

Overall comments to the editor and reviewers:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time, their compliments on our manuscript being well written and clearly presented, as well as their valuable suggestions for improvements. Specific replies to the reviewers' comments are given per reviewer below. Here, we have copied the referees' comments in black, with our answers in blue italics.

The main things we would like to clarify is that our study is intended as a sensitivity study, using an idealized model and forcing set-up. We did not aim for a full analysis of parameter uncertainty, which would be a topic on its own. However, the fact that different vegetation parameters may change the outcomes will be added to the Discussion. Furthermore, we will compare our experiments to discharge observations of the GRDC data base to argue for the quality of our model and experiments. Also, we will re-run our experiments. In our experiments presented in the submitted paper, multi-cropping was not included, which may explain the relatively low consumptive water use (evapotranspiration) from irrigation in experiment HUM2000. With the referees' comments, we identify this as a shortcoming and will thus address this in the revised manuscript.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 10 January 2017

The paper describes a global assessment of hydrological impacts of land cover change and human water use for the period 1850-2000 and fits therefore well to the scope of the journal. The manuscript is well written and interesting; the figures shown in the manuscript are of good quality. Quantifying the effects of land cover change and water use on the hydrological cycle for such a long period is challenging and previous estimates varied considerably, depending on input data, models and assumptions used. Therefore, more research is needed to reduce these uncertainties. However, I think that a major revision is required before the manuscript may be considered for publication in HESS. My major points of criticism are:

General comments: 1) The authors quantify and compare the effects of land cover change and water consumption on evapotranspiration and river discharge. However, they assume that the third term in the water balance, the precipitation term, is not affected by the changes in land cover and water use (at least there is no attempt to analyze changes in precipitation). This is a strong assumption that needs at least some discussion, because the authors present here a spatial analysis. There is growing evidence in the literature that both, land cover change and water use, modify precipitation patterns over large regions (see for example Pei et al., 2016 on the effect of irrigation on summer precipitation in the US). When irrigation results in increased ET, increased ET results in increased precipitation, and increased precipitation results in increased runoff. Consequently, the net effect of irrigation on river discharge may be much smaller than the results suggested by the authors. So, the key question is certainly where water use and land cover change are taking place and in which region this will cause changes in precipitation (within the same watershed, outside of it but in an- other watershed or over the sea outside terrestrial surface). Answering this question is only possible by coupling a hydrological model with an atmospheric circulation model. This might be out of scope of the present analysis but the consequences of ignoring feedback mechanisms by changed precipitation patterns requires at least discussion.

Author comments: indeed, the changes in land cover and particularly irrigation can affect precipitation. This feedback will be mentioned in section 4.2 where we discuss the uncertainty in input data. We wish to state that by using reanalysis data (CRU, ERA-Interim)

for the last 3 decades the observed changes in precipitation that reflect such a feedback are likely included in the forcing. Furthermore, to fully disentangle the effect of irrigation, both on- and offline experiments are needed. Online (coupled) experiments are indeed beyond our scope. Such experiments are typically possible within land surface models or general circulation models, which typically do not allow the inclusion of water use, dams etc as readily as PCR-GLOBWB does. Coupling PCR-GLOBWB with a global or regional climate model is daunting and beyond our resources. Our experiments are offline experiments, set up as sensitivity experiments, all being forced with the same precipitation, whether irrigation is included (HUM2000) or not (LC experiments). This allows us to focus on the direct effects of land cover change and human water use.

2) One basic result of the study is that the effect of human water use on actual evapotranspiration is smaller than the effect of land cover change (page 11, line 6). However, the increase of ET by irrigation estimated by the authors seems to be very low compared to other studies. According to the present study, global ET is increased by irrigation by 377 km³ yr⁻¹ (page 11, line 7) while other studies reported a much larger increase in ET by irrigation (for example, > 1000 km³ yr⁻¹ between 1900 and 2005 according to Kummu et al., 2016). Why is that? Assuming that the uncertainty in additional ET created by irrigation is that large: how would this uncertainty then affect the basic conclusions drawn by the authors?

Author comments: our estimate of increased ET by irrigation is indeed rather low. The HUM2000 experiment did not include multi-cropping in irrigated areas, which explains (at least partly) this low value of 377 km³/yr. We realize that using multi-cropping will provide a more realistic estimate of the effect of human water use and we will include this and repeat the HUM2000 experiment for the updated manuscript.

