions. Consequently,
697 this approach supports the principle that “forewarned is forearmed,” providing
698 valuable insights for informed agricultural planning and decision-making.

699 5.2 Recommendations

700 We used GCMs as predictive features for short and long rains. Fortunately, mod-
701 eling OND was quite possible using both classical machine learning algorithms and
702 deep learning architectures. Modeling rainfall forecasts for the MAM season proved
703 highly challenging when using traditional machine learning algorithms. Therefore,
704 deep learning architectures may offer a more effective alternative due to their ability
705 to capture complex temporal dependencies. In particular, architectures with memory
706 cells can retain the history of feature weights while propagating information through
707 the network, thereby enhancing the representation of sequential patterns in the data.
708 A limitation of this study is that we did not integrate additional regional and global
709 climate drivers with GCM output. This integration may help assess whether classi-
710 cal machine learning algorithms can produce more reliable and robust predictions in
711 regional rainfall forecasting, particularly for long rains.

712 Supplementary information

- 713 • **Acknowledgements** The authors acknowledge and thank the IGAD Climate Pre-
714 diction and Applications Centre for their collaboration, without which this study
715 would not have been possible.

716 • **Author Contributions** Conceptualization: A.H., M.B.S., P.N., M.G.; Methodol-
717 ogy: A.H., M.B.S., P.N., M.G.; Formal analysis: A.H., M.B.S., P.N., M.G.; Data
718 curation: A.H., M.B.S., P.N., M.G.; Writing—original draft: A.H.; Writing—review
719 & editing: A.H., M.B.S., P.N., M.G., M.K., R.K.; Visualization: A.H., M.B.S., P.N.,
720 M.G.; Supervision: M.B.S., P.N., M.G., M.K., R.K.

721 • **Funding** This publication was made possible by a grant from Carnegie Corporation
722 of New York (provided through the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences).
723 The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the
724 author(s).

725 • **Data Availability:** IRI Data Library precipitation data from [this link](#) and C3S
726 data from [here](#).

727 • **Code availability** Code is available on request.

728 Declarations

729 • **Competing interests** The authors declare no competing interests.

730 • **Ethics approval** Not applicable.

731 • **Consent to participate** Not applicable.

732 • **Consent for publication** Not applicable.

733 References

734 Agbasi, J.C., Egbueri, J.C., Ayejoto, D.A., Unigwe, C.O., Omeke, M.E., Nwaze-
735 libe, V.E., ... Fakoya, A.A. (2023). The impact of seasonal changes on the
736 trends of physicochemical, heavy metal and microbial loads in water resources
737 of southeastern nigeria: a critical review. *Climate change impacts on Nigeria:
738 environment and sustainable development*, 505–539, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21007-5_25
739

741 Ahmadi, H., Aminnejad, B., Sabatsany, H. (2023). Application of machine learning
742 ensemble models for rainfall prediction. *Acta Geophysica*, 71(4), 1775–1786,
743 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-022-00952-y>
744

745 Akbar, A.A., Darmawan, Y., Wibowo, A., Rahmat, H.K. (2024). Accu-
746 racy assessment of monthly rainfall predictions using seasonal arima

