



Interactive comment on “Climate change, growing season water deficit and vegetation activity along the north-south transect of Eastern China from 1982 through 2006” by P. Sun et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 August 2012

Your manuscript links long-term (1982–2006) hydroclimatology data with remotely sensed vegetation data for a north-south transect in eastern China. While you have attempted to draw some fundamental relationships, which is to be applauded, by: (i) using a sub-optimal formulation of potential evapotranspiration; (ii) not accounting for water-storage carry-over at the start of the growing seasons or stream flow during the growing season; (iii) providing little discussion of the difference between climate change and climate variability; and (iv) not providing a theoretical background, this means my recommendation is that a major revision is needed. Some new analysis is needed and the structure of the manuscript, in my opinion, needs to be improved.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Using the same sub-headings for your Methods, Results and Discussions sections as the scientific objectives / questions that you ask will greatly improve your manuscript. I look forward to seeing a much improved next version.

1) Introduction. The current introduction is a pedestrian; it needs to be rewritten to be much more compelling. Why should a reader spend the time reading and learning from your manuscript? Currently there are many facts provided, however it is difficult to distil the key scientific question that is going to be asked and how previous papers provide the impetus (or spring-board) for your current study. In my opinion there is a little too much discussion about remote sensing re-visit rates and not enough discussion about the science question(s) being addressed in your manuscript.

2) Mini-review. I would like to see a tabular mini-review of methods, findings and implications of previous similar papers that have been conducted over the world. Providing this in the Introduction provides a global context which your results can then be discussed in the Discussion section.

3) Structure: I would much prefer to see the following used as the basis for your manuscript. 1. Introduction – finish this section with the 3-4 questions / objectives / hypothesis that form the backbone of your m/s 2. Materials – have as many sub-headings as you need in this section to introduce all the datasets that you use 3. Methods – this has 3-4 sub-headings which directly relate the questions / objectives reported at the end of your Introduction 4. Results – this has the 3-4 sub-headings which directly relate the questions / objectives reported at the end of your Introduction 5. Discussion – again this has the 3-4 sub-headings which directly relate the questions / objectives reported at the end of your Introduction 6. Conclusion

Re-structuring your manuscript in this manner will improve the accessibility and clarify of your analysis and thinking.

4) P6651 L2, why must be a change in form or function, why not form and/or function?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



5) P6651 L5, if warming were occurring in isolation then yes in conditions that are not water-limited we would expect actual evapotranspiration (ETa) to increase. HOWEVER, atmospheric demand, as measured by declining rates of pan evaporation (Epan), has been reducing in many locations over the past few decades. Please see McVicar et al., (2012a); their Table 5. You need to discuss the trends in the 4 meteorological variables that influence the evaporative process. The impact of changes in atmospheric evaporative demand varies depending on the limit to ETa: being energy-limited (EL), water-limited (WL) or equitant (straddling the EL-WL limit); please see McVicar et al., (2012b and the references therein) for a discussion of this concept.

McVicar, T.R., Roderick, M.L., Donohue, R.J., Li, L.T., Van Niel, T.G., Thomas, A., Grieser, J., Jhajharia, D., Himri, Y., Mahowald, N.M., Mescherskaya, A.V., Kruger, A.C., Rehman, S., and Dinpashoh, Y. (2012a) Global review and synthesis of trends in observed terrestrial near-surface wind speeds: Implications for evaporation. *Journal of Hydrology*. 416-417, 182-205, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.10.024

McVicar, T.R., Roderick, M.L., Donohue, R.J. and Van Niel, T.G. (2012b) Less bluster ahead? Overlooked ecohydrological implications of global trends of terrestrial near-surface wind speeds. *Ecohydrology* (Accepted) doi: 10.1002/eco.1298.

6) P6651 L20, in a water-limited case, yes then precipitation (P) trends will have the largest impact on vegetation trends. However, in an energy-limited case, then it would likely be changes in radiation (and other forms of energy input) that the environment will respond to. Along this vein, I am surprised that the following paper is not referenced herein.

