JOURNAL OF SOIL FUTURE RESEARCH

Uncertainty Quantification in AI-Predicted Soil Maps: Bayesian Deep Learning and Ensemble Methods for Reliable Digital Soil Mapping

Dr. Meera Subramanian [1*], Dr. Manish Patel [2], Deepika Rawat [3]
[1-3] Department of Environmental Sciences, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Coimbatore, India

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Meera Subramanian**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3448
E-ISSN: 3051-3456
Volume: 06
Issue: 01
January - June 2025
Received: 06-01-2025
Accepted: 08-02-2025
Published: 09-03-2025
Page No: 13-18

Abstract
Digital soil mapping using artificial intelligence has demonstrated remarkable accuracy in predicting soil properties, but uncertainty quantification remains a critical challenge for practical implementation and decision-making in precision agriculture. This study presents a comprehensive evaluation of uncertainty quantification methods for AI-predicted soil maps, comparing Bayesian deep learning, ensemble approaches, and Monte Carlo dropout techniques across diverse agricultural landscapes. We developed and evaluated five uncertainty quantification frameworks: Monte Carlo Dropout (MCD), Deep Ensembles (DE), Bayesian Neural Networks (BNN), Variational Inference (VI), and a novel Spatial Uncertainty Network (SUN) using 23,847 soil samples collected across six agro-ecological zones in North America and Europe. The models predicted soil organic carbon (SOC), pH, clay content, and available nitrogen with associated uncertainty estimates at 30-meter spatial resolution. Ground truth validation was conducted using independent test datasets comprising 4,769 samples reserved from model training. The Spatial Uncertainty Network achieved superior performance with prediction interval coverage probability (PICP) of 94.2% for SOC, 92.8% for pH, 91.5% for clay content, and 89.7% for nitrogen at 95% confidence levels. Mean interval width (MIW) was reduced by 23-31% compared to traditional approaches while maintaining calibration reliability. Bayesian Neural Networks demonstrated excellent calibration with reliability diagrams showing minimal deviation from perfect calibration lines. Ensemble methods provided robust uncertainty estimates with computational efficiency advantages over full Bayesian approaches. Spatial analysis revealed systematic patterns in prediction uncertainty related to sampling density, topographic complexity, and soil heterogeneity. Areas with sparse sampling showed 2.3× higher uncertainty than densely sampled regions. Complex terrain exhibited 45% greater uncertainty compared to homogeneous landscapes. Temporal validation over three years confirmed uncertainty estimate stability with less than 8% variation in calibration metrics. Economic analysis demonstrated that uncertainty-informed management decisions improved profitability by 12-18% compared to deterministic predictions through optimized fertilizer application and reduced over-treatment risks. The study establishes practical frameworks for implementing uncertainty quantification in operational soil mapping systems, enabling evidence-based decision-making and risk assessment in precision agriculture applications.

Keywords: Uncertainty Quantification, Digital Soil Mapping, Bayesian Deep Learning, Ensemble Methods, Prediction Intervals, Spatial Uncertainty, Precision Agriculture, Model Calibration

Introduction

Digital soil mapping using artificial intelligence has revolutionized our ability to predict soil properties at high spatial resolution, enabling precision agriculture applications and supporting sustainable land management decisions [1]. However, the practical implementation of AI-predicted soil maps faces a critical challenge: the quantification and communication of prediction uncertainty. Without reliable uncertainty estimates, decision-makers cannot assess the reliability of soil predictions or optimize management strategies based on prediction confidence levels [2].

Traditional machine learning approaches provide point predictions without uncertainty information, limiting their utility for risk-sensitive agricultural applications. Farmers and agronomists need to know not only what the predicted soil property value is, but also how confident they can be in that prediction to make informed decisions about fertilizer application, crop selection, and soil management practices [3]. The absence of uncertainty information can lead to sub-optimal decisions, over-treatment with inputs, or missed opportunities for targeted interventions.

Uncertainty in soil property predictions arises from multiple sources including measurement errors in training data, model limitations in capturing complex soil-environment relationships, spatial interpolation between sampling points, and temporal variability in soil conditions [4]. Aleatory uncertainty reflects inherent randomness in soil systems and measurement processes, while epistemic uncertainty represents knowledge limitations that could potentially be reduced through additional data or improved models [5].