3) The authors explicitly pointed out that an analysis and discussion of the uncertainties involved in their estimates was not focus of the present analysis (page 14, lines 30-32). Nevertheless, these uncertainties exist and should be discussed. It is complex enough to simulate changes in ET on cropland because data for irrigated/rainfed crops and the distinction between paddy and upland crops are available for recent years only, in addition simulation of ET for the period outside the cropping season requires many assumptions. Even more complex and extremely difficult is it to estimate changes in ET caused by the use of ecosystems as pasture. There are many different types of pasture characterized by distinct species composition, different proportion of woody biomass and different stocking densities. There are very intensive types of pasture with properties very similar to cropped surfaces and extensive pasture systems that hardly differ from natural vegetation. It remains completely unclear how the authors reflected this complexity in the parameterization of their model to estimate realistic changes in ET caused by the conversion of natural vegetation to pasture. In addition, there are large uncertainties about the historical extent of pasture. Currently available data sets differ considerably in their estimates. The authors mention these uncertainties in section 4.2 but it remains unclear how much the basic results of the study are impacted by these uncertainties. How robust are the results of the study? More description and discussion is needed.

Author comments: the effect of uncertainty in parameter values on our estimates is indeed excluded as we present an idealized sensitivity study using one model version (and hence one model parameter set). Papers such as Boisier et al (2014) show that model results may vary due to differences in land cover parameterization, different land cover maps and different evapotranspiration rates of land cover products (as referred to in section 4.2). Assessing the robustness of our results (i.e. 'how sensitive is the sensitivity to e.g. land cover change') would be another study in itself.

Within the PCR-GLOBWB model, changes in ET between various crop types are taken into account by basing the crop factors on the 26 crop types in MIRCA. Crop factors also vary seasonally, as does the ground cover of the land cover types, thus taking into account differences in ET in and outside the cropping season.

Pasture is indeed a complex land use type. Within our parameterization, we allow for spatial variation in the parameter values depending on local variations. In the crop types (rainfed crops, irrigated paddy, irrigated non-paddy) this largely reflects the abundance of the different crop types. For pasture, this reflects a mixture of actual pastures or meadows and grazed, semi-natural lands. This information is derived from the GLCC land cover types, identifying which land cover types are preferred. These types are subsequently selected locally on the basis of their presence in the GLCC coverage and the required area of pasture/rangeland in the controlling dataset (e.g., HYDE). Thus, various types of pasture/rangeland are created, selecting for example grassland in NW Europe as an equivalent of intensive dairy farming but shrublands or savannah in drier parts of the world as equivalents of more extensive, pastoral systems. This will be clarified in the Methods section of the updated paper. A table with the areas of GLCC land cover types identified as pasture, per gridcell, will be send in with this rebuttal¹. GLCC IDs 2, 7, 10, 19, 34, 40, 41, 42, 55, 56, 57, 58, 93 and 94 can be used as pasture, see appendix 1 on https://lta.cr.usgs.gov/glcc/globdoc2_0 for a description of each land cover ID.

4) The text section is often difficult to read because it contains too many numbers and reads to technical (e.g. section 4.1; section 3.2). I recommend to report the general findings in the text section and detailed results in tables. It may also help to develop a figure presenting the main results of the study (changes in terrestrial ET and discharge by water use and land cover change at global scale).

Author comments: we agree, the text will be simplified by adding tables / figures representing the main numbers and findings of our study.

Minor comments: Abstract: Please report more in detail how the present study adds to a better understanding of the impact of lands cover change and water use on terrestrial hydrology. What is reported in the second part of the abstract represents more the state of knowledge but not new findings and conclusions from the present analysis. *The abstract will be adapted as suggested.*

Page 2, lines 25-29: This sentence is hard to understand. Please simplify. *Will do.*

Page 3, lines 5-9: Please simplify. Not nice to have brackets in brackets *Will do.*

Page 3, lines 28-30: ERA-Interim and CRU data often differ considerably, in particular for precipitation and number of wet days. Is this not a problem when combining these two products? *PCR-GLOBWB requires daily meteo input as forcing and to this end we combined ERA-Interim and CRU TS 3.21 on a spatial resolution of 0.5 degrees. We included the CRU primarily to correct the rainfall depths in the reanalysis but are aware that certain areas in certain periods are not always covered by stations. Thus, we include CRU information only if stations are present in the sphere of influence of a half-degree cell for the month under consideration. So, if the CRU has matching station data in a cell, the spatial interpolated precipitation amounts are used to scale the ERA-Interim precipitation to the correct depth. To this end, we first remove drizzle (applying a threshold of 0.1 mm per day) and then the CRU monthly precipitation is proportionally apportioned to the resulting days rain days according to ERA-Interim daily. If no CRU information is available, the ERA-Interim information is used directly, redistributing the removed drizzle proportionally over the significant raindays. We*