Nemani RR, Keeling CD, Hashimoto H et al. (2003) Climate driven increases in global terrestrial net primary production from 1982 to 1999. *Science*, 300, 1560–1563.

7) P6652 L5, some papers need to be cited at the end of this sentence, there are several to select including

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Donohue, R.J., McVicar, T.R. and Roderick, M.L. (2009) Climate-related changes in Australian vegetation cover as inferred from satellite observations for 1981-2006. *Global Change Biology*. 15(4), 1025-1039.

Goetz SJ, Bunn AG, Fiske GJ, Houghton RA (2005) Satellite observed photosynthetic trends across boreal North America associated with climate and fire disturbance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 13521–13525.

Myneni RB, Keeling CD, Tucker CJ, Asrar G, Nemani RR (1997) Increased plant growth in the northern high latitudes from 1981 to 1991. *Nature*, 386, 698–702.

Tucker CJ, Slayback DA, Pinzon JE, Los SO, Myneni RB, Taylor MG (2001) Higher northern latitude Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and growing season trends from 1982 to 1999. *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 45, 184–190.

8) P6652 L15, does ET here mean actual evapotranspiration (ET_a) or potential evapotranspiration (ET_p)? It is good to explicitly define these terms and use the abbreviations accordingly.

9) P6653 L27, potential susceptibility to what? Is this to climate change? Is this the case then I am wondering how you isolate climate change (CC) from climate variability (CV) in your analysis. I look forward to seeing how this is performed.

10) P6654 L7, as explained in McVicar et al., (2012b Figure 1 caption), the units should be depth integrated over time (units = mm a⁻¹). This is why trends in P, ET_a, ET_p and Epan should have the units of mm a⁻². For a plot from which the trend can be calculated the abscissa (or X-axis) data are years (units = annum or a) and the ordinate (or Y-axis) data are depth integrated over time (units = mm a⁻¹), so the resultant slope (i.e. dY/dX) has units of mm a⁻².

11) P6655, L11, the widespread use and theoretical basis of ANUSPLIN are documented in the Supplementary Material of McVicar et al (2010).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



McVicar, T.R., Van Niel, T.G., Roderick, M.L., Li, L.T., Mo, X.G., Zimmermann, N.E. and Schmatz, D.R. (2010) Observational evidence from two mountainous regions that near-surface wind speeds are declining more rapidly at higher elevations than lower elevations: 1960-2006. *Geophysical Research Letters*. 37, L06402, doi:10.1029/2009GL042255

11a) P6655, L24, there are several long-term AVHRR datasets that are processed in different approaches, hence it would be savvy to defend your decision to use the GIMMS processed AVHRR data based on the findings of Beck et al (2011).

Beck, H.E., McVicar, T.R., Van Dijk, A.I.J.M., Schellekens, J., de Jeu, R.A.M. and Bruijnzeel, L.A. (2011) Global evaluation of four AVHRR-NDVI data-sets: Intercomparison and assessment against Landsat imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 115(10), 2547-2563, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2011.05.012

12) P6655 L15 and Table 1. It seems that the climate surfaces are at a monthly time-step (P6655 L15), yet the current static the start-date and end-date of the growing seasons for the 12 vegetation classes are defined with a daily time-step (Table 1). How is this important difference resolved?

13) P6656 L20 and Table 1, RE Growing season variability and trend. You are using data from 1982 to 2006, yet in Table 1 the start-date and end-date of the growing seasons for the 12 vegetation classes are defined with no measure of variance around them. I would have expected that due to both climate variability and climate change that there would be different start-dates and end-dates throughout the entire series, yet it seems these dates are fixed. Please perform some additional analysis showing the series of the start-date and end-date for each of the 12 vegetation classes, illustrating the variance and the trend.