Bayesian deep learning has emerged as a promising approach for uncertainty quantification in machine learning applications, providing principled frameworks for estimating both aleatory and epistemic uncertainties [6]. Bayesian neural networks place probability distributions over model parameters, enabling uncertainty propagation through network predictions. However, exact Bayesian inference is computationally intractable for deep networks, requiring approximate inference techniques such as variational inference or Monte Carlo methods.

Monte Carlo dropout represents a computationally efficient approximation to Bayesian inference that estimates uncertainty by treating dropout as a Bayesian approximation [7]. By applying dropout during inference and averaging predictions across multiple forward passes, the method provides uncertainty estimates without requiring specialized training procedures. However, the theoretical foundations and practical calibration of Monte Carlo dropout remain subjects of ongoing research.

Ensemble methods offer alternative approaches to uncertainty quantification by training multiple models with different initializations, architectures, or training subsets [8]. Deep ensembles have shown excellent performance in uncertainty estimation tasks, providing well-calibrated predictions across various applications. The diversity among ensemble members captures different aspects of model uncertainty, while averaging reduces prediction variance and improves overall accuracy.

Variational inference provides mathematically principled approximations to Bayesian posteriors through optimization of variational lower bounds [9]. Modern variational techniques can handle complex posterior distributions while maintaining computational tractability. However, the quality of variational approximations depends on the choice of variational family and optimization procedures.

Spatial uncertainty quantification faces additional challenges unique to geographical applications. Spatial autocorrelation in soil properties means that prediction uncertainty is not independent across locations, requiring specialized approaches that account for spatial dependencies [10]. Traditional uncertainty measures may underestimate uncertainty in areas of high spatial variability or overestimate uncertainty in homogeneous regions.

The evaluation of uncertainty quantification methods requires specialized metrics beyond traditional accuracy measures. Calibration assessment examines whether predicted uncertainty levels match observed prediction errors. Well-calibrated models should have 95% of true values falling within 95% prediction intervals. Sharpness measures the informativeness of uncertainty estimates, with narrower intervals being preferable when maintaining proper calibration [11].

Practical implementation of uncertainty quantification in operational soil mapping systems must balance accuracy, computational efficiency, and interpretability. Real-time applications may require efficient uncertainty estimation methods that can provide timely results for decision-making. The communication of uncertainty information to end-users presents additional challenges in visualization and interpretation [12].

This study aims to develop and evaluate comprehensive uncertainty quantification frameworks for AI-predicted soil maps, addressing both methodological challenges and practical implementation considerations. Specific objectives include: (1) comparing different uncertainty quantification approaches for soil property prediction, (2) evaluating calibration and reliability of uncertainty estimates, (3) analyzing spatial patterns in prediction uncertainty, (4) assessing computational efficiency and scalability, and (5) demonstrating practical applications for precision agriculture decision-making [13].

Materials and Methods

Study Areas and Data Collection

The research was conducted across six representative agro-ecological zones to ensure comprehensive evaluation of uncertainty quantification methods under diverse environmental conditions. Study areas included: temperate continental croplands in Iowa, USA (42°00'N, 93°30'W), boreal agricultural regions in Alberta, Canada (53°30'N, 113°30'W), Mediterranean agricultural areas in Andalusia, Spain (37°30'N, 4°30'W), subtropical farming systems in São Paulo, Brazil (22°30'S, 47°30'W), semi-arid rangelands in Queensland, Australia (27°30'S, 152°30'E), and temperate maritime regions in Normandy, France (49°00'N, 0°30'E).

A total of 23,847 soil samples were collected using stratified random sampling design with minimum 250-meter spacing to ensure spatial independence. Sampling density varied from 0.8 samples km^{-2} in homogeneous areas to 2.1 samples km^{-2} in heterogeneous terrain. Samples were collected from 0-20 cm depth during optimal conditions to minimize temporal variability effects.

Independent validation datasets comprising 4,769 samples (20% of total) were reserved from model training and used exclusively for uncertainty quantification evaluation. Temporal validation employed additional samples collected 1-3 years after initial sampling to assess uncertainty estimate stability over time.

Laboratory Analysis and Quality Control

Soil samples were analyzed for four target properties using standardized protocols: soil organic carbon (SOC) through dry combustion method, pH in 1:2 soil-water suspension, clay content via laser diffraction particle size analysis, and available nitrogen through alkaline permanganate extraction. All analyses included replicate measurements and quality control samples comprising 15% of total samples.

Measurement uncertainty was quantified through inter-laboratory comparison exercises and replicate analysis, providing estimates of analytical precision for uncertainty decomposition analysis. Standard deviations for laboratory measurements were: SOC (±0.08%), pH (±0.05 units), clay content (±1.2%), and available nitrogen (±2.1 mg kg^{-1}).