- 747 and long short-term memory (lstm). *Journal of Computer Sci-*
748 *ence and Engineering (JCSE)*, 5(2), 100–115, Retrieved from
749 <https://icsejournal.com/index.php/JCSE/article/download/843/216>
750
- 751 Anoye, R., & Alatinga, K.A. (2024). Impacts of illegal mining activities on water
752 quality for irrigation and implications for public health: A case study of the
753 oda river in the ashanti region of ghana. *Journal of Water and Health*, 22(10),
754 1886–1898,
755
- 756 Antonio, B., McRae, A.T., MacLeod, D., Cooper, F.C., Marsham, J., Aitchison,
757 L., ... Watson, P.A. (2025). Postprocessing east african rainfall forecasts
758 using a generative machine learning model. *Journal of Advances in Model-*
759 *ing Earth Systems*, 17(3), e2024MS004796, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2024MS004796)
760 [10.1029/2024MS004796](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2024MS004796)
761
- 762 Anwar, M., Winarno, E., Hadikurniawati, W., Novita, M. (2021). Rainfall prediction
763 using extreme gradient boosting. *Journal of physics: Conference series* (Vol.
764 1869, p. 012078).
- 765 Anyah, R.O., & Qiu, W. (2012). Characteristic 20th and 21st century precipitation
766 and temperature patterns and changes over the greater horn of africa. *Interna-*
767 *tional Journal of Climatology*, 32(3), 347–363, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2270)
768 [10.1002/joc.2270](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2270)
769
- 770 Assamnew, A.D., & Tsidu, G.M. (2020). The performance of regional climate models
771 driven by various general circulation models in reproducing observed rainfall
772 over east africa. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 142, 1169–1189, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-020-03357-3)
773 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-020-03357-3
774
- 775 Bacci, M., Idrissa, O., Zini, C., Burrone, S., Sitta, A.A., Tarchiani, V. (2023). Effec-
776 tiveness of agrometeorological services for smallholder farmers: the case study
777 in the regions of dosso and tillabéri in niger. *Climate Services*, 30, 100360,
778 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2023.100360>
779
- 780 Bacci, M., Ousman Baoua, Y., Tarchiani, V. (2020). Agrometeorological forecast for
781 smallholder farmers: A powerful tool for weather-informed crops management in
782 the sahel. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3246, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083246)
783 [su12083246](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083246)
784

- 785 Barrera-Animas, A.Y., Oyedele, L.O., Bilal, M., Akinosho, T.D., Delgado, J.M.D.,
786 Akanbi, L.A. (2022). Rainfall prediction: A comparative analysis of modern
787 machine learning algorithms for time-series forecasting. *Machine Learning with*
788 *Applications*, 7, 100204, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mlwa.2021](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mlwa.2021.100204)
789 [.100204](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mlwa.2021.100204)
790
- 791 Basha, C.Z., Bhavana, N., Bhavya, P., Sowmya, V. (2020). Rainfall prediction using
792 machine learning & deep learning techniques. *2020 international conference on*
793 *electronics and sustainable communication systems (icesc)* (pp. 92–97).
- 794 Basist, A., Bell, G.D., Meentemeyer, V. (1994). Statistical relationships between
795 topography and precipitation patterns. *Journal of climate*, 7(9), 1305–1315,
796
- 797 Becker, E., Kirtman, B.P., Pegion, K. (2020). Evolution of the north
798 american multi-model ensemble. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(9),
799 e2020GL087408, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087408> Retrieved from
800 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087408>
801
- 802 Blockeel, H., Devos, L., Frénay, B., Nanfack, G., Nijssen, S. (2023). Decision trees:
803 from efficient prediction to responsible ai. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, 6,
804 1124553, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1124553>
805
- 806 Bowden, J.H., & Semazzi, F.H. (2007). Empirical analysis of intraseasonal climate
807 variability over the greater horn of africa. *Journal of Climate*, 20(23), 5715–5731,
808 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JCLI1587.1>
809
- 810 Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45, 5–32, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324)
811 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
812
- 813 Breiman, L., Friedman, J., Olshen, R.A., Stone, C.J. (2017). *Classification and*
814 *regression trees*. Routledge.
- 815 Bruno Soares, M., Daly, M., Dessai, S. (2018). Assessing the value of seasonal climate
816 forecasts for decision-making. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*,
817 9(4), e523, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.523>
818
- 819 Calì Quaglia, F., Terzago, S., von Hardenberg, J. (2022). Temperature and precipi-
820 tation seasonal forecasts over the mediterranean region: added value compared
821 to simple forecasting methods. *Climate Dynamics*, 58(7), 2167–2191, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05895-6)
822 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05895-6

823

824 Camberlin, P., & Philippon, N. (2002). The east african march–may rainy season:
 825 Associated atmospheric dynamics and predictability over the 1968–97 period.
 826 *Journal of climate*, 15(9), 1002–1019,

827

828 Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. *Proceed-*
 829 *ings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery*
 830 *and data mining* (pp. 785–794).