¹ Area_table_pasture.tbl, providing per gridcell the longitude and latitude as well as the area per GLCC id.

prefer to use the temporal rainfall distribution of the ERA-Interim over the CRU as the ERA-Interim reflects the continuous state of the atmosphere on a daily resolution whereas the CRU is statistically interpolated and the rainfall distribution is sensitive to the changing number of contributing stations over time. The number of raindays of the CRU is only used when a proportional scaling of the two precipitation datasets is not feasible, for example when one of the precipitation amounts is zero or virtually nil. In that case, raindays are added to match the number in the CRU and those days given an amount that brings the total to the observed total depth. In general, this only concerns the arid and semi-arid regions of the world and its influence on the global precipitation distribution is negligible. (see Van Beek et al., 2011 for a similar procedure using CRU and ERA-40).

Page 3, line 33: More description is needed how the different land cover types were parameterized to account for different types of pasture vegetation and crops. For example, the rooting depth may vary considerably even within the 6 major land cover classes used by the authors. *This will be clarified, see also point 3 above. The land cover types can exist of different types of crops or vegetation based on the distribution of crops and vegetation in the GLCC and MIRCA data sets. This distribution, and thus the combination used for each land cover type, varies spatially, hence the resulting parameter values are spatially distributed. In Figures 1 and 2 at the end of this document we show the root fractions in the two soil layers as an example – showing that even within one land cover type the distribution of roots differ from cell to cell. For crops, there is little variation in the root fractions as roots typically only extend into the upper layer. For natural vegetation and pasture there is a greater range.*

Page 6, section 2.3: How were reservoirs treated in LC1850 and LC2000? *They are excluded in both of these experiments (i.e. no anthropogenic impacts on the water flow).*

Page 11, lines 6-7: “as evapotranspiration is only increased over irrigated areas”. => This is an assumption made by the authors, however, in reality ET has also changed considerably in rainfed crops due to land use modification. *True, but here we refer to the comparison of experiments LC2000 and HUM2000 with have the same land cover, the only difference is that water is redistributed in HUM2000 (added to irrigated crops for instance). This will be clarified, e.g. by adding a reference to Figure 5b.*

References: Kummu, M., Guillaume, J.H.A., de Moel, H., Eisner, S., Florke, M., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., Veldkamp, T.I.E. and Ward, P.J., 2016. The world’s road to water scarcity: shortage and stress in the 20th century and pathways towards sustainability. Scientific Reports, 6, 38495.

Pei, L.S., Moore, N., Zhong, S.Y., Kendall, A.D., Gao, Z.Q. and Hyndman, D.W., 2016. Effects of Irrigation on Summer Precipitation over the United States. Journal of Climate, 29, 3541-3558.

Review #2 of “Hydrological Impacts of Global Land Cover Change and Human Water use” by Bosmans et al.

Generally, the paper is interesting and well written. But for the moment it does not contribute originally to the literature on the impact of land use on the continental water cycle. Indeed, this topic has been studied with many land surface models. But these are all numerical experiments which trust blindly that the parameters for the various vegetation types (Which have been tuned for the current climate and vegetation distribution.) apply to the original

vegetation which existed before the human started to change landscapes massively in the mid 19th century. The authors acknowledge only partly this fact in the discussion section of the paper.

Coming from the global hydrological models community, the authors have a trump they should use. In contrast to classical LSMs, PCR-GLOWB is designed to simulate today's water usage and thus should simulate quite realistic river discharges in current conditions. Thus, the simulation HUM2000 should be much more realistic than the simulations on which the other land use studies are based. In other words, I would expect this study to present the realism of this simulation to argue for the quality of his study and its added value. Furthermore, the use of the deviation from observed discharges could serve as an estimate of uncertainty and qualify the global averages changes in actET and discharge presented in section 4.1.