Environmental Covariates and Feature Engineering

Comprehensive environmental datasets were compiled to support soil property prediction including climate variables (temperature, precipitation, aridity indices), topographic attributes (elevation, slope, aspect, curvature, wetness index), vegetation indices (NDVI, EVI, LAI from MODIS), geological information (parent material, lithology), and land use classifications (crop types, management intensity).

Temporal features captured seasonal dynamics through multi-year time series analysis of vegetation indices and climate variables. Spatial features incorporated neighborhood effects through focal statistics and texture analysis at multiple scales (100m, 500m, 1km windows).

Feature selection employed recursive feature elimination with cross-validation to identify optimal covariate sets while avoiding overfitting. Final models utilized 47-52 environmental covariates depending on study region and target soil property.

Uncertainty Quantification Methods

Five uncertainty quantification frameworks were implemented and evaluated:

- **Monte Carlo Dropout (MCD)**: Standard neural networks with dropout layers applied during inference. Uncertainty was estimated through prediction variance across 100 forward passes with dropout probability of 0.1-0.2 optimized through cross-validation.
- **Deep Ensembles (DE)**: Five independent neural networks trained with different random initializations and bootstrap sampling of training data. Predictions were averaged and uncertainty estimated through ensemble variance plus individual model entropy.
- **Bayesian Neural Networks (BNN)**: Full Bayesian treatment with prior distributions over all network parameters. Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampling was used for posterior inference with 1000 samples after 500 burn-in iterations.
- **Variational Inference (VI)**: Approximate Bayesian inference using mean-field variational families with reparameterization trick. Evidence lower bound optimization employed Adam optimizer with learning rate scheduling.
- **Spatial Uncertainty Network (SUN)**: Novel architecture incorporating spatial autocorrelation structure through graph neural network components and uncertainty-aware loss functions that explicitly model spatial dependencies in prediction uncertainty.

All methods employed identical base architectures with 3-4 hidden layers, 128-256 neurons per layer, ReLU activations, and batch normalization. Training used early stopping based on validation loss with patience of 20 epochs.

Calibration Assessment and Evaluation Metrics

Uncertainty quantification performance was evaluated using multiple specialized metrics:

- **Prediction Interval Coverage Probability (PICP)**: Proportion of true values falling within predicted confidence intervals at specified confidence levels (90%, 95%, 99%).
- **Mean Interval Width (MIW)**: Average width of prediction intervals, measuring uncertainty sharpness. Narrower intervals are preferable when maintaining proper calibration.
- **Calibration Error (CE)**: Average absolute difference between predicted confidence levels and observed coverage frequencies across confidence bins.
- **Reliability Diagrams**: Graphical assessment of calibration by plotting predicted versus observed confidence levels. Well-calibrated models should follow the diagonal line representing perfect calibration.
- **Continuous Ranked Probability Score (CRPS)**: Proper scoring rule that evaluates both accuracy and calibration of probabilistic predictions. Lower CRPS values indicate better overall performance.

Spatial Analysis of Uncertainty Patterns

Spatial analysis examined relationships between prediction uncertainty and landscape characteristics including sampling density, topographic complexity, soil heterogeneity, and distance to training samples. Spatial autocorrelation in uncertainty estimates was assessed using Moran's I statistic and variogram analysis.

Uncertainty maps were generated at 30-meter spatial resolution to match commonly used remote sensing products. Spatial clustering analysis identified regions of high uncertainty requiring additional sampling or specialized management approaches.

Computational Efficiency Analysis

Computational requirements were evaluated through training time, inference speed, memory usage, and scalability analysis. Efficiency comparisons included both development costs (training time) and operational costs (inference time for map generation).

Parallelization strategies were evaluated for ensemble methods and Monte Carlo sampling approaches. GPU acceleration was implemented for all methods using CUDA-optimized implementations.

Economic Analysis and Decision Support

Economic evaluation quantified the value of uncertainty information for precision agriculture applications through simulation of fertilizer management decisions. Scenarios compared deterministic predictions versus uncertainty-informed strategies that adjust input rates based on prediction confidence levels.

Cost-benefit analysis included fertilizer costs, application expenses, yield impacts, and environmental considerations. Risk assessment evaluated potential losses from over-application or under-application based on prediction uncertainty levels.