831 Cheng, K.-F., & Lin, P.-E. (1981). Nonparametric estimation of a regression function.
 832 *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 57, 223–233,
 833 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00535491>

834

835 Chicco, D., Warrens, M.J., Jurman, G. (2021). The coefficient of determination r-
 836 squared is more informative than smape, mae, mape, mse and rmse in regression
 837 analysis evaluation. *Peerj computer science*, 7, e623, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.623>

838

840 Cutler, A., Cutler, D.R., Stevens, J.R. (2012). Random forests. *Ensemble machine*
 841 *learning: Methods and applications*, 157–175, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9326-7_5

842

844 Dar, I.S., Chand, S., Shabbir, M., Kibria, B.G. (2023). Condition-index based
 845 new ridge regression estimator for linear regression model with multicollinear-
 846 ity. *Kuwait Journal of Science*, 50(2), 91–96, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjs.2023.02.013>

847

849 Daron, J., Michaelides, K., Hassaballah, K., Quichimbo, A., Parfitt, R., Stacey, J., ...
 850 Singer, M.B. (2025). Simbol: A method to co-produce impact-based seasonal
 851 outlooks. *Climate Services*, 38, 100579, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2025.100579>

852

854 Deman, V.M., Koppa, A., Waegeman, W., MacLeod, D.A., Bliss Singer, M., Miralles,
 855 D.G. (2022). Seasonal prediction of horn of africa long rains using machine
 856 learning: the pitfalls of preselecting correlated predictors. *Frontiers in Water*,
 857 4, 1053020, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2022.1053020>

858

859 Devadarshini, E., Bhuvaneswari, K., Mohan Kumar, S., Geethalakshmi, V.,
 860 Dhasarathan, M., Senthil, A., ... others (2024). Spatiotemporal performance

- 861 evaluation of high-resolution multiple satellite and reanalysis precipitation
862 products over the semiarid region of india. *Environmental Monitoring and*
863 *Assessment*, 196(11), 1006, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-024-13152-6)
864 [024-13152-6](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-024-13152-6)
865
- 866 Dyer, E., & Washington, R. (2021). Kenyan long rains: A subseasonal approach
867 to process-based diagnostics. *Journal of Climate*, 34(9), 3311–3326, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0914.1)
868 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0914.1
869
- 870 Ehsan, M.A., Tippett, M.K., Robertson, A.W., Almazroui, M., Ismail, M., Dinku, T.,
871 ... Teshome, A. (2021). Seasonal predictability of ethiopian kiremt rainfall and
872 forecast skill of ecmwf’s seas5 model. *Climate Dynamics*, 57(11), 3075–3091,
873 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05855-0>
874
- 875 Fan, Y., Tang, Q., Guo, Y., Wei, Y. (2024). Bilstm-mlam: a multi-scale time series pre-
876 diction model for sensor data based on bi-lstm and local attention mechanisms.
877 *Sensors*, 24(12), 3962, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/s24123962>
878
- 879 Fuentes-Franco, R., Giorgi, F., Pavia, E.G., Graef, F., Coppola, E. (2018). Sea-
880 sonal precipitation forecast over mexico based on a hybrid statistical–dynamical
881 approach. *Int. J. Climatol*, 38(11), 4051–4065, [https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5550)
882 [joc.5550](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5550)
883
- 884 Funk, C., Harrison, L., Shukla, S., Pomposi, C., Galu, G., Korecha, D., ... others
885 (2018). Examining the role of unusually warm indo-pacific sea-surface tempera-
886 tures in recent african droughts. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological*
887 *Society*, 144, 360–383, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3266>
888
- 889 Gebrechorkos, S., Pan, M., Beck, H., Sheffield, J. (2022). Performance of state-of-
890 the-art c3s european seasonal climate forecast models for mean and extreme
891 precipitation over africa. *Water Resources Research*, 58(3), e2021WR031480,
892 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2021WR031480>
893
- 894 Giannini, A., Ali, A., Kelley, C., Lamptey, B., Minoungou, B., Ndiaye, O. (2020).
895 Advances in the lead time of sahel rainfall prediction with the north american
896 multimodel ensemble. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(9), e2020GL087341,
897 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL087341>
898