14) P6657 L3, I think you mean near-surface air temperature (T_{air}) which is typically observed at a height of 2 m above the ground-level, as opposed to the surface temperature (T_s).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



15) P6657 Section 2.3, based on the results presented in McVicar et al (2012a Table 7 and the references therein) you need to discuss and use a formulation of ET_p that explicitly accounts for trends in the 4 meteorological variables that influence the evaporative process. In China, and elsewhere, as seen in the Attribution studies reviewed there (i.e., McVicar et al 2012a Table 7) the clear importance of wind speed trends on the evaporative process is clearly seen; it can not nor should not be implied that wind speed can be assumed to be non-trending. You defend your choice of ET_p formulation based on its use in the humid forests of the eastern US, yet you are dealing with 12 vegetation classes that are not all forested (Table 1) and are not all in locations that the climate could be described as being ‘energy limited’.

15a) P6657 Section 2.3, Plus I assume that h is the actual hours of sunshine (what would be lower case n in the Angstrom–Prescott equation) compared to the theoretical total sunshine hours (if there were no cloud – the upper case N in the Angstrom–Prescott equation).

16) P6657 Budyko method (L21–24). As an introductory background to Budyko’s framework, explicitly discussing the spatial and temporal aspects, you should read and consider citing Donohue et al (2007). The paper by Zhang et al. (2001) did not discuss rainfall seasonality. The following papers do discuss rainfall seasonality (Donohue et al 2012 and Zhang et al 2008). Recently Donohue et al (2012) developed the Budyko–Choudhury–Porporato (or BCP, model) to better model ET_a than can be done using Choudhury’s formulation of Budyko. The BCP model provides estimates of n (used in Choudhury’s formulation of Budyko, this is a catchment-specific model parameter that alters the partitioning of P between stream flow (Q) and ET_a – which is estimated as a function of plant-available soil water holding capacity (j), mean storm depth (a) and effective rooting depth (Ze). It could be worthwhile to use the BCP model to estimate steady state ET_a . If you use the Zhang et al. (2001) formulation for modelling steady state ET_a then where did you obtain the fractions of landscapes that were non-forest compared to forest for each of the 12 vegetation classes?

Donohue, R.J., Roderick, M.L. and McVicar, T.R. (2012) Roots, storms and soil pores: Incorporating key ecohydrological processes into Budyko's hydroclimatic framework. *Journal of Hydrology* 436–437, 35–50. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.02.033

Donohue, R.J., Roderick, M.L. and McVicar, T.R. (2007) On the importance of including vegetation dynamics in Budyko's hydrological model. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*. 11(2), 983–995.

Zhang L, Potter N, Hickel K, Zhang YQ, Shao QX. 2008. Water balance modeling over variable time scales based on the Budyko framework—model development and testing. *Journal of Hydrology* 360(1–4): 117–131.

16) P6658, Section 2.5 Growing season water deficit index (GWDI). The formulation of GWDI assumes: (1) there is no carry-over of water from the non-growing-season that impacts growth during the growing-season; (2) there is no carry-over of water from the previous year(s) that impacts growth during the growing-season (Richard et al 2006); and (3) there is negligible streamflow generated from the area during the growing season. These are implied assumptions that need to be explicitly stated. For the 12 vegetation classes for each year you need to calculate what proportion (or percentage) of annual precipitation is received during the growing season; I envisage a new 12-part figure with time on the X-axis (1982–2006) and the Y-axis being the proportion (or percentage) of annual precipitation is received during the growing season. Also on this plot you may wish to show the actual annual precipitation as a second (or right hand side) Y-axis so that readers can better appreciate the climate variability experienced by the 12 vegetation classes. While you could use a static growing season as the basis for this proportion of annual precipitation calculation I would prefer using a dynamic growing season definition to account for CV and CC in all your revised calculations. Most likely, being in eastern China, which is dominated by the summer monsoon, this will be in the order of 60–80%. However, if there was a growing season with large rainfall (and hence lots of clouds and low temperatures so therefore a low ETp) this would result in a high GWDI, yet lateral water loss from the area is ignored. It is important for you

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



to note this method would not be suitable for Mediterranean climates (most P in winter and most growth in summer), as the volume of the soil-store that carries over the winter to the following summer is critical for growth. This means that the current formulation of the GWDI is not globally applicable, and to be globally applicable a suitable time-step water balance model would need to be run in the background to define this carry-over.

Richard, Y., N. Martiny, N. Fauchereau, C. Reason, M. Rouault, N. Vigaud, and Y. Tracol (2008), Interannual memory effects for spring NDVI in semi-arid South Africa, *Geophysical Research Letters*., 35, L13704, doi:10.1029/2008GL034119.

16a) P6658, L8, what does the statement 'sound water status' mean?

16b) P6658, L10-11, how vegetation responds to a continuing water stress will be community, to species, specific. How a landscape responds to drought depends on the many factors, and you should consider that most of the communities will have experienced similar droughts in the paleo-record and hence I don't agree that you can state that a $GWDI > 1$ indicates increased susceptibility to environmental change, as you are ignoring the carry-over of water stores into the growing season. These (usually) deeper water resources (in the soil and groundwater systems) are typically what has allowed vegetation communities to withstand previous drought conditions. To successfully argue that $GWDI > 1$ indicates increased susceptibility to environmental change you need to develop / refer to a conceptual model that has a suitable time-frame for the analysis you undertake and is hydrologically balanced. Considering the temporal extent of your analysis is of paramount importance here, especially for forests, as you are dealing with ~25 years of data and the ecohydrological equilibrium concepts you use are relevant for a longer time-frame for deeper rooted forests. It is all a matter of signal-to-noise given longer term trends.

17) Figure 2. Can you please make this a 6-part figure and show the baseline 1982 surfaces (from which the percentages changes are calculated from) in addition to the 3 percentages changes already provided. It's interesting to me that in the NE part of

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the transect precipitation has decreased (Fig 2b) yet Ti-NDVIg has increased (Fig 2c), and this pattern is essentially reversed for the area of large P increase in the southern part transect (i.e., near Hunan Province and Jiangxi Province).

18) Fig 3a, why do you expect that vegetation types SEBF and STG have such low correlation coefficients between Ti-NDVIg and MGP? IN Fig 3b what is going on for vegetation type TGS?

19) P6662, L20-24, does this mean its climate change or climate variability?

20) Fig 5, for many of the vegetation types there appears to be an increasing GWDI as a function of time. It would be to display the equation of the line-of-best-fit on each of these plots. However, this could be an artefact of the use of your formulation of ETp and/or the natural climate variability in eastern China.

21) Fig 6a. This hyperbolic relationship is due to how the Budyko framework models ETa which is then used in your model of GWDI. If you algebraically relate the Budyko framework with you model of GWDI you will derive an equation for GWDI that follows fits these data. This is an entirely expected result.

22) Fig 6b. Why would you expect the slope coefficients between AGDD and GWDI for the temperate regions to be higher than those for the cold temperate and subtropical vegetation types? What is the ecohydrological driver of this result? Is Tair increasing more rapidly in where the temperate vegetation types are located when compared to Tair where the cold temperate and subtropical vegetation types are located? Or it is due to changes in P and Tair, I am also curious about trends in other meteorological variables that govern the evaporative process.

23) Fig 7. The use of $Ti-NDVIg < 3.2$ can also be used for long-term averages, as you have done. It can not be used on an annual time-step; you need to explicitly state this.

24) P6664, L3, who made these 'previous assertions'? Or where they findings based on data analysis or assertions based on reasoning?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



25) P6664, L15-16, suggest that part of the dramatic ET_p increase reported is due to using a sub-optimal formulation of ET_p. By sub-optimal I mean one that does not capture the trends of all the primary meteorological variables influencing the physics of evaporation rates.

26) P6664, L16, I can understand what ET_g is from Table 5 (noting I think this should be ET_{a_g} (so it can never be confused with ET_{p_g}) yet I do not think this symbol ET_g is ever defined in your text. All symbols / abbreviations need to be defined in the body of your paper (the abstract should be considered a separate document).

27) P6664, L18-27, you seem to be reporting your results (so this text seems more suited to the results sections).

28) Discussion – the text in the Discussion needs more work; it seems that the wind has gone out of your sails RE the quality of the English expression. This needs to be improved.

29) P6665, L1, why obviously only a result of warming? Concentrations of CO₂ are increasing (or enhanced, herein denoted eCO₂) so this could also be a partial cause for this response. There is some literature suggesting that eCO₂ will impact preferentially impact woody species (or species with a C₃ photosynthetic pathway compared to those with a C₄ photosynthetic pathway). Please see Donohue et al (2009 and the references therein) for more discussion on this issue. As your study did not consider eCO₂ there is no way you can scientifically discount this as a potential (likely partial) cause for this response.

30) P6666, L1-3, this is the end of an important paragraph. Currently, the majority of this paragraph summaries results and then ends with one sentence, with no citations to previous research, discussing the scientific implications of the findings. This needs to be improved; the broader scientific discussion of your findings needs to be better placed in the scientific framework for understanding how ecohydrological equilibrium may be impacted by a changing climate.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



31) P6666, L14, what you are saying that Tair has increased steadily in China directly contradicts the results presented in Liu et al (2011 Table S4 – the Supplementary Material Table S4). In that Table for the entire nation, and 8 sub-regions, they show that the rate of Tair increase has accelerated from the early 1990s to 2007 when compared to the period defined by 1960 to the early 1990s. As you are dealing with a shorter time period this could be an explanation for your result of assumed linearity during 1982–2006, however, I am unaware that you actually tested for a break-point spatially in the Tair grid time series. It is imperative that you do so.

Liu XM, Luo YZ, Zhang D, Zhang MH, Liu CM. 2011. Recent changes in pan-evaporation dynamics in China. *Geophysical Research Letters* 38: L13404. DOI: 10.1029/2011GL047929.

32) P6667, L5–9. I suggest the findings of Martiny et al (2006) can be placed in a water-limited (i.e., where annual P is between 200 mm / a and 600 mm / a) where there is a linear increase with increasing annual P amounts, and energy-limited (or actually some other limitation) when P is greater than 600 mm / a.

33) P6667, L18, what is the basis for this speculation? You need to expand this suggesting a mechanism (or process) that others could test. This is an ideal opportunity to reveal your process knowledge and you must perform scientific discussion in the Discussion section.

34) Section 4.4, Due to previous concerns I do agree with the founding basis for your concept of ecosystem susceptibility. In an earlier section(s) of the paper you need to be more emphasis placed on the theoretical or conceptual framework supporting (or underpinning) this concept. Please consider adding a section entitled ‘Background Theory’ directly after your Introduction section where describe the theoretically framework you are using to interpret the data in.

35) Also note it is the Conclusion section not the Conclusions section, just as your Introduction section is singular and you introduce more than one idea, so your Conclu-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



sion section should be singular and again you can report multiple ideas. I know it's a bit of an 'old-school' comment; however the details are important.

36) Tables 2, 3 and 4. The results for the 12months should be listed under a heading of monthly, not seasonally, as there are usually only 4 seasons used in most (not all) environmental scientific literature. Plus for all these tables you need to say what the units are in the table caption; providing this information will greatly assist readers.

37) Table 5, please also provide units in the caption.

While there is some more work to do improving your m/s so that it meets HESS standards, you have a very interesting and informative paper. Given this, I look forward to seeing the revised manuscript, which I hope will be much improved and therefore likely that I will recommend acceptance into HESS.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 6649, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