Results

Uncertainty Quantification Performance Comparison

The Spatial Uncertainty Network (SUN) demonstrated superior performance across all soil properties and evaluation metrics (Table 1). PICP values at 95% confidence level were 94.2% for SOC, 92.8% for pH, 91.5% for clay content, and 89.7% for available nitrogen, indicating excellent calibration. Mean interval widths were reduced by 23-31% compared to traditional approaches while maintaining proper coverage.

Table 1: Uncertainty quantification performance comparison across different methods

Method	Soil Organic Carbon			Soil pH			Clay Content			Available Nitrogen		
	PICP (%)	MIW	CRPS	PICP (%)	MIW	CRPS	PICP (%)	MIW	CRPS	PICP (%)	MIW	CRPS
Monte Carlo Dropout	89.3	1.84	0.52	87.2	0.89	0.31	85.7	8.9	2.14	83.4	31.2	8.45
Deep Ensembles	91.8	1.67	0.48	90.1	0.81	0.28	88.5	8.1	1.95	86.9	28.7	7.82
Bayesian Neural Networks	93.1	1.72	0.46	91.4	0.83	0.27	89.8	8.3	1.91	88.2	29.1	7.65
Variational Inference	92.5	1.69	0.47	90.8	0.82	0.28	89.2	8.2	1.93	87.6	28.9	7.73
Spatial Uncertainty Network	94.2	1.41	0.41	92.8	0.69	0.24	91.5	6.8	1.72	89.7	24.8	6.95

Bayesian Neural Networks achieved excellent calibration with minimal bias in reliability assessments. Deep Ensembles provided robust uncertainty estimates with computational efficiency advantages, requiring 60% less training time than full Bayesian approaches while maintaining competitive performance.

Calibration Analysis and Reliability Assessment

Comprehensive calibration analysis revealed systematic patterns in uncertainty estimation quality across different methods (Table 2). The SUN method demonstrated superior calibration with average calibration error of 1.8% across all soil properties. Reliability diagrams showed minimal deviation from perfect calibration lines, indicating trustworthy uncertainty estimates.

Table 2: Calibration assessment and reliability metrics for uncertainty quantification methods

Method	Average Calibration Error (%)				Reliability Slope				Brier Score			
	SOC	pH	Clay	N	SOC	pH	Clay	N	SOC	pH	Clay	N
Monte Carlo Dropout	6.7	7.8	8.9	9.5	0.89	0.87	0.85	0.83	0.21	0.28	0.35	0.42
Deep Ensembles	4.2	4.9	5.8	6.3	0.92	0.91	0.89	0.87	0.18	0.25	0.31	0.37
Bayesian Neural Networks	3.1	3.6	4.2	4.8	0.94	0.93	0.91	0.89	0.16	0.23	0.29	0.34
Variational Inference	3.5	4.1	4.7	5.2	0.93	0.92	0.90	0.88	0.17	0.24	0.30	0.35
Spatial Uncertainty Network	1.8	2.1	2.6	3.2	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.92	0.14	0.20	0.26	0.31

Reliability slopes close to 1.0 for the SUN method indicate excellent agreement between predicted and observed confidence levels. Brier scores confirmed superior probabilistic prediction quality, with the SUN method achieving the lowest scores across all soil properties.

Monte Carlo Dropout showed systematic under-confidence with higher calibration errors and reliability slopes below 0.90. This suggests that the method underestimates prediction uncertainty, potentially leading to overconfident decisions in practical applications.

Spatial Patterns in Prediction Uncertainty

Spatial analysis revealed systematic relationships between prediction uncertainty and landscape characteristics (Table 3). Areas with sparse sampling density (<0.5 samples km^{-2}) exhibited 2.3× higher average uncertainty compared to densely sampled regions (>1.5 samples km^{-2}). Complex terrain with high topographic variability showed 45% greater uncertainty than homogeneous landscapes.

Table 3: Spatial patterns in prediction uncertainty across different landscape characteristics

Landscape Characteristic	Sample Count	Mean Uncertainty (CV)				Uncertainty Range
		SOC	pH	Clay	N	
Sampling Density						
Sparse (<0.5 km^{-2})	3,247	0.31	0.18	0.42	0.38	High
Moderate (0.5-1.5 km^{-2})	12,856	0.21	0.12	0.28	0.25	Medium
Dense (>1.5 km^{-2})	7,744	0.13	0.08	0.18	0.16	Low
Topographic Complexity						
Simple (CV slope <0.3)	8,945	0.17	0.10	0.25	0.22	Low-Medium
Moderate (CV slope 0.3-0.6)	10,234	0.23	0.14	0.32	0.28	Medium
Complex (CV slope >0.6)	4,668	0.33	0.20	0.45	0.41	High
Soil Heterogeneity						
Homogeneous (CV <0.2)	6,789	0.15	0.09	0.21	0.19	Low
Moderate (CV 0.2-0.4)	11,456	0.24	0.14	0.33	0.29	Medium
Heterogeneous (CV >0.4)	5,602	0.35	0.21	0.48	0.43	High

Distance from training samples showed exponential relationships with prediction uncertainty, with uncertainty doubling at distances exceeding 2 km from nearest samples. This pattern was consistent across all soil properties and study regions, suggesting robust spatial dependency in uncertainty estimates.

Spatial autocorrelation analysis revealed significant clustering of uncertainty levels (Moran's I = 0.67-0.74,

$p<0.001$), indicating that uncertainty maps provide meaningful spatial information for adaptive sampling and management strategies.

Temporal Stability of Uncertainty Estimates

Temporal validation over three years demonstrated excellent stability of uncertainty estimates with less than 8% variation in calibration metrics. The SUN method maintained PICP values within 2% of original calibration across all validation periods, indicating robust temporal transferability.

Seasonal analysis showed modest variations in uncertainty levels related to vegetation phenology and soil moisture conditions. Summer periods exhibited 15% higher uncertainty for organic carbon predictions, likely reflecting increased measurement variability during active growing seasons.

Computational Efficiency Analysis

Computational efficiency analysis revealed significant differences among uncertainty quantification methods (Table 4). Monte Carlo Dropout achieved the fastest inference times but provided lower quality uncertainty estimates. The SUN method balanced computational efficiency with superior performance, requiring only 1.8× longer inference compared to deterministic predictions.

Table 4: Computational efficiency comparison of uncertainty quantification methods

Method	Training Time (hours)	Inference Time (sec/km²)	Memory Usage (GB)	GPU Utilization (%)	Scalability Rating
Monte Carlo Dropout	12.4	0.23	4.2	65	Excellent
Deep Ensembles	45.8	0.89	18.7	78	Good
Bayesian Neural Networks	127.5	2.34	12.8	82	Fair
Variational Inference	89.3	1.45	8.9	75	Good
Spatial Uncertainty Network	67.2	0.41	6.7	71	Good

Deep Ensembles required highest memory usage due to multiple model storage but offered excellent parallelization opportunities. Bayesian Neural Networks showed longest training times due to MCMC sampling requirements but provided highest quality uncertainty estimates.

The SUN method achieved optimal balance between computational efficiency and uncertainty quality, making it suitable for operational deployment in large-scale soil mapping applications.

Economic Impact of Uncertainty-Informed Decisions

Economic analysis demonstrated significant value from uncertainty-informed management decisions. Precision fertilizer application guided by uncertainty estimates improved profitability by 12-18% compared to deterministic predictions through reduced over-application and optimized input timing.

Risk assessment scenarios showed that uncertainty information enabled farmers to avoid costly over-treatment in low-confidence areas while ensuring adequate inputs in high-confidence regions. Total input cost reductions of 8-15% were achieved while maintaining or improving yield outcomes.

Environmental benefits included 22% reduction in excess nitrogen application and associated leaching risks. Uncertainty-guided management strategies supported more sustainable agricultural practices through evidence-based decision-making.

Discussion

The superior performance of the Spatial Uncertainty Network demonstrates the importance of incorporating spatial dependencies in uncertainty quantification for geographic applications. Traditional methods that assume spatial independence fail to capture the complex spatial relationships inherent in soil systems, leading to suboptimal uncertainty estimates. The SUN method's ability to model spatial autocorrelation in uncertainty patterns provides more realistic and useful uncertainty information for decision-making.

The excellent calibration achieved across all uncertainty quantification methods indicates that modern deep learning approaches can provide trustworthy uncertainty estimates for soil mapping applications. The PICP values exceeding 90% for most methods suggest that practitioners can rely on these uncertainty estimates for risk assessment and decision support. However, the systematic differences in calibration quality highlight the importance of method selection based on specific application requirements.

The spatial patterns in prediction uncertainty provide valuable insights for adaptive sampling strategies and precision agriculture applications. The strong relationship between sampling density and uncertainty levels confirms the importance of adequate ground truth data for reliable predictions. The identification of high-uncertainty regions enables targeted additional sampling to improve map quality where it matters most for management decisions.

The temporal stability of uncertainty estimates over three years provides confidence in the long-term reliability of these methods for operational soil mapping systems. The modest seasonal variations suggest that uncertainty estimates remain valid across different environmental conditions, though periodic recalibration may be beneficial for optimal performance.

The computational efficiency analysis reveals important trade-offs between uncertainty quality and operational feasibility. While full Bayesian approaches provide the highest quality uncertainty estimates, their computational requirements may limit practical deployment. The SUN method provides an optimal balance for operational applications, achieving high-quality uncertainty estimates with reasonable computational demands.

The economic analysis demonstrates clear value propositions for uncertainty quantification in precision agriculture. The 12-18% profitability improvements justify the additional computational costs of uncertainty estimation, while environmental benefits support sustainability goals. The ability to optimize input applications based on prediction confidence enables more efficient resource use and reduced environmental impact.

Conclusion

This comprehensive study establishes practical frameworks for implementing uncertainty quantification in AI-predicted soil maps, with the Spatial Uncertainty Network emerging as the optimal approach for operational applications. The method achieves excellent calibration (PICP >92% across soil properties) while maintaining computational efficiency suitable for large-scale deployment.

The systematic analysis of spatial patterns in prediction uncertainty provides valuable guidance for adaptive sampling strategies and precision agriculture applications. The strong relationships between uncertainty levels and landscape characteristics enable informed decision-making about where additional ground truth data would be most valuable for improving map quality.

The demonstrated economic value of uncertainty-informed management decisions (12-18% profitability improvement) provides compelling justification for implementing uncertainty quantification in operational soil mapping systems. The ability to optimize input applications based on prediction confidence supports both economic and environmental sustainability goals.

The temporal stability of uncertainty estimates over three years confirms the reliability of these methods for long-term applications, while the computational efficiency analysis provides practical guidance for method selection based on specific operational requirements and constraints.

Future research should focus on extending uncertainty quantification to multi-temporal soil monitoring applications, developing user-friendly visualization tools for uncertainty communication, and integrating uncertainty estimates with economic optimization models for precision agriculture decision support. The incorporation of process-based knowledge into uncertainty estimation frameworks could further improve the physical realism and interpretability of uncertainty estimates.

The findings provide a solid foundation for implementing uncertainty quantification in operational digital soil mapping systems, enabling evidence-based decision-making and supporting the transition toward more sustainable and efficient agricultural practices.

References

1. McBratney AB, Mendonça Santos ML, Minasny B. On digital soil mapping. Geoderma. 2003;117(1–2):3-52.
2. Goovaerts P. Geostatistical approaches for incorporating elevation into the spatial interpolation of rainfall. Journal of Hydrology. 2000;228(1–2):113-129.
3. Wadoux AMC, Minasny B, McBratney AB. Machine learning for digital soil mapping: applications, challenges and suggested solutions. Earth-Sci Rev. 2020;210:103359.
4. Heuvelink GBM, Brown JD, van Loon EE. A probabilistic framework for representing and simulating uncertain environmental variables. Int J Geogr Inf Sci. 2007;21(5):497-513.
5. Kiureghian AD, Ditlevsen O. Aleatory or epistemic? Does it matter? Struct Saf. 2009;31(2):105-112.
6. Gal Y, Ghahramani Z. Dropout as a Bayesian approximation: representing model uncertainty in deep learning. Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning. 2016;48:1050-1059.
7. Kendall A, Gal Y. What uncertainties do we need in Bayesian deep learning for computer vision? Adv Neural Inf Process Syst. 2017;30:5574–5584.
8. Lakshminarayanan B, Pritzel A, Blundell C. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. Adv Neural Inf Process Syst. 2017;30:6402–6413.
9. Blundell C, Cornebise J, Kavukcuoglu K, Wierstra D. Weight uncertainty in neural network. Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning. 2015;37:1613–1622.
10. Hengl T, Heuvelink GB, Rossiter DG. About regression-kriging: from equations to case studies. Comput Geosci. 2007;33(10):1301–1315.
11. Gneiting T, Balabdaoui F, Raftery AE. Probabilistic forecasts, calibration and sharpness. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol. 2007;69(2):243–268.
12. Spiegelhalter D, Pearson M, Short I. Visualizing uncertainty about the future. Science. 2011;333(6048):1393–1400.
13. Padarian J, Minasny B, McBratney AB. Machine learning and soil sciences: a review aided by machine learning tools. Soil. 2020;6(1):35–52.