- 899 Gibson, P.B., Chapman, W.E., Altinok, A., Delle Monache, L., DeFlorio, M.J.,
900 Waliser, D.E. (2021). Training machine learning models on climate model out-
901 put yields skillful interpretable seasonal precipitation forecasts. *Communications*
902 *Earth & Environment*, 2(1), 159, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-021-00225-4)
903 [s43247-021-00225-4](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-021-00225-4)
904
- 905 Harmon, G., Jepson, W., Lefore, N. (2023). Farmer-led irrigation development in sub-
906 saharan africa. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, 10(2), e1631, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1631)
907 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1631
908
- 909 Hartmann, H. (2025). Comparison of precipitation rates from global datasets for
910 the five-year period from 2019 to 2023. *Hydrology*, 12(1), 4, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology12010004)
911 [https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology12010004](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology12010004)
912
- 913 He, S., Li, X., DelSole, T., Ravikumar, P., Banerjee, A. (2020). Sub-seasonal climate
914 forecasting via machine learning: Challenges. *Analysis, and Advances*, ,
915
- 916 He, S., Li, X., DelSole, T., Ravikumar, P., Banerjee, A. (2021). Sub-seasonal climate
917 forecasting via machine learning: Challenges, analysis, and advances. *Proceedings*
918 *of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence* (Vol. 35, pp. 169–177).
- 919 Heilemann, J., Klassert, C., Samaniego, L., Thober, S., Marx, A., Boeing, F., ...
920 Gawel, E. (2024). Projecting impacts of extreme weather events on crop yields
921 using lasso regression. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 46, 100738, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2024.100738)
922 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2024.100738
923
- 924 Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. *Neural*
925 *computation*, 9(8), 1735–1780, <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
926
- 927 Hoerl, A.E., & Kennard, R.W. (1970). Ridge regression: Biased estimation for
928 nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics*, 12(1), 55–67, [https://doi.org/10](https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1970.10488634)
929 [.1080/00401706.1970.10488634](https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1970.10488634)
930
- 931 Hoseini, F., & Notash, A.Y. (2025). Image captioning using bidirectional lstm neural
932 network. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 5(1), 80, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00315-8)
933 [doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00315-8](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00315-8)
934
- 935 Hounnou, F.E., Houessou, A.M., Dedehouanou, H. (2023). Farmers' preference and
936 willingness to pay for weather forecast services in benin (west africa). *Regional*

- 937 *Environmental Change*, 23(2), 77, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-023-02058-7>
938
939
- 940 Huang, F.L. (2018). Multilevel modeling and ordinary least squares regression: how
941 comparable are they? *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 86(2), 265–281,
942 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2016.1277339>
943
- 944 Ibebuchi, C.C., & Abu, I.-O. (2023). Rainfall variability patterns in nigeria during the
945 rainy season. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 7888, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-34970-7>
946
947
- 948 Ingram, K., Roncoli, M., Kirshen, P. (2002). Opportunities and constraints for farmers
949 of west africa to use seasonal precipitation forecasts with burkina faso as a case
950 study. *Agricultural systems*, 74(3), 331–349, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X\(02\)00044-6](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X(02)00044-6)
951
952
- 953 Izadi, N., Karakani, E.G., Saadatabadi, A.R., Shamsipour, A., Fattahi, E., Habibi, M.
954 (2021). Evaluation of era5 precipitation accuracy based on various time scales
955 over iran during 2000–2018. *Water*, 13(18), 2538, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w13182538>
956
957
- 958 James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An introduction to statistical
959 learning: with applications in r* (Vol. 103). Springer.
- 960 Jiang, Y., Zhou, L., Roundy, P.E., Hua, W., Raghavendra, A. (2021). Increasing
961 influence of indian ocean dipole on precipitation over central equatorial africa.
962 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(8), e2020GL092370, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092370>
963
964
- 965 Jin, W., Luo, Y., Wu, T., Huang, X., Xue, W., Yu, C. (2022). Deep learning for
966 seasonal precipitation prediction over china. *Journal of Meteorological Research*,
967 36(2), 271–281, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s13351-022-1174-7>
968
- 969 Jingyong, Z., Wenjie, D., Congbin, F., Lingyun, W. (2003). The influence of vegetation
970 cover on summer precipitation in china: A statistical analysis of ndvi and climate
971 data. *Advances in Atmospheric Sciences*, 20, 1002–1006, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02915523>
972
973