Thus, and before proposing a list of minor comments, I would suggest a major revision of this paper so as to present hydrological arguments as to why we should trust your numbers more than those of the cited papers. Else this paper will be just more noise on a topic where for the moment we are just guessing some numbers and anybody can propose "alternative facts".

Author comments: the aim of our study is to provide a sensitivity analysis of the separate and joint impacts of land cover change and human water use on the terrestrial water cycle, in particular surface water availability, in PCR-GLOBWB. This by itself is novel. The reviewer is correct in stating that the parameterization of the vegetation types may affect the outcomes, but here we provide an idealized sensitivity analysis rather than an analysis of parameter uncertainty. The overall goal as well as the parameter uncertainty being a point of discussion will be made clearer in the updated version of the paper.

Previous assessments of PCR-GLOBWB's validation include, amongst others, Wada et al (2011, 2014), showing model validation against observations from sources such as GRDC (Global Runoff Data Centre), FAO Aquastat (for water use) and GRACE (for total water storage). Such studies show a good agreement for discharge and water storage in most catchments, as well as good agreement for water use per country. This will be made clearer in the methods section of the updated manuscript.

Here, we will take into account the suggestion to present the realism of our experiments by comparing them to discharge from the GRDC (Global Runoff Data Centre), providing this comparison for major river basins in terms of mean results such as monthly mean discharge as well as statistics such as the Kling-Gupta Efficiency (less sensitive to extreme values and biases than the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency, e.g. Lopez et al 2017). If, as expected, the HUM2000 simulation is more realistic this indeed supports the relevance of our study and can serve as an estimate of uncertainty. We wish to stress that our simulations were set up as sensitivity studies, thus leaving out some of the details and sacrificing realism, for instance keeping land cover or water use fixed during each experiment, in order to capture the major impacts of land cover change and human water use on the terrestrial water cycle.

Below you will find some minor comments which will hopefully help improve the paper. These comments also illustrate the major changes I would deem necessary to raise the level of this paper above the previous studies on this topic.

- Page 1, Line 21 : It is not true that few studies focus on including land use. Most land surface models used in the CMIP5 simulations apply a land use scenario. It could be true that the work is not very visible in the literature. I would attribute that to the fact that this is only a set of guestimates as the vegetation parameters are highly tuned and cannot claim to have any generality.

The CMIP5 simulations do indeed include land use scenarios, but the focus of studies using CMIP5 simulations (typically GCMs) is not on surface water availability / terrestrial hydrology.

Only a handful of studies focus on the latter. The reviewer is correct that each GCM interprets the land use scenarios differently (i.e. translates the fractional crop and pasture cover into model specific parameter sets depending on model set-up, resolution etc).

• Page 2, Lines 1-15 : In your review you do not mention that the picture is further muddled by the fact that in parallel to the land & water use change climate and aerosol loadings have evolved. Thus, potET has a significant trend through modification of incident long-wave and solar radiation, atmospheric turbulence, water vapour pressure deficit and amplitude of the diurnal cycle.

I can understand that this is outside of the scope of your study but these caveats need to be mentioned in the introduction. The literature is plentiful on this topic!

Our aim was to perform sensitivity experiments, singling out the effects of land cover change and anthropogenic water use by keeping all other boundary conditions fixed (including model parameters and climate). Indeed, the climate around 1850 was slightly different from the present day, in the revised paper we will mention in the discussion that this may affect the results. In order to include changing climate over time longer experiments including climate change are needed (this is our next step for a future paper, using climate input from GCMs from 1850 to 2100, and we believe this present sensitivity study provides essential information to interpret those more complex results).

• Page 3, lines 25-30 : Please state clearly that you assume that the potET estimated for the period 1979-2010 is valid in 1870. To me this casts a big shadow over all land use studies but intellectual honesty requires that this is stated as a working hypothesis !

This will be stated (see previous comment)

• Pages 18, line 18 : Can this impact on the Nile really be trusted ? The observed discharge in Aswan for the period 1871-1900 (i.e. before the first dam) is 112km³/y or about 3500 m³/s (What does PCR-GLOWB say?). Your combined change (HUM2000-LC1850) seems to be above 100m³/s, thus the amount of water in the Nile at Aswan should have increased! Observations indicate that the inflow into the great dam has not changed significantly since the end of the 19 th century. On the other hand, the amount arriving at the sea has dramatically been reduced. As you see, the value of your hydrological model is that you can check the reality of the predicted changes with the observations which date back to the 19 th century. Based on my own experience the land use change proposed by LUH for the upper Nile is unrealistic, but you could quantify it!

In our experiments the Nile outflow (at the delta) is 461, 575 or 572 km³/yr (LC1850, LC2000, HUM2000), which is indeed above the observed pre-Aswan values. PCR-GLOBWB thus does not perform well in the Nile region, likely a consequence of PCR-GLOBWB being an un-calibrated model. We will mention this in the updated version of the paper and remark that results for the Nile need to be considered with caution.

The upstream land cover change does include large areas of pasture taking over tall natural vegetation, hence it is not strange that land cover has a strong impact on the discharge. The smaller impact of human water use may be related to multi-cropping not being included, which likely results in irrigation water consumption being too low.

• Page 9, line 33 : PCR-GLOWB has rounding errors ? That is strange and would point to numerical problems.

These rounding errors are in the post-processing of the PCR-GLOBWB output and thus do not point to internal numerical problems; it concerns small rounding errors in the water balance that was drafted from the model output and that does not include explicitly the change in storage among others (see below).

• Page 11, lines 15-21 : These numbers are strange. The equation in this paragraph is not balanced. Where have the missing 2km³/y gone ? Has the ground water increased or is the model not stabilized and shows different trends on the 1979-2010 period for the three configurations ? This requires some explanation.

The disbalance in the equation can be related to both rounding errors in the post processing as well as a remaining trend in the water storage. When including storage change into the equation, the equation becomes: $dDesalinated = dQ + dET + dConsumption + dTWS$, where TWS is total water storage (besides groundwater it also includes storage in the soil, canopy

and waterbodies). Note that 'dGWfossil' is now included in dTWS and therefore is excluded from the equation. Because of (fossil) groundwater abstraction, dTWS due to human water use is much larger than dTWS due to land cover change (see table 1 below). The remaining disbalance is on the order of a few km³/yr, related to rounding errors, small compared to for instance the global discharge (which in LC2000 is ~48,200 km³/yr). This will be updated in the new version of the paper.

in km ³ /yr	dLC (LC2000 – LC1850)	dHUM (HUM2000-LC2000)
dDesalinized	0	1.2
dQ	1058.3	-906.8
dET	-1048.4	532.9
dConsumption	0	504.6
dTWS	-15.0	-125.6

Table 1: water balance terms for changes due to land cover (dLC) or human water use (dHUM) in km³/yr.

- Section 3.2 : This section should include a discussion of the ground water recharge changes between LC1850 and LC2000 or HUM2000. This is another point where we have data to support a constructive discussions. There are many wells with over a 100 year long water table records where at least the sign of the observed recharge changes can be compared to the simulations. See for instance the study by MacDonald et al. 2016 for the Ganges.

Indeed, such long records are available and could be compared to a transient model experiment. Here, we use sensitivity experiments, "time slices", which hinders a comparison to such records.

- Page 14, line 3 : "leading to a strong increase in discharge" acknowledges better the existing relation.

This will be updated in the revised paper.

- Page 14, line 24 : what supports the assertion that "crops lead to the largest reduction in evapotranspiration". Models have shown it but what data is there to support this in all generality ? Does it not depend on the crop variety, the type of agriculture (in small units or large scale) and cropping practices (number of harvests and rotations) ?

This is an assertion supported by our experiments (Figure 8), which show that overall ET is reduced most when crops replace natural vegetation. Our experiments do include a variety of crop types as well as irrigation (in HUM2000) (this will be made clearer in the updated version of the paper).

- Page 14, line 32 : How can we believe a sensitivity analysis of a model if we do not know if the model is a trustworthy reproduction of the current situation ? As I have pointed above, not only would your study be more credible by using the available observations but you could nicely qualify the simulated sensitivity.

See our comments above, a comparison to observed discharge will be made to see how trustworthy the model outcomes are. We will however also further clarify that the experiments were not set up to specifically represent the current situation as realistically as possible.

- Figures 7 & 8 : These are really complex figures which would benefit from a more didactic presentation. Take one case to walk through the graphical representation so that your interpretation is easier to follow.

These will be explained better in the revised paper.

- Figure 9 : Only 1 basin seems to have significant ground water pumping as the arrow points above the actET=P line. Which basin is this and are there observations to give some credibility to this result ?

This basin is a drainage basin in North Africa, draining into the Gulf of Sirte. This area is very dry and thus water limited, hence potET is much larger than P and actET is naturally very close to P. In experiment HUM2000 the actET/P is only slightly higher than in LC2000, in this very dry area not much water needs to be added to reach actET>P. There are other basins

where the impact of human water use on actET/P is much greater (see grey arrows in Figure 9). Both surface and groundwater can be a source for additional actET.

• Page 18, lines 17-21 : I think that it is important to stress that we have no way of verifying that the parameters used for pre-land-use vegetation are correct. Vegetation parameters which are used to compute evapotranspiration have been calibrated to current vegetation covers in order to obtain correct fluxes and they have no fundamental physical or biological foundation. Today's pristine forests can have functioning different from their ancestors because they are exposed to milder winters, air pollution, increased CO2 levels and other environmental stresses.

Indeed, we do not take into account that the 1850 vegetation parameters may have been different, this will be stated in the updated version of the paper. The vegetation parameters are derived from the GLCC and MIRCA datasets which represent present-day vegetation, but no calibration to fluxes has been done in these datasets (GLCC is based on remote sensing, MIRCA on crop statistics mostly).

• Page 18, line 24 : Is it really meaningful to distinguish between the 1850 estimated land cover and a potential cover ? I would contend that the uncertainty in the LUH data and vegetation parameters is larger than the difference to a potential cover. Could you give more substance to your hypothesis ?

There is a difference in the 1850 land cover according to LUH, which includes e.g. pasture and crop in western Europe (Figure 3d) and a fully potential, e.g. natural, cover. Indeed, there are differences in land cover data (e.g. HYDE vs Sage as mentioned in the discussion), but here we simply state the differences between the studies with the use of potential land cover instead of 1850 land cover as one of the potential reasons for different outcomes.

• Page 19 : The discussion would be greatly helped with a table which provides the estimates of the previous studies and their main characteristics.

Such a table will be provided in the updated version of the paper.

• Section 4.2 : I would like to restate that you have the unique opportunity to estimate the uncertainties by comparing your simulations with the observations available for most of your 100 basins. It just occurs to me that in figure 9 the century long records which exist for a number of basins could allow you to estimate the resulting arrow LC1850 → HUM2000!

We will indeed compare our simulations to GRDC discharge. In Figure 9 it will be difficult to add an estimate based on observations as there is, to our knowledge, no data source that indicates basin-wide changes in actET and potET for 1850 to present-day. Also, our experiments are set up as sensitivity experiments, complicating the comparison to such records.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 17 February 2017

Review of Bosmans et al "Hydrological impacts of global land cover change and human water use"

This manuscript discusses a series of global hydrologic simulations to infer the impacts of land cover change on changes in ET and subsequent water balance changes. They project the impacts this will have on discharge over major water basins. I find the manuscript clearly presented and topically appropriate for HESS. I think the conclusion that land cover change needs to be considered when studying anthropogenic impacts is important but not particularly novel as this has been shown in other regional and global studies. Nevertheless, I still think the authors make a contribution to the literature and recommend moderate revisions the manuscript at which point I think it will be suitable for publication in HESS. My major comments are below.

1. Energy balance. The authors discuss changes to ET using a model that does not contain a fully land-energy balance as many land surface models do. I think this may influence the findings of the work, particularly where the results show canceling out or reinforcement from land cover changes and the Budyko relationships. It would seem that exploration of the sensitivity (beyond what is in the SI) of this assumption on results would be important. I would like to see discussion of the impacts of the simplified approach used here contrasted with a more complete energy balance both in approach and with discussion on the impacts to the conclusions.

Author comments: indeed, we do not compute the energy balance within the PCR-GLOBWB model, a water-balance model that uses prescribed potential reference evapotranspiration. Our experiments are thus set up as idealized sensitivity experiments, which will be clarified further in the updated version of the paper. Future work will focus on including the energy balance when investigating the land cover changes, using the model VIC which can be run both in water-balance mode as well as a full energy balance mode.

Results from a comparison between PCR-GLOBWB and VIC (both in water balance and full energy balance mode; WB and EB) in a master student's report indicate that while VIC-EB outperforms VIC-WB in some aspects of the water balance, the improvement due to the energy balance is small. Furthermore, PCR-GLOBWB scores are on average similar to both VIC versions. An example of comparing snow water equivalent of these models is given in Figure 3.

2. Since the authors force the model with a reference E_p (p3, lines 25+) "We force the model with CRU-TS3.21 temperature, precipitation and reference potential evapotranspiration from 1979- 2010:" and the PCR-GLOB does not calculate a land energy balance on its own, the only component that is changing within the simulation is the available water stress curve and shallow soil storage. This also would have a direct effect on the simulation results. The authors discuss the crop factor sensitivity in the SI but a discussion of the sensitivity of soil moisture storage and plant and bare soil water stress on the overall water budget and simulation results is important.

Author comments: the changes between our simulations are either the land cover (LC2000 vs LC1850), with land cover-specific and spatially varying parameters such as root fractions, interception capacity and crop factors, or whether human water use is included (HUM2000 vs LC2000). A different land cover thus results in a different distribution of the energy fluxes, as energy is limited by the potential evapotranspiration which itself broken up into interception evaporation (based on interception storage and whether the canopy is wet), transpiration and soil evaporation (based on crop factor, gap fraction and soil moisture). A different root depth distribution as a result of the land cover differences between LC2000 and LC1850 also acts to change the transpiration between the two experiments (see root depth distribution, spatially varying, per land cover type in Figures 1 and 2). This will be further clarified in the methods and discussion of the updated paper.

3. As I understand it, the authors compare rain-fed (p6. line 25) with irrigated agriculture (same page line 30) but do not present results for groundwater depletions. Either I'm misunderstanding the work and groundwater is not pumped in these cases or I feel there is an opportunity to present differences in abstraction with land cover change.

Author comments: we do indeed represent both rainfed as well as irrigated agriculture, with irrigation only being applied in the experiment HUM2000. HUM2000 is the only experiment in which groundwater is pumped for human water use (this will be clarified in the updated version of the paper). Hence there is no comparison to be made of abstraction for the LC1850 and LC2000 experiments.

4. It would be interesting to compare to the simulation results to both point and remote sensing products (eg. p 19 discussion) and other studies spatially. The authors discuss total magnitudes of change but how do the spatial patterns change between model and remotely sensed inferences?

Author comments: we will compare our results to observed discharge from the GRDC data base (see other reviewer comments). A comparison of the spatial patterns of change between model output and remotely sensed interferences is beyond the scope of our study. Furthermore, such a comparison would be hampered by the idealized set up of our experiments as well as the short period of availability of remotely sensed products (the time scale of those is decades whereas we for instance compare land cover of 1850 to 2000).

References:

- Lopez, P. L., Sutanudjaja, E., Schellekens, J., Sterk, G., & Bierkens, M. Calibration of a large-scale hydrological model using satellite-based soil moisture and evapotranspiration products. *Hydrology and Earth System Science Discussions*, 2017
- Wada, Y., Van Beek, L., Viviroli, D., Dürr, H. H., Weingartner, R., and Bierkens, M. F.: Global monthly water stress: 2. Water demand and severity of water stress, *Water Resources Research*, 47, 2011.
- Wada, Y., Wisser, D., and Bierkens, M.: Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and consumptive use of surface water and groundwater resources, *Earth System Dynamics*, 5, 15, 2014.




Figure 1: Root fraction in soil layer 1 (upper soil layer, 0.13 to 0.3 m deep). The higher the root fraction the more root is in the upper layer (and thus not reaching the lower layer).




Figure 2: Root fraction in soil layer 2 (lower soil layer, 0.52 to 1.2 m deep). The higher the root fraction the more root is in the lower layer (and thus able to pick up moisture from both layers), a value of 0 means that the roots do not extend into the second soil layer.




Figure 3: Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE), Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE), and correlation scores (r) for three model runs (PCR-GLOBWB, VIC-EB, VIC-WB, all forced with WFDEI data) for snow water equivalent compared to ASMR-E. Outliers are not shown in the box plots. For details see master thesis by Lars Killaars², “Hydrologic response modelling: comparing the VIC and PCR-GLOBWB models”, February 2016.

² MSc thesis Utrecht University and University of Washington. See <https://www.dropbox.com/s/p869jecxp1nt1ok/Killaars%20Scriptie%20Final%20version.docx?dl=0>

Hydrological impacts of global land cover change and human water use

Joyce H.C. Bosmans¹, L.P.H. (Rens) van Beek¹, Edwin H. Sutanudjaja¹, and Marc F.P. Bierkens^{1,2}

¹Department of Physical Geography, Faculty of Geoscience, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

²Unit Soil and Groundwater Systems, Deltares, