Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 16 November 2016

General Comments:

This manuscript investigated the water footprint of crop production for different crop structures in the HSP based on the statistics data of crop yield, crop acreage, fertilization and water withdrawal in 2012. The water footprint was decomposed into blue water footprint, green water footprint, and grey water footprint. Eight different crop structure planning scenarios were used for the assessment of water footprint for different crop structure. Although in my opinion the subject of research is interesting and may be helpful for the water resource management in the HSP, there are several important issues need to be addressed. So I recommend a major revision. Major points:

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's comments. After our careful modification for more than two months, we resubmitted the manuscript. The responses of the comments are as follows,

1. The language of the manuscript needs to be improved, since some sentences are too long and not well expressed. I would suggest the manuscript refined by a native speaker.

Response: We invited an Elsevier editorial company to modify this manuscript, and the proof file was attached.

2. In my opinion, the result in section 3 is rather brief, which is not robust enough for the publication in this high-quality journal. The study of water footprint for only one year (2012) is obviously lack of persuasion. I suggest extending the length of time series (such as 5 or 10 years) to compare the interannual variability of water footprint in the HSP.

Response: This advice is good, we have extended the time series from 2000 to 2012 and analyzed the temporal variability of WF in the HSP. Over the past 13 years (2000-2012), the total WF of crop production in the HSP was 604.8 km^3, comprised of 288.5 km^3 WFblue, 141.3 km^3 WFgreen and 175.0 km^3 WFgray, and decreased by 22% (from 53.7 km^3 to 41.8 km^3), 26% (from 26.5 km^3 to 19.7 km^3), 14% (from 11.7 km^3 to 10.1 km^3), and 23% (from 15.5 km^3 to 12.0 km^3), respectively, from 2000 to 2012 (Fig. 3). The main reasons for the downtrend of the WF was due to the urbanization of farmland and the decrease of the winter wheat planting area. In addition, the total WFblue of these crops was approximately twice the amount of the total WFgreen, and the total WFgray was slightly more than the total WFgreen.

3. The scenarios setting of crop structure has a large impact on the results. Why choose eight scenarios rather than ten scenarios in this study? My question is whether or not these eight scenarios represent all possibilities of the crop structure. In addition, why cotton and peanut are not involved in the scenarios setting (Table 2)? Do they show little impact on water footprint in the HSP? Please clarify it.

Response: Good question. Taking into consideration the crop structure change from 2000 to 2012, the high ground-water usage for rice and winter wheat per unit and the local residents' pasta-based diet, eight different crop structure planning scenarios were formulated with the cotton, peanut and side-crops cultivating areas unchanged.

4. The conclusion (section 5) is too simple and less appealing to the readers. Please re-organize this part to highlight your innovation and new findings.

Response: The conclusion was modified and summarized the findings of this study. "This study analyzed the WF of crop production in the HSP and evaluated its temporal variation from 2000 to 2012. Over 13 years, the production of main crops consumed a total of approximately 604.8 km^3 of water, of which 288.5 km^3 of that was groundwater; additionally, the WF of the production of crops exhibited a downtrend yearly. Among the local main crops, winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables were the three leading crops in water consumption; their WF, WFblue, WFgreen and WFgray accounted for 76.2%, 73.7%, 74.2% and 81.6% of the total, respectively.

In this region, adjusting crop farming structures has been an important means to protect groundwater resources; therefore, we evaluated reasonable farming structures by analyzing scenarios of the main crops' WF in this plain and suggest that: scenario 6with approximately 20% of the arable land in cultivation of winter wheat-summer maize in rotation, 40% of spring maize, 10% of vegetables, 10% of fruiters, 0% of rice and no change to other crops, will promote the sustainable development of agriculture in this region. This scenario, not only can protect approximately 14.5% of groundwater resources (compared to the baseline), but can also ensure the local supply of wheat, vegetables, and fruits."

Specific Comments:

Page 2, line 30: "has becoming. . ." should be "has become. . ."

Response: Ok.

Page 2, line 44: what is the meaning of "As s metric. . ."?

Response: Metric should be "method".

Page 3, line 60: please give the full name of "HSP", since it first appeared in the introduction of the paper.

Page 3, line 77: "are located in . . .." » "is located in . . .."

Page 4, line 80: it is better to use "from July to September"

Response: The above problems were modified.

Page 4, line 88: please check the number of weather stations in Figure 1. It seems to me that only 22-23 stations can be found. Please add the id number to the stations in Figure 1.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's carefulness, the weather stations is 21 in figure 1.

Page 7, line 138: please move the sentence "ETc is crop actual evapotranspiration (mm)" to the front of the sentence "Pe is the effective . . .."

Page 10, line 204: please change to "indicated that vegetables and winter wheat. . .."

Response: We corrected line 138 and 204, thanks a lot.

Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 23 January 2017

This is an interesting manuscript, and the discussion of the water footprint of each kind of crops is beneficial to design the current crop structure to save agricultural water consumption. In my opinion, it can be accepted after moderate revision. The specific comments are below:

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's comments. We resubmitted the manuscript after our careful modification. The responses of the comments are as follows,

1. The newly published papers as reference should be added, the newest papers are 2015 papers in the reference list.

Response: Ok, we have added some newest papers, which were published in 2015 and 2016.

2. The conclusions should be enriched according to the research aims given at the end of the discussion section. The research result of the first aim is missing, and should be added in the conclusion section.

Response: Good idea, we modified the discussion section further and summarized the findings of this study. "This study analyzed the WF of crop production in the HSP and evaluated its temporal variation from 2000 to 2012. Over 13 years, the production of main crops consumed a total of approximately 604.8 km^3 of water, of which 288.5 km^3 of that was groundwater; additionally, the WF of the production of crops exhibited a downtrend yearly. Among the local main crops, winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables were the three leading crops in water consumption; their WF, WFblue, WFgreen and WFgray accounted for 76.2%, 73.7%, 74.2% and 81.6% of the total, respectively.

In this region, adjusting crop farming structures has been an important means to protect groundwater resources; therefore, we evaluated reasonable farming structures by analyzing scenarios of the main crops' WF in this plain and suggest that: scenario 6with approximately 20% of the arable land in cultivation of winter wheat-summer maize in rotation, 40% of spring maize, 10% of vegetables, 10% of fruiters, 0% of rice and no change to other crops, will promote the sustainable development of agriculture in this region. This scenario, not only can protect approximately 14.5% of groundwater resources (compared to the baseline), but can also ensure the local supply of wheat, vegetables, and fruits."

3. The authors gave eight scenarios, why? The authors should give the reason to give eight scenarios.

Response: Reasonable question. Taking into consideration the crop structure change from 2000 to 2012, the high ground-water usage for rice and winter wheat per unit and the local residents' pasta-based diet, eight different crop structure planning scenarios were formulated with the cotton, peanut and side-crops cultivating areas unchanged.

4. In the discussion section, that 4.3 the main shortcomings of this study is just uncertainties of the results, not shortcoming, so the title should C1 HESSD Interactive comment Printer-friendly version Discussion paper be corrected.

Response: Ok.

5. The authors discussed the water footprint for specific crop types. However, I cannot find the data source of water consumptions of each type of crop in “2.2 data source” section. It should be given.

Response: The water consumption of each crop was calculated by the WF equations, and WF can reflect the water consumption. And the data of the structure of crops was added in this section.

Water footprint of crop production for different crop structures in the Hebei southern plain, North China

Yingmin Chu[a,b,c], Yanjun Shen[d], Zaijian Yuan[e*]

[a] School of Management, China University of Mining & Technology, Xuzhou 221116, Jiangsu, P.R.China;

[b] Guangdong Science and Technology Library, Guangzhou, 510070, P.R.China;

[c]College of Tourism, Hebei University of Economics & Business, Shijiazhuang 050018, Hebei, P.R.China;

[d] Center for Agricultural Resources Research, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shijiazhuang, Hebei 050021, P. R. China;

[e] Guangdong Key Laboratory of Agricultural Environmental Pollution Integrated Control, *Guangdong Institute of Eco-environment Technology, Guangzhou, 510650, P. R. China*

** Corresponding author. Tel: +86 13722793672 E-mail address: selfsurpass@163.com*

Abstract

The North China Plain (NCP) ~~is~~ has serious ~~lack~~ shortage of fresh water resources, ~~while~~ and crop production consumes~~d~~ approximately~~about~~ 75% of the region's water. To estimate water consumption of different crops and crop structures in the NCP, the Hebei southern plain (HSP) was selected as a study area, as~~because~~ it is a typical region of groundwater overdraft in the NCP. In this study, the water footprint (WF) of crop production, ~~was being used which was consisted~~ comprised of green, blue and grey ~~components~~water footprints, and its annual variation was analyzed. The results ~~showed~~demonstrated the following: (1) the WF from the~~of the main crops~~ production of main crops was ~~about 4~~51.8~~0~~ km^3 in 2012~~ and w~~. Winter wheat, summer maize ~~vegetables~~ and vegetables ~~summer maize~~ were ~~in~~ the top ~~three leading among the main~~water-consuming crops in the HSP~~, while t~~. The water footprint intensity (WFI) of cotton was the largest, and for vegetables, it was ~~were~~ the smallest; (2) The total WF, WFblue, WFgreen and WFgray for 13 years (2000-2012) of crops production were 604.8 km^3, 288.5 km^3, 141.3 km^3 and 175.0 km^3, respectively, with an annual downtrend from 2000 to 2012; (3) W~~w~~inter wheat, summer maize and vegetables consumed the ~~main~~ most groundwater, and their blue water footprint (WFblue) accounted for ~~66~~74.2~~0~~% of the

带格式的：上标
带格式的：上标
带格式的：上标
带格式的：上标

total WFblue in the HSP; (~~3~~4) ~~the~~ The crop structure scenarios analysis indicated that, with ~~about~~ approximately 20% of arable land ~~cultivating~~ cultivated with winter wheat-summer maize in rotation, 40% spring maize, 10% vegetables and 10% fruiters, ~~can promote the~~a sustainable utilization of groundwater resources can be promoted, ~~at the same time can ensure~~and a sufficient supply of food, including vegetables and fruits, can be ensured in the HSP.

Keywords: ~~The~~ Hebei southern plain; water footprint; crop production; crop structure; scenario analysis

1 Introduction

~~With the~~Due to excessive ~~consumption~~ water usage~~of water by people~~, freshwater scarcity has becoming a threat to human society (Dong et al., 2013). ~~In the w~~Worldwide, the largest freshwater consumer is agriculture, ~~which consumed~~ consuming more than 70% of the world's freshwater (UNEP, 2007; Lucrezia et al., 2014). Water resources have been heavily exploited by agriculture worldwide (Konar et al., 2011) and t~~T~~o ensure the increasing food demand, global water consumption ~~have~~ has almost doubled during the past 40 years (Gleick, 2003), and~~ water resources have been heavily exploited for worldwide agriculture (Konar et al., 2011)~~. ~~In f~~Future~~,~~ water use for food production will continue to ~~meet the~~be influenced by population growth and changes in dietary preferences (Rosegrant and Ringler, 2000)~~. This~~, which will lead to the consumption~~e~~ of more water resources. China is a freshwater-~~-~~poor country with ~~about~~ approximately 2100 m^3/y of water resources per capita, accounting for only 28% of the world's per capita share. The spatial mismatch between water and arable land ~~strengthened~~ reinforces China's water challenge. ~~There is a~~About 70% arable land in the north of the Yangtze River ~~with~~ contains only ~~about~~ approximately 17% of the national total water resources~~ of the national total in China~~. Due to the c~~C~~urrent~~ly, as a~~ water shortage in the area north of the Yangtze River, the NCP is facing~~ the acutest~~ its most severe water scarcity issue~~, –~~. The NCP presently contains~~accounting for~~ only 1.3% of China's total available water with 225 m^3/y per capita (White et al., 2015).

As ~~s~~ a method~~ric~~ to assess the water use of ~~the~~ production systems, the water footprint (WF) concept ~~has~~ was ~~been~~ proposed (Heokstra, 2003), which includes~~d~~ direct and indirect water usage~~e~~ of a consumer or producer (Hoekstra et al., 2009). In recent years, many researchers have used the WF to evaluate water use in agricultural production (Bocchiola et al., 2013;Chapagain and Hoekstra, 2011; Chapagain and Orr, 2009; Gheewala et al., 2014; Jefferies et al., 2012; Lamastra et al., 2014; Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2010, Shrestha et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2014; Zang et al.,2014; Wang et al., 2015; Suttayakul et al., 2016). The WF of crops reflects the water consumption of different crops, and ~~it~~ can ~~be~~ focused on local crop products. For ~~a certain~~each crop, the blue WF (WFblue) refers to the volume of irrigation water ~~consumption~~consumed, the green WF (WFgreen) is consistent with the effective rainfall for plants, and the grey WF (WFgrey) represents the volume of water required to dilute pollutants to the agreed maximum acceptable levels (Hoekstra and Chapagain, 2007). ~~For~~ Since the water consumption of each crop is different, the WF ~~of~~ for different crops ~~differ~~ varies greatly. Xu et al. (2014) analyzed the WF of six kinds of crops in Beijing from 1978 to 2012, and found maize accounts for 57% of the green WF and 46% of the grey WF~~ respectively~~, vegetables account for 45% of the blue WF, and wheat accounts for 26% of the total WF. Wang et al. (2015) found that winter wheat conserved ~~about~~ approximately 1.9× 10^9 m^3 yr^{-1} of WFblue ~~during~~ from 1998 to~~-~~2011 in the Hebei Plain.

The Hebei southern plain (HSP) was selected as the study area. It is located ~~at~~ in the northwest of the NCP ~~with about~~and has approximately 4.0 ×10^4 km^2 of arable land (accounting for ~~about~~ approximately 13% of the NCP and 3% of China's total)~~,~~.In 2008, the HSP ~~which~~ produced ~~about~~ approximately 2.7×10^{10} kg of grain ~~yield~~ (accounting for ~~about~~approximately 5% of China's total) ~~with~~ that had a water consumption ~~about~~approximately 3.0×10^{10} m^3~~ in 2008~~ (Yuan and Shen, 2013). The over-exploitation of groundwater in this region has had devastating consequences~~, with~~: the groundwater table ~~being~~ has decreased by more than 20 m within ~~recent~~ the past 30 years (Chen et al., 2003; Hu and Cheng, 2011). Because the WF of various crops is different and the crop structure of a region reflects the proportion of various crops growing ~~areas~~ within that~~a~~ region, the WF of the crop structure can illustrate the ~~whole~~ entire agricultural water consumption of ~~the~~ that region. ~~Study of the WF for crop structures can help to promote the sustainable utilization of water resources for agriculture in the water shortage area.~~ The study of the WF for crop structures can help promote the sustainable utilization of water resources for agriculture, and can be particularly valuable for areas facing water shortage.

The main aims of this study were: (1) to quantify the WF of production of main crops ~~production~~ in the HSP in 2012~~;~~ and (2) to discuss ~~the~~ a reasonable crop structure based on the WF analysis for different crop structure scenarios. ~~Through~~ In this study, we propose a ~~most~~ suitable crop planting structure for this region, and ~~give~~ support ~~to~~ the development and implementation of policies on agricultural water management.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study area

The Hebei southern plain (114º20'E-119º25'E, 36º03'N-39º56'N), with an area of ~~about~~approximately 62,000 km^2, are located in southern Beijing and Tianjin (Fig. 1). The climate in this region is temperate ~~continental~~ monsoon with a mean annual precipitation of 550 mm and a mean annual temperature of 11.5 ºC. Precipitation has a non-uniform distribution throughout the year, and ~~about~~approximately 80% of the total precipitation occurs from July through September. In the HSP, most arable lands are irrigated by groundwater except ~~for~~ in the eastern part where there is saline shallow groundwater ~~restrains the irrigation~~. The ~~main~~ primary crops in the plain are wheat, maize (including summer maize and spring maize), cotton, and peanut~~,~~; the main vegetable ~~species~~ crops are Chinese cabbage, celery, cauliflower, onion, bean, rape, leek, coriander, fennel, and the main fruits are apple, pear, jujube and grape.



Fig. 1 Location of the Hebei southern plain

2.2 Data collection

The meteorological data ~~for~~ from ~~25~~ 21 weather stations (Fig. 1) around the HSP, including daily maximum temperature, minimum temperature, average temperature, wind speed, relative humidity, precipitation, sunshine duration, vapor pressure, and atmospheric pressure, were obtained from the China Meteorological Data Sharing Service System (China Meteorological Administration, 2000-2012).

The statistics data for the plain in 2012, including crop yield, crop acreage and fertilization, were obtained from Hebei economic statistical yearbooks;~~,~~ and the data for water withdrawal were obtained from the water resources bulletins and relevant statistical yearbooks. The l~~L~~and-use map ~~in~~ of the HSP for 2012 (Fig. 2) ~~of the plain were~~was drawn based ~~on the~~off of spot satellite images and ~~the~~ a topographic map (1:10000). The main land-use types include cropland, ~~construction land~~urban, forestland, water~~s~~, orchard, wetland, grassland and shrub land (Table. 1).



Fig. 2 Land-use map of the Hebei southern plain

Table 1 Area of each land-use type and their ratios (%)

Land-use	Forestland	Shrub land	Grassland	Cropland	Orchard	Building land	Waters	Wetland	Total
Area(10^5 hm^2)	3.66	0.31	0.72	42.80	2.61	7.02	2.91	1.83	61.85
%	5.91	0.49	1.17	69.20	4.21	11.35	4.70	2.95	100

The crop structure data were produced based on remote sensing data for this study area from 2000 to 2012 (Table. 2), which included MODIS NDVI (MOD13Q1), Terra/MODIS (MOD12Q1), and Landsat TM/ETM with spatial resolutions of 250 m, 1000 m and 30 m, respectively. Pan et al. (2015) and Wang et al. (2015) presented the details of this method. Compared with 2000, the crop planting area changed considerably; specifically, the planting area of winter maize-summer maize decreased by 34.76%, rice decreased by 31.61%, spring maize increased by 34.13%, vegetables increased by 26.05%, and fruiters increased by 33.04%, while cotton, peanut and others had a slight change, and the total cultivated area in HSP decreased by 12.58% in 2012 (Table. 2).

Table 2 Planting areas (10^5 hm^2) for the main crops and their percent change

Year	Winter wheat-summer maize	Spring maize	Vegetables	Fruiters	Cotton	Peanut	Rice	Others	Total

2000	29.54	3.89	6.72	1.96	5.59	2.42	0.44	1.38	51.94
2001	25.20	3.67	7.46	2.05	5.15	2.69	0.49	1.54	48.23
2002	22.79	3.91	6.85	2.26	7.27	2.47	0.45	1.41	47.41
2003	24.40	3.76	7.09	2.03	2.82	3.26	0.39	1.87	45.63
2004	24.11	4.89	7.27	1.86	3.45	2.86	0.34	1.64	46.42
2005	24.64	3.40	7.20	2.15	5.04	2.59	0.31	1.48	46.82
2006	24.69	4.41	6.96	1.76	4.24	2.51	0.30	1.43	46.31
2007	22.37	5.25	6.89	2.14	6.99	2.48	0.45	1.42	48.00
2008	24.31	4.18	7.43	2.36	4.62	2.68	0.32	1.53	47.43
2009	25.19	3.64	7.25	2.25	3.74	2.61	0.31	1.49	46.49
2010	23.24	4.85	7.20	2.12	3.99	2.59	0.31	1.48	45.79
2011	20.65	4.36	7.54	1.94	5.74	2.72	0.33	1.55	44.83
2012	19.27	5.22	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0.30	1.43	45.41
Change	-34.76	34.13	26.05	33.04	0.39	2.64	-31.61	3.27	-12.58

2.3 Crop structure scenarios setting

The baseline for the crop structure (2012) in the HSP, consisted of 42.44% of winter wheat-summer maize rotation, 11.50% of spring maize, 18.65% of vegetables, 5.75% of fruiters, 12.35% of cotton, 5.51% of peanut, 0.66% of rice, and 3.15% of others (side crops i.e., millet, sorghum, sweet potato and others). Taking into consideration the crop structure change from 2000 to 2012, the high ground-water usage for rice and winter wheat per unit and the local residents' pasta-based diet, e~~E~~ight different crop structure planning scenarios were formulated ~~according to the main crops of the baseline~~ with the cotton, peanut and ~~side~~ side-crops cultivating~~g~~ areas unchanged (Table ~~2~~3). These scenarios involved reducing winter wheat-summer maize and rice cultivating area to 40% and 0% ~~separately~~respectively;~~,~~ and increasing spring maize cultivating area to 13.94% (scenario 1); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 30% and increasing spring maize to 23.94% (scenario 2); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 20% and increasing spring maize to 33.94% (scenario 3); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 10% and increasing spring maize to 43.94% (scenario 4); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 0 and increasing spring maize to 53.94% (scenarios 5); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 20% and increasing spring maize to 38.99%, and adjusting vegetables and fruiters to 10% (scenario 6); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 20%, ~~and~~ increasing spring maize to 28.99%, vegetables to 20% and fruiters to 10% (scenario 7); reducing winter wheat-summer maize to 20% ~~and~~, increasing spring maize to 28.99%, decreasing vegetables to 10% and increasing fruiters to 20% (scenario 8) .

Table ~~2~~ 3 Crop structure planning scenarios for the Hebei southern plain

Crop structure		Winter wheat-summer maize	Spring maize	Vegetables	Fruiters	Cotton	peanut	Rice	Others	Total
Baseline	Area(10^5 hm^2)	19.27	5.22	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0.30	1.43	45.41
	%	42.44	11.50	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0.66	3.15	100
Scenario 1	Area(10^5 hm^2)	18.16	6.33	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	40.00	13.94	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 2	Area(10^5 hm^2)	13.62	10.87	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	30.00	23.94	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 3	Area(10^5 hm^2)	9.08	15.41	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	20.00	33.94	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 4	Area(10^5 hm^2)	4.54	19.95	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	10.00	43.94	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 5	Area(10^5 hm^2)	0	24.49	8.47	2.61	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	0	53.94	18.65	5.75	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 6	Area(10^5 hm^2)	9.08	17.71	4.54	4.54	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	20.00	38.99	10.00	10.00	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 7	Area(10^5 hm^2)	9.08	13.16	9.08	4.54	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	20.00	28.99	20.00	10.00	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100
Scenario 8	Area(10^5 hm^2)	9.08	13.16	4.54	9.08	5.61	2.50	0	1.43	45.41
	%	20.00	28.99	10.00	20.00	12.35	5.51	0	3.15	100

2.4 *WF evaluation*

The WF of a crop production is the sum of the green, blue and grey ~~components~~ water footprints (Chapagain et al., 2006). The WF of ~~7~~ seven ~~main~~ primary type ~~kinds~~ of crops planted in the HSP is calculated separately:

$$WF = \sum_{a=1}^{n} WF_a \quad (1)$$

$$WF = WF_{blue} + WF_{green} + WF_{grey} \quad (2)$$

where WF is the total water footprint (m^3 yr^{-1}); WF_a is the water footprint of each type of crop in the Hebei plain; WF_{blue} is the blue water footprint (m^3 yr^{-1}); WF_{green} is the green water footprint (m^3 yr^{-1}), and WF_{grey} is the grey water footprint (m^3 yr^{-1}).

The WF intensity (*WFI*) of a crop production is evaluated by dividing *WF* with crop yield:

$$WFI_a = WF_a / Y_a \quad (3)$$

where WFI_a is the WF intensity of a certain crop (m^3 ton^{-1}) and Y_a is the yield of that kind of crop (ton).

~~Green~~ The green water footprint was represented by crop evaporation or effective rainfall:

$$WF_{blue} = 10 \times ET_{blue} \times A \quad (4)$$

$$WF_{green} = 10 \times ET_{green} \times A \tag{5}$$

$$ET_{blue} = \max\{0, ET_c - P_e\} \tag{6}$$

$$ET_{green} = \min\{P_e, ET_c\} \tag{7}$$

where ET_{blue} is the blue water evapotranspiration during the growth period of crops (mm); ET_{green} is green water evapotranspiration (mm); A is the acreage of the ~~calculating~~ calculated crop (hm^2) ; ET_c is the actual crop evapotranspiration (mm); P_e is the effective precipitation (mm), which can be calculated using the~~a~~ Soil Conservation Service Method developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)~~; ET_c is crop actual evapotranspiration (mm).~~.

$$P_e = \begin{cases} P \times (125 - 0.6P)/125 & P \le 250/3 \\ 125/3 + 0.1P & P > 250/3 \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where P is the precipitation (mm).

ET_c can be calculated based on the reference evapotranspiration (ET_0) which is estimated according to the FAO56-PM model (Allen et al., 1998);

$$ET_c = K_c \times ET_0 \tag{9}$$

$$ET_0 = \frac{0.408\Delta(R_n - G) + \gamma \dfrac{900}{T_{em} + 273} u_2 (e_s - e_a)}{\Delta + \gamma(1 + 0.34 u_2)} \tag{10}$$

where K_c is the crop coefficient, and the K_c of the crops was determined according to their growing stage (Duan, 2004); R_n is the net radiation at the vegetation surface (MJ m^{-2} d^{-1}); G is the soil heat flux density (MJ m^{-2} d^{-1}); T_{em} is the daily average temperature (ºC); u_2 is the wind speed at a 2 m height (m s^{-1}); e_s is the vapor pressure of the air at saturation (kPa); e_a is the actual vapor pressure (kPa); Δ is the slope of the vapor pressure curve (kPa $ºC^{-1}$); and γ is the psychrometric constant (kPa $ºC^{-1}$). A complete set of equations is proposed by Allen et al. (1998) to compute the variables in Eq. (10) according to available weather data and the time step computation, which constitute the FAO-PM method. G can be ignored for daily time step computations.

~~For~~ Due to a lack~~ing~~ of ~~accessed~~ accessible data, the grey WF of crops only ~~assimilate~~ assesses nitrogen contamination without considering the effect of pesticides and other fertilizers, ~~which~~ and was calculated ~~as~~ by the following equation (Hoekstra et al., 2009):

$$WF_{grey} = (\delta \times U_N \times 10^6) / \rho_0 \qquad (11)$$

where U_N is the applied amount of N fertilizer (ton). δ represents the leaching rate to freshwater with values 5-15% (Zhang and Zhang, 1998) and we use ambient water quality standard for nitrogen (10 mg L^{-1}) as the permissible concentration (ρ_0). Due to a lack of ~~accessed~~ accessible data, we ignored pesticides and other fertilizer~~here~~s.

3 Results

3.1 WF and WFI of crop production in 2012

~~In 2012, the total~~The WF of crop~~s~~ production in 2012 was analyzed, and the results were taken as the baseline for the crop structure analysis. The total WF of the production of crops in the HSP was ~~about~~approximately ~~51~~41.~~0~~8 km^3, of which 2~~7.6~~4% was WFgreen (~~14~~10.1 km^3), 4~~8.4~~7% was WFblue (~~24~~19.7 km^3) and 2~~4.0~~9% was WFgrey (12.~~2~~0 km^3)~~, respectively~~ (Table ~~3~~4). We found large differences ~~of~~ among the WF, WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey ~~within~~ for the main crops: ~~among these crops (~~wheat, maize, cotton, peanut, rice, vegetables, fruiters~~), w~~. Winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables ~~and summer maize~~ were the three leading crops in water consumption, taking 2~~8.8~~9% (~~14~~12.~~7~~0 km^3), 2~~3.8~~4% (~~13~~10.1 km^3) and 1~~9.3~~8% (~~10~~7.~~7~~6 km^3) of the total WF, respectively~~; t~~. The WF of spring maize, cotton, peanut, rice, fruiters and others ~~was~~ were ~~3~~2.~~9~~0 km^3 (~~5.4~~7%), ~~4~~3.~~0~~8 km^3 (~~7.2~~9%), 1.6 km^3 (~~2.9~~4%),0.3 km^3 (~~0.6~~1%),2.~~7~~6 km^3 (~~4.9~~6%) and ~~1~~0.~~9~~0 km^3 (~~1.8~~2%), respectively. The WFgreen of these crops was 2.~~0~~1 km^3 (~~accounted~~ accounting for ~~14.2~~21% of the total WFgreen), ~~4.4~~ 3.6 km^3 (3~~1.~~5%), ~~1~~0.~~9~~4 km^3 (~~10.0~~9%),~~1.7~~0.9 km^3 (~~12.0~~9%),0.~~7~~5 km^3 (~~4.9~~5%), 0.1 km^3 (~~0.7~~1%), ~~3~~1.~~0~~3 km^3 (~~21.0~~13%), 0.~~6~~5 km^3 (~~4.9~~5%), and 0.2 km^3 (~~1.4~~2%), respectively, ~~in~~ of which ~~vegetables~~ summer maize was the largest, ~~then was summer maize~~followed by winter wheat. The WFblue of these crops was ~~7~~5.~~8~~1 km^3 (~~accounted~~ accounting for ~~31.8~~26% of the total WFblue), 3.~~3~~7 km^3 (1~~3.4~~9%), ~~0~~1.~~9~~3 km^3 (~~5.4~~7%),~~1~~2.~~6~~1 km^3 (~~7.2~~11%), 0.~~7~~8 km^3 (~~2.9~~4%), 0.2 km^3 (~~0.6~~1%), ~~8~~4.~~5~~9 km^3 (2~~3.8~~5%), 1.1 km^3 (~~4.9~~6%), 0.~~6~~5 km^3 (~~1.8~~3%), respectively, ~~in~~ of which ~~vegetables~~ winter wheat was the largest, ~~then was winter wheat~~followed by vegetables. The WFgrey of these crops was 4.8 km^3 (accountinged for 39.440% of the total WFgrey), 2.9 km^3 (23.74%), 0.7 km^3 (5.4%), 0.7 km^3 (5.7%), 0.3 2 km^3 (2.9%), 0.1 km^3 (0.51%), 1.7 5 km^3 (13.93%), 1.0 km^3 (8.0%), 0.2 km^3 (1.52%), respectively, in of which winter wheat was the largest, then followed bywas summer maize.

The situation of the WFI was totally different from the situation of the WF (Table 34). Among these crops, the WFI of cotton was the largest and for vegetables, it wasere the smallest, and the former was aboutapproximately eight six times as much as that ofgreater than the latter; the WFI of winter wheatsummer maize was basically equal to which that of peanutspring maize.

Table 3 4 The WF (km^3) and the WFI (m^3 ton^{-1}) of each crop

Crop types	WFgreen	WFblue	WFgrey	WF	WFI
Winter wheat	2.01	75.81	4.8	1412.70	1086887.90
Summer maize	3.64.4	3.73.3	2.92.9	10.110.6	701.7736.0
Spring maize	1.31.4	1.30.9	0.70.7	2.93.0	691.1709.1
Cotton	0.91.7	2.11.6	0.70.7	3.84.0	1493.01573.3
Peanut	0.50.7	0.80.7	0.20.3	1.61.6	1043.21082.8
Rice	0.10.1	0.20.2	0.10.1	0.40.3	903.1913.9
Vegetables	1.33.0	4.98.5	1.51.7	7.713.1	183.6207.7
Fruiters	0.50.6	1.11.1	1.01.0	2.62.7	246.4257.5
Others	0.20.2	0.50.6	0.20.2	0.91.0	1030.81147.0
Total	10.114.1	19.724.7	12.012.2	41.851.0	

3.2 Annual WF of crop production

Over the past 13 years (2000-2012), the total WF of crop production in the HSP was 604.8 km^3, comprised of 288.5 km^3 WFblue, 141.3 km^3 WFgreen and 175.0 km^3 WFgray, and decreased by 22% (from 53.7 km^3 to 41.8 km^3), 26% (from 26.5 km^3 to 19.7 km^3), 14% (from 11.7 km^3 to 10.1 km^3), and 23% (from 15.5 km^3 to 12.0 km^3), respectively, from 2000 to 2012 (Fig. 3). The main reasons for the downtrend of the WF was due to the urbanization of farmland and the decrease of the winter wheat planting area. In addition, the total WFblue of these crops was approximately twice the amount of the total WFgreen, and the total WFgray was slightly more than the total WFgreen.



Fig. 3. WF of crop production in the HSP from 2000 to 2012

Table 5 shows the WF of each crop over 13 years. Winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables are the three leading crops for water usage, taking 33%, 28% and 16% of the total WF, respectively. Notably, summer maize accounted for 42% of WFgreen, 22% of WFblue and 27% of WFgray; winter wheat accounted for 21% of WFgreen, 31% of WFblue and 44% of WFgray; and vegetables accounted for 11% of WFgreen, 22% of WFblue and 11% of WFgray (Table 5).

Table 5 WF (km^3) of each crop in the HSP from 2000 to 2012

Crop types	WFgreen	WFblue	WFgray	WF
Winter wheat	30.0	89.1	77.6	196.7
Summer maize	58.8	62.6	46.6	168.0
Spring maize	10.5	13.8	6.9	31.2
Cotton	11.9	24.4	8.0	44.3
Peanut	6.2	12.8	3.4	22.4
Rice	0.8	3.5	0.9	5.2
Vegetables	15.4	62.3	18.7	96.4
Fruiters	4.8	12.5	10.3	27.7
Others	2.8	7.5	2.6	12.9
Total	141.4	288.5	175.1	604.8

3.~~2~~ 3 Scenario analysis of WF for different crop structure

Results from the ~~seven~~ eight scenario~~s~~ (Table ~~4~~6) illustrated ~~that~~that the following: (1) the WF (~~including~~ comprised of WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey) of all the scenarios was smaller than the baseline, and those of scenario 5 were the smallest in the eight scenarios; (2) the WF of scenario 3 and scenario ~~8~~ 6 ~~was~~ were essentially equal,~~ and which of~~as were scenario 7 ~~was slightly larger than~~

~~them and scenario 6 was slightly larger than~~to scenario ~~4~~8; (3) the WF ~~(including WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey) was getting smaller and smaller~~reduced from scenario 1 to scenario 5 ~~with~~ as the planting area of winter wheat and summer maize rotation decreased to zero and spring maize increased to 53.94~~%.~~ %; (4) the WFgreen of the scenario 2,3,6,7 and scenario 8 were~~all the scenarios was~~ nearly equal, and the value was approximately ~~12~~ 9 km^3.

Table ~~4~~ 6 WF (km^3) of different crop structure scenarios in the Hebei southern plain

Crop structure	WFgreen	WFblue	WFgrey	WF
Baseline	10.1~~14.1~~	19.7~~24.7~~	12.0~~12.2~~	41.8~~51.0~~
Scenario 1	9.9~~12.7~~	19.2~~24.2~~	11.7~~11.9~~	40.8~~48.7~~
Scenario 2	9.4~~12.4~~	18.3~~22.2~~	10.4~~10.6~~	38.1~~45.3~~
Scenario 3	8.9~~12.1~~	17.4~~20.4~~	9.2~~9.4~~	35.4~~41.9~~
Scenario 4	8.4~~11.8~~	16.4~~18.5~~	7.9~~8.1~~	32.7~~38.5~~
Scenario 5	7.9~~11.5~~	15.6~~16.7~~	6.7~~6.9~~	30.3~~35.1~~
Scenario 6	9.1~~12.4~~	16.8~~17.7~~	9.6~~9.6~~	35.5~~39.6~~
Scenario7	9.1~~12.1~~	18.6~~20.1~~	9.9~~10.3~~	37.6~~42.6~~
Scenario8	9.2~~12.2~~	17.6~~18.8~~	10.7~~10.7~~	37.5~~41.7~~

带格式表格

4 Discussions

4.1 Crop water consumption

In the HSP, irrigation water has been the primary source of water for agricultural needs~~the agricultural water consumption mainly came from irrigation~~ (Yuan and Shen, 2013), which was confirmed this study~~and this study also proved this point~~. According to the above analysis, ~~the~~ water consumption of ~~the~~ crops ~~(except maize, cotton and peanut)~~ mainly came from irrigation, and their WFblue accounted for ~~about~~approximately 50% of the WF (Table ~~3~~4 and Table 5). Although irrigation can directly increase ~~yield of the~~ crop yields, it also usually ~~increased~~ increases the crop WF (da Silva et al., 2013). In areas of water shortage ~~area~~, improving water use efficiency to reduce groundwater exploitation is imperative~~, and~~. ~~deficit~~ Deficit irrigation ~~was~~ has been widely used to save groundwater resources in the NCP (Ma et al., 2013)~~, which~~ by ~~took~~ taking better account of crop yield and water consumption.

During the 13 years, t~~T~~he WFblue of ~~vegetables~~ winter wheat was the largest ~~in~~ of these crops, ~~and then was winter wheat~~followed by summer maize, and then vegetables; which ~~indicated~~ indicates that winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables ~~and winter wheat~~ consume~~d~~ a large amount of groundwater. The WFblue of the crops, apart from summer maize and spring maize, was more than double their WFgreen; furthermore, the WFblue of rice and vegetables was more than quadruple their WFgreen.The WFgreen of both summer maize and spring maize were approximatelywas more than its WFblue, and the WFgreen of cotton and peanut was approximately equal to their WFblue. This was, because the rapid growth stage of these four cropmaizes was from June to August, this period was basically synchronized with the rainy season (July to September) in this region, and the precipitation can basicallywas able to meet the needs of crop growth in this period. So Therefore, in arid and semi semi-arid areas, cultivating rain fed crops is an effective approach to save groundwater. While for wheat, rice, vegetables, fruiters and other crops, the precipitation cannot meet their needsWFblue was significantly more than their WFgreen. The main reason was the precipitation can not meet the needs of these crops, and the; therefore, water consumption offor these crops needs to come mainlymainly came from irrigation.

4.2 WF responses to crop structure

Crop structure affects the water consumption directly. From tThe above analysis shows that, with the decrease of winter wheat-summer maize rotation planting area and the increase of spring maize (scenario 1 to scenario 5), the WF (including comprised of WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey) decreased (Table 46),). Sspecifically, when the area of winter wheat-summer maize decreased 10% and spring maize increased 10% (relative to the total farmland area), the average WF, WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey decreased 7.92%, 25.54%, 85.91% and 12.78%, respectively. However, people consumed flour as the majorsince wheat is a staple food in the HSP and wheat is a ration crop here, and this region needs to guaranteewe should plant a certain area of winter wheat to guarantee the food self-sufficiency in this region, areas should still be planted with winter wheat, despite in spite of it consumed a lot of water resourcesits large consumption of water resources. In per unit area, the water consumption of vVegetables had a low-level WFI; however, the water consumption of vegetables per unit area, was much more than with other crops (scenario 6 to scenario 7) in spite of its WFI was low level. Despite this, but the HSP should protect the basic supply of vegetables and fruits for Beijing, Tianjin and the Hebei province, p. Planting and keeping a certain area~~s~~ ~~of~~ with vegetables and fruiters is necessary.

Changes to c~~C~~rop structure ~~changing~~ directly affect~~s~~ irrigation ~~water~~ consumption (or WFblue) and indirectly affect~~s~~ the emissions of environmental pollutants ~~which~~ that ~~were closely linked with~~can be measured by WFgrey. In the study area, ~~crop~~ water consumption for crops is primarily attributable to~~ mainly came from ~~ groundwater irrigation~~, i~~. It is imperative to ~~an urgency to find~~identify ~~out~~ a reasonable crop structure by considering the sustainable use of groundwater and the lifestyle of local people~~'s daily life~~. According to the above scenario analysis, we found the crop structure of scenario 6 ~~was~~ to be reasonable. Because this structure can guarantee ~~the~~ regional self-sufficient~~ of~~cy food, including vegetables, fruits, cotton, and peanut~~ etc~~s~~. at the same time~~, and the groundwater consumption of this structure was acceptable. In addition, policies on agricultural crop structure optimization should be encouraged, with the aim of relieving the pressure on groundwater for crop production and ensuring food security in this region. In recent years, winter wheat and summer maize were being replaced by spring crops in many places of the HSP, this was ~~been~~ called "the spring corn planting belt phenomenon" (Feng et al., 2007; Huang et al., 2012; Wang et al.,2014). ~~Undoubtedly~~Clearly, this phenomenon can help ~~to~~ in the restoration of groundwater resources in this region.

4.3 ~~The m~~Main ~~shortcomings~~ uncertainties of this study

First~~ly~~, the estimation of WF (~~including~~ comprised of WFgreen, WFblue and WFgrey) was affected by crop distribution, in regards to the spatial differences of ~~for the~~ underlying surface conditions, climatic conditions and irrigation conditions~~ have spatial difference, but t~~. The crop ~~distribution of the baseline mainly came from land use map and statistical data and the crop~~ structure scenarios only considered the crop planting areas and did not take into account the crop distribution~~, this study only considered the crop planting area and ignored its distribution~~. Second~~ly~~, the scenarios ~~setting~~ had a certain degree of randomness ~~without considering~~since there was no-consideration to ~~planting area~~ changes ~~of~~ in planting areas of cotton, peanut and others (Table 2)~~, in fact, due to~~. For example, with cotton lacking a high market value and having~~ the~~ ~~difficulty~~

difficulties in its managementof cotton management (e.g., requiringit needs artificial picking–) without high price, its growing area was likely shrinking, and its distribution was changing. Thirdly, due to the development of urbanization in this region, the area of arable land has been shrinking, at the same time; likewise, some arable land was abandoned because many rural young people went to work in cities in many rural communities, but. oOur scenario analysis, however, did not take into account these phenomenons phenomena, as we for lackeding the corresponding data. Fourthly, climatic variability has major effects on crop WF (Sun et al., 2010; Bocchiolaet al., 2013; Yang et al., 2013), and many researchers have found that this region has undergone an upward trend of temperatures and a declining trend of precipitation since the 1960s (Hu et al., 2002; Yuan et al., 2009; Sun et al., 2010). If precipitation continues to decline and while temperature increases in the futureover time, these climatic developments will certainly affect the WF for crop production certainly and . Tthese questions effects are worth an in-depth analyzinganalysis, which can could provide valuable information for water resource management.

5 Conclusions

This study analyzed the WF of crop production in the HSP and evaluated its temporal variation from 2000 to 2012. Over 13 years, the production of main crops consumed a total of approximately 604.8 km^3 of water, of which 288.5 km^3 of that was groundwater; additionally, the WF of the production of crops exhibited a downtrend yearly. Among the local main crops, winter wheat, summer maize and vegetables were the three leading crops in water consumption; their WF, WFblue, WFgreen and WFgray accounted for 76.2%, 73.7%, 74.2% and 81.6% of the total, respectively.

In this region, aAdjusting crop farming structures was has been an important means to protect groundwater resources in the HSP. This study; therefore, we evaluated the reasonable farming structures by analyzing scenarios analysis of the main crops' WF in this plain and suggested that: scenario 6: with aboutapproximately 20% of the arable land in cultivating cultivation of winter wheat-summer maize in rotation, 40% of cultivating spring maize, 10% cultivating of vegetables, 10% ~~cultivating~~ of fruiters, ~~without~~ 0% of rice and no change to other crops, ~~unchanging (i.e. scenario 6) were available to~~will promote the sustainable development of agriculture in this region~~,~~ ~~which~~. This scenario, not only can protect approximately 14.5% of groundwater resources (~~the groundwater resources~~compared to the baseline), but ~~also~~ can also ensure the local supply of ~~food~~wheat, vegetables, and fruits.

Acknowledgements ~~The~~ This paper was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (40901130, 41471027), the high-level leading talent introduction program of GDAS (2060599), the Innovation-driven Development Capacity Construction Program (2017GDASCX-0861), the Scientific Platform and Innovation Capability Construction Program of GDAS (2016GDASPT-0304), the Research Team of the Guangdong Natural Science Foundation (S2012030006144), the Science and Technology Project of Hebei Province (16454203D) and the Social Science Foundation of Hebei Province (HB15GL083). We are also grateful to the reviewers and editors.

References

Bocchiola, D., Nana, E., Soncini, A., 2013. Impact of climate change scenarios on crop yield and water footprint of maize in the Po valley of Italy. Agric.Water Manag. 116, 50-61.

Castellanos, M.T., Cartagena, M.C., Requejo, M.I., et al., 2016. Agronomic concepts in water footprint assessment: A case of study in a fertirrigated melon crop under semiarid conditions. Agric.Water Manag., 170, 81-90.

Chapagain, A.K., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2011. The blue, green and grey water footprint of rice from production and consumption perspectives. Ecol. Econ. 70, 749-758.

Chapagain, A.K., Orr, S., 2009. An improved water footprint methodology linking global consumption to local water resources: a case of Spanish tomatoes. J. Environ. Manag. 90, 1219-1228.

Daniela, L., Jacopo, B., Marco. F., 2016. Water Footprint of crop productions: A review. Sci. Total Environ., 548-549:236-251.

da Silva, V.d.P.R., da Silva, B.B., Albuquerque, W.G., Borges, C.J.R., de Sousa, I.F. Neto, J.D., 2013. Crop coefficient, water requirements, yield and water use efficiency of sugarcane growth in Brazil. Agric. Water Manag. 128(10), 102-109.

Dong, H., Geng, Y., Sarkis, J., Fujita, T., Okadera, T., Xue, B., 2013. Regional water footprint evaluation in China: A case of Liaoning. Science of the Total Environment,442, 215-224.

Duan, A.W.,2004. Irrigation water quota of main crops in North China. Beijing: Agricultural Science and Technology Press of China.

Feng, Z.M., Liu, D.W., Zhang, Y.H., 2007. Water requirements and irrigation sched-uling of spring maize using GIS and CropWat model in Beijing-Tianjin-Hebeiregion. Chin. Geogr. Sci. 17, 56-63.

Gheewala, S.H., Silalertruksa, T., Nilsalab, P., Mungkung, R., Perret, S.R., Chaiyawannakarn,N., 2014. Water footprint and impact of water consumption for food, feed, fuel crops production in Thailand. Water, 6, 1698-1718.

Gleick, P.H., 2003. Global freshwater resources: soft-path solutions for the 21stcentury. Science 302, 1524-1528

Hoekstra, A.Y. (Ed.), 2003. Virtual Water Trade: Proceedings of the InternationalExpert Meeting on Virtual Water Trade. Delft, The Netherlands, 12-13 December2002, Value of Water Research Report Series No. 12. UNESCO-IHE, Delft, TheNetherlands, Available at: www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report12.pdf

Hoekstra, A.Y., Chapagain, A.K., 2007. Water footprints of nations: water use by people as a function of their consumption pattern. Water Resour. Manag. 21, 35-48.

Hoekstra, A.Y., Chapagain, A.K., Aldaya, M.M., Mekonnen, M.M., 2009. Water Footprint Manual: State of the Art 2009.

Huang, J., Bradley, G.R., Xu, C.C., Zhang, H.L., Chen, F., 2012. Cropping pattern mod-ifications change water resource demands in the Beijing metropolitan area. J.Integr. Agric. 11, 1914-1923.

Hu, C.S., Zhang, X.Y., Cheng, Y.S., Pei, D., 2002. An analysis on dynamics of water tableand overdraft in the piedmont of Mt Taihang. Syst. Sci. Compr. Stud. Agric. 18,89–91 (in Chinese).

Jefferies, D., Muñoz, I., Hodges, J., King, V.J., Aldaya, M., Ercin, A.E., Canals, L.M., Hoekstra,A.Y., 2012.Water footprint and life cycle assessment as approaches to assess potential impacts of products on water consumption. Key learning points from pilot studies on tea and margarine. J. Clean. Prod. 33, 155-166.

Konar, M., Dalin, C., Suweis, S., Hanasaki, N., Rinaldo, A., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., 2011.Water for food: the global virtual water trade network. Water Resour. Res. 47,http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2010WR010307.

Lamastra, L., Suciu, N.A., Novelli, E., Trevisan, M., 2014. A new approach to assessing the water footprint of wine: an Italian case study. Sci. Total Environ. 490, 748-756.

Lucrezia, L., Nicoleta, A.S., Elisa, N., Marco, T., 2014. A new approach to assessing the water footprint of wine: An Italian case study. Science of the Total Environment, 490, 748-756.

Ma, Y., Feng, S., Song, X., 2013. A root zone model for estimating soil water balance and crop yield responses to deficit irrigation in the North China Plain. Agric. Water Manag. 127(28), 13-24.

Mekonnen, M.M., Hoekstra, A.Y., 2010. The green, blue and grey water footprint of crops and derived crop products. Value ofwater research report series No. 47. UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands.

Pan, X. P., Li, G.X., Liu, F. G., Wu, X.F., Kondoh, A., Shen, Y.J., 2015. Using remote sensing to determine spatio-temporal variations in winter wheat growing area in the North China Plain. Chinese Journal of Eco-Agriculture, 23(4): 497-505 (in Chinese).

Postel, S., 2000. Entering an era of water scarcity: the challenges ahead. Ecological Applications, 10 (4), 941-948.

Ridoutt, B., Eady, S., Sellahewa, J., Simons, L., Bektash, R., 2009.Water footprinting at the product brand level: case study and future challenges. Journal of Cleaner Production 17 (13), 1228-1235.

Rosegrant, M.W., Ringler, C., 2000. Impact on food security and rural developmentof transferring water out of agriculture. Water Policy 1, 567-586.

Suttayakul, P., H-Kittikun, A., Suksaroj, C., Mungkalasiri, J., Wisansuwannakorn, R., Musikavong, C., 2016. Water footprints of products of palm plantations and palm oil mills in Thailand. Science of the Total Environment, 542, 521-529.

Shrestha, S., Pandey, V.P., Chanamai, C., Ghosh, D.K., 2013. Green, blue and grey water footprints of primary crops production in Nepal. Water Resour. Manag. 5223-5243.

Sun, H., Shen, Y., Yu, Q., Flerchinger, G.N., Zhang, Y., Liu, C., Zhang, X., 2010. Effect ofprecipitation change on water balance and WUE of the winter wheat-summermaize rotation in the North China Plain. Agric. Water Manage. 97,1139-1145.

Suttayakul, P., H-Kittikun, A., Suksaroj, C., Mungkalasiri, J., Wisansuwannakorn, R., Musikavong, C.,2016. Water footprints of products of oil palm plantations and palm oil mills in Thailand. Science of the Total Environment, 542, 521-529.

UNEP, 2007. Global Environment Outlook e Geo 4: Environment for Development. United Nations Environment Programme, Valletta, Malta.

Wang, H.Y., Pan, X.P., Luo, J.M., Luo, Z.P., Chang, C.P., Shen, Y.J., 2015. Using remote sensing to analyze spatiotemporal variations in crop planting in the North China Plain. Chinese Journal of Eco-Agriculture, 23(9):1199-1209 (in Chinese).

Wang, X., Li, X.B., Fischer, G., 2015. Impact of the changing area sown to winter wheat on crop water footprint in the North China Plain. Ecological Indicators, 57:100-109.

Wang, Y.B., Wu, P.T., Engel, B.A., Sun, S.K., 2014. Application of water footprint combined with unified virtual crop pattern to evaluate crop water productivity in grain production in China. Sci. Total Environ., 497-498, 1-9.

Wang, X., Li, X., Xin, L., 2014. Impact of the shrinking winter wheat sown area onagricultural water consumption in the Hebei Plain. J. Geogr. Sci. 24, 313-330.

White, D.J., Feng, K.S., Sun, L.X., Hubacek, K., 2015. A hydro-economic MRIO analysis of the

Haihe River Basin’s water footprint and water stress. Ecological Modelling, 318, 157-167.

Xu, Y.J., Huang, K., Yu, Y.J., Wang, X.M., 2014. Changes in water footprint of crop production in Beijing from 1978 to 2012: a logarithmic mean Divisia index decomposition analysis. Journal of Cleaner Production, 87:180-187.

Yang, X., Gao, W., Shi, Q., Chen, F., Chu, Q., 2013. Impact of climate change on thewater requirement of summer maize in the Huang–Huai–Hai farming region.Agric. Water Manag. 124, 20–27.

Yuan, Z.J., Shen, Y.J. Estimation of Agricultural Water Consumption from Meteorological and Yield Data: A Case Study of Hebei, North China. PLOS ONE,2013, 8(3), e58685.

Yuan, Z.J., Shen, Y.J., Chu, Y.M., et al, 2009. Variations and distribution of temperature and precipitation of Haihe River Basin in recent 40 years. Research of Soil and Water Conservation, 16(3):24-26 (in Chinese).

Zang, T., Xie, X., Huang, Z., 2014. Life cycle water footprints of nonfood biomass fuels in China. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 4137-4144.

Language Editing Services

Registered Office:
Elsevier Ltd
The Boulevard, Langford Lane,
Kidlington, OX5 1GB, UK.
Registration No. 331566771

To whom it may concern

The paper "Water footprint of crop production for different crop structures in the Hebei southern plain, North China" by Yingmin Chu was edited by Elsevier Language Editing Services.

Kind regards,

Biji Mathilakath
Elsevier Webshop Support

(This is a computer generated advice and does not require any signature)