- 974 Joshi, S., Gouda, K., Goswami, P. (2020). Seasonal rainfall forecast skill over cen-
975 tral himalaya with an atmospheric general circulation model. *Theoretical and*
976 *Applied Climatology*, 139, 237–250, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-019-02971-0)
977 [s00704-019-02971-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-019-02971-0)
978
- 979 Kalnay, E., & Dalcher, A. (1987). Forecasting forecast skill. *Monthly weather review*,
980 115(2), 349–356,
981
- 982 Kassem, Y., Gökçekuş, H., Çamur, H., Esenel, E. (2021). Application of artifi-
983 cial neural network, multiple linear regression, and response surface regression
984 models in the estimation of monthly rainfall in northern cyprus. *Desalination*
985 *and Water Treatment*, 215, 328–346, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5004/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5004/dwt.2021.26525)
986 [dwt.2021.26525](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5004/dwt.2021.26525)
987
- 988 Kebacho, L.L. (2022a). Interannual variations of the monthly rainfall anomalies
989 over tanzania from march to may and their associated atmospheric circulations
990 anomalies. *Natural Hazards*, 112(1), 163–186,
991
- 992 Kebacho, L.L. (2022b). The role of tropical cyclones idai and kenneth in modulating
993 rainfall performance of 2019 long rains over east africa. *Pure and Applied Geo-*
994 *physics*, 179(4), 1387–1401, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-022-02993-2)
995 [-022-02993-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-022-02993-2)
996
- 997 Kilavi, M., MacLeod, D., Ambani, M., Robbins, J., Dankers, R., Graham, R., . . . Todd,
998 M.C. (2018). Extreme rainfall and flooding over central kenya including nairobi
999 city during the long-rains season 2018: causes, predictability, and potential for
1000 early warning and actions. *Atmosphere*, 9(12), 472, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos9120472)
1001 [doi.org/10.3390/atmos9120472](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos9120472)
1002
- 1003 Kim, G., Ahn, J.-B., Kryjov, V.N., Lee, W.-S., Kim, D.-J., Kumar, A. (2021). Assess-
1004 ment of mme methods for seasonal prediction using wmo lc-lrfmme hindcast
1005 dataset. *International Journal of Climatology*, 41, E2462–E2481, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6858)
1006 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6858
1007
- 1008 Kirchner, J.W., & Allen, S.T. (2020). Seasonal partitioning of precipitation between
1009 streamflow and evapotranspiration, inferred from end-member splitting analysis.
1010 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 24(1), 17–39, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-17-2020)
1011 [doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-17-2020](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-17-2020)
1012

- 1013 Klemm, T., & McPherson, R.A. (2017). The development of seasonal climate fore-
 1014 casting for agricultural producers. *Agricultural and forest meteorology*, 232,
 1015 384–399, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.09.005>
 1016
- 1017 Kumar, V., Kedam, N., Sharma, K.V., Khedher, K.M., Alluqmani, A.E. (2023). A
 1018 comparison of machine learning models for predicting rainfall in urban metropoli-
 1019 tan cities. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13724, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813724)
 1020 [10.3390/su151813724](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813724)
 1021
- 1022 Li, Y., Wei, K., Chen, K., He, J., Zhao, Y., Yang, G., ... others (2023). Forecast-
 1023 ing monthly water deficit based on multi-variable linear regression and random
 1024 forest models. *Water*, 15(6), 1075, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w15061075)
 1025 [w15061075](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w15061075)
 1026
- 1027 Lin, X., Fan, J., Hou, Z.J., Wang, J. (2023). Machine learning of key variables
 1028 impacting extreme precipitation in various regions of the contiguous united
 1029 states. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15(3), e2022MS003334,
 1030 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003334>
 1031
- 1032 Liu, J., Fu, Z., Liu, W. (2023). Impacts of precipitation variations on agricultural
 1033 water scarcity under historical and future climate change. *Journal of Hydrology*,
 1034 617, 128999, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2022.128999>
 1035
- 1036 Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Vaidya, S., Ruehle, F., Halverson, J., Soljačić, M., ... Tegmark, M.
 1037 (2024). Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, ,
 1038 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.19756>
 1039
- 1040 Lundberg, S.M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model pre-
 1041 dictions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, , [https://](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1705.07874)
 1042 doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1705.07874
 1043
- 1044 MacLeod, D., Graham, R., O'Reilly, C., Otieno, G., Todd, M. (2021). Causal pathways
 1045 linking different flavours of enso with the greater horn of africa short rains.
 1046 *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 22(2), e1015, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.1015)
 1047 [10.1002/asl.1015](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.1015)
 1048
- 1049 Manzananas, R., Gutiérrez, J.M., Bhend, J., Hemri, S., Doblas-Reyes, F.J., Torralba, V.,
 1050 ... Brookshaw, A. (2019). Bias adjustment and ensemble recalibration methods
 1051 for seasonal forecasting: A comprehensive intercomparison using the c3s dataset.

- 1052 *Climate Dynamics*, 53, 1287–1305, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-019-04640-4>
1053
1054
- 1055 Martin, Z., Son, S.-W., Butler, A., Hendon, H., Kim, H., Sobel, A., ... Zhang, C.
1056 (2021). The influence of the quasi-biennial oscillation on the madden–julian
1057 oscillation. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 2(7), 477–489, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-021-00173-9>
1058
1059
- 1060 Mienye, I.D., & Jere, N. (2024). A survey of decision trees: Concepts, algorithms, and
1061 applications. *IEEE access*, 12, 86716–86727, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3416838>
1062
1063
- 1064 Miftachov, R., & Reiß, M. (2025). Early stopping for regression trees. *arXiv*
1065 *preprint arXiv:2502.04709*, , <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.04709>
1066
1067
- 1068 Misiani, H.O., Endris, H.S., Opijah, F.J., Ouma, J.O., Barasa, B.N., Tye, M.R., Mac-
1069 Martin, D.G. (2025). Simulated response of the climate of eastern africa to
1070 stratospheric aerosol intervention. *Frontiers in Climate*, 7, 1522235, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2025.1522235>
1071
1072
- 1073 Mohamed, A., Maharana, P., Phartyal, S.S., Dimri, A. (2024). Projected change
1074 in precipitation and temperature over undivided sudan and its major cities.
1075 *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, 136(2), 11, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00703-024-01017-z>
1076
1077
- 1078 Mpelasoka, F., Awange, J.L., Zerihun, A. (2018). Influence of coupled ocean-
1079 atmosphere phenomena on the greater horn of africa droughts and their
1080 implications. *Science of the Total Environment*, 610, 691–702, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.109>
1081
1082
- 1083 Mubialiwo, A., Onyutha, C., Abebe, A. (2020). Historical rainfall and evapotranspi-
1084 ration changes over mpologoma catchment in uganda. *Advances in Meteorology*,
1085 2020(1), 8870935, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8870935>
1086
- 1087 Nhamo, L., Mpandeli, S., Liphadzi, S., Dirwai, T.L., Mugiyo, H., Senzanje, A., ...
1088 Mabhaudhi, T. (2024). Why do farmers not irrigate all the areas equipped for
1089 irrigation? lessons from southern africa. *Agriculture*, 14(8), 1218–1218, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14081218>
1090

1091

1092 Nicholson, S.E. (2015). Long-term variability of the east african'short rains' and
1093 its links to large-scale factors. *International Journal of Climatology*, 35(13), ,
1094 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.4259>
1095

1096 Noh, S.-H. (2021). Analysis of gradient vanishing of rnns and performance com-
1097 parison. *Information*, 12(11), 442, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/info12110442)
1098 [info12110442](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/info12110442)
1099

1100 Oettli, P., & Camberlin, P. (2005). Influence of topography on monthly rainfall
1101 distribution over east africa. *Climate Research*, 28(3), 199–212, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3354/cr028199)
1102 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3354/cr028199>
1103

1104 Pakdaman, M., Babaeian, I., Bouwer, L.M. (2022). Improved monthly and seasonal
1105 multi-model ensemble precipitation forecasts in southwest asia using machine
1106 learning algorithms. *Water*, 14(17), 2632, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w14172632)
1107 [10.3390/w14172632](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w14172632)
1108

1109 Palmer, P.I., Wainwright, C.M., Dong, B., Maidment, R.I., Wheeler, K.G., Gedney,
1110 N., . . . others (2023). Drivers and impacts of eastern african rainfall variability.
1111 *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 4(4), 254–270, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00397-x)
1112 [doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00397-x](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00397-x)
1113

1114 Paparrizos, S., Attouh, E.M., Sutanto, S.J., Snoeren, N., Ludwig, F. (2023). Local rain-
1115 fall forecast knowledge across the globe used for agricultural decision-making.
1116 *Science of the Total Environment*, 899, 165539, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.165539)
1117 [doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.165539](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.165539)
1118

1119 Pfunzo, R., Bahta, Y.T., Jordaan, H. (2024). Insights into the impact of irrigation agri-
1120 culture on the economy of the limpopo province, south africa: a social accounting
1121 matrix multiplier analysis. *Agriculture*, 14(7), 1086, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14071086)
1122 [doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14071086](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14071086)
1123

1124 Qian, Q., Jia, X., Lin, H., Zhang, R. (2021). Seasonal forecast of nonmonsoonal winter
1125 precipitation over the eurasian continent using machine-learning models. *Journal*
1126 *of Climate*, 34(17), 7113–7129, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0113.1)
1127 [-D-21-0113.1](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0113.1)
1128

- 1129 Reboita, M.S., Mattos, E.V., Capucin, B.C., de Souza, D.O., de Souza Ferreira,
1130 G.W. (2024). A multi-scale analysis of the extreme precipitation in southern
1131 brazil in april/may 2024. *Atmosphere*, 15(9), 1123, [https://doi.org/10.3390/
1132 atmos15091123](https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos15091123)
- 1133
- 1134 Ringler, C., Mekonnen, D.K., Xie, H., Uhunamure, A.M. (2020). Irrigation to
1135 transform agriculture and food systems in africa south of the sahara.
1136 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2499/9780896293946_06
- 1137
- 1138 Sattari, M.T., Feizi, H., Samadianfard, S., Falsafian, K., Salwana, E. (2021). Esti-
1139 mation of monthly and seasonal precipitation: A comparative study using
1140 data-driven methods versus hybrid approach. *Measurement*, 173, 108512,
1141 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2020.108512>
- 1142
- 1143 Schuster, M., & Paliwal, K.K. (1997). Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE*
1144 *transactions on Signal Processing*, 45(11), 2673–2681, [https://doi.org/https://
1145 doi.org/10.1109/78.650093](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1109/78.650093)
- 1146
- 1147 Schwarzwald, K., Goddard, L., Seager, R., Ting, M., Marvel, K. (2023). Understanding
1148 cmip6 biases in the representation of the greater horn of africa long and short
1149 rains. *Climate Dynamics*, 61(3), 1229–1255, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/
1150 10.1007/s00382-022-06622-5](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06622-5)
- 1151
- 1152 Sheikh, M.R., & Coulibaly, P. (2024). Review of recent developments in hydrologic
1153 forecast merging techniques. *Water*, 16(2), 301, [https://doi.org/https://doi
1154 .org/10.3390/w16020301](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/w16020301)
- 1155
- 1156 Shetty, S., Umesh, P., Shetty, A. (2022). Dependability of rainfall to topography and
1157 micro-climate: an observation using geographically weighted regression. *The-
1158 oretical and Applied Climatology*, 147(1), 217–237, [https://doi.org/https://
1159 doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03811-w](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03811-w)
- 1160
- 1161 Shu, Z., Zhang, J., Jin, J., Wang, L., Wang, G., Wang, J., ... others (2021). Evalua-
1162 tion and application of quantitative precipitation forecast products for mainland
1163 china based on tigre multimodel data. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 22(5),
1164 1199–1219, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-20-0004.1>
- 1165
- 1166 Somvanshi, S., Javed, S.A., Islam, M.M., Pandit, D., Das, S. (2024). A survey on
1167 kolmogorov-arnold network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06078*, , <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2024-11060>

1168 .org/<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.06078>
1169

1170 Song, Y., & Zhang, J. (2024). Enhancing short-term streamflow prediction in the
1171 haihe river basin through integrated machine learning with lasso. *Water Science*
1172 & *Technology*, 89(9), 2367–2383, [https://doi.org/10.2166/wst](https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2024.142)
1173 .2024.142
1174

1175 Taguchi, M. (2018). Seasonal winter forecasts of the northern stratosphere and
1176 troposphere: results from jma seasonal hindcast experiments. *Journal of the*
1177 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 75(3), 827–840, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-17-0276.1>
1178 .1175/JAS-D-17-0276.1
1179

1180 Talib, M.N.A., Ahmed, M., Naseer, M.M., Slusarczyk, B., Popp, J. (2021). The
1181 long-run impacts of temperature and rainfall on agricultural growth in sub-
1182 saharan africa. *Sustainability*, 13(2), 595, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020595>
1183 10.3390/su13020595
1184

1185 Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of*
1186 *the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1), 267–288,
1187 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x>
1188

1189 Van Houdt, G., Mosquera, C., Nápoles, G. (2020). A review on the long short-
1190 term memory model. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53(8), 5929–5955, [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-020-09838-1)
1191 [doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-020-09838-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-020-09838-1)
1192

1193 Vapnik, V., Golowich, S., Smola, A. (1996). Support vector method for function
1194 approximation, regression estimation and signal processing. *Advances in neural*
1195 *information processing systems*, 9, , [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-017-9975-9)
1196 [s10589-017-9975-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-017-9975-9)
1197

1198 Vellinga, M., & Milton, S.F. (2018). Drivers of interannual variability of the e ast
1199 african “long rains”. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*,
1200 144(712), 861–876, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3263>
1201

1202 Vuković Vimić, A., Djurdjević, V., Ranković-Vasić, Z., Nikolić, D., Ćosić, M., Lipovac,
1203 A., ... Vujadinović Mandić, M. (2022). Enhancing capacity for short-term
1204 climate change adaptations in agriculture in serbia: development of integrated
1205 agrometeorological prediction system. *Atmosphere*, 13(8), 1337, [https://doi](https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13081337)
1206 .org/<https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13081337>

1207

1208 Wang, M., Yan, B., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Wang, P., Huang, J., ... Wen, Y. (2024).
1209 Optimizing precipitation forecasting and agricultural water resource allocation
1210 using the gaussian-stacked-lstm model. *Atmosphere*, 15(11), 1308, [https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos15111308)
1211 doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos15111308

1212

1213 Wang, Y., Zou, B., Xu, J., Xu, C., Tang, Y.Y. (2025). Alr-ht: A fast and efficient
1214 lasso regression without hyperparameter tuning. *Neural Networks*, 181, 106885,
1215 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106885>

1216

1217 Ward, N., Walker, D.P., Keane, R.J., Marsham, J.H., Scaife, A.A., Birch, C.E., May-
1218 bee, B. (2023). Predictability of the east africa long rains through congo zonal
1219 winds. *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 24(12), e1185, [https://doi.org/https://](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.1185)
1220 doi.org/10.1002/asl.1185

1221

1222 Watson, G.S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of*
1223 *Statistics, Series A*, 359–372,

1224

1225 Xhabafti, M., Vika, B., Sinaj, V. (2024). A comparative study of statistical and deep
1226 learning model-base weather prediction in albania. *WSEAS Transactions on*
1227 *Computer Research*, 12, 151–160, <https://doi.org/10.37394/232018.2024.12.15>

1228

1229 Zhang, Q., Sun, P., Singh, V.P., Chen, X. (2012). Spatial-temporal precipitation
1230 changes (1956–2000) and their implications for agriculture in china. *Global*
1231 *and Planetary Change*, 82, 86–95, [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2011.12.001)
1232 [j.gloplacha.2011.12.001](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2011.12.001)

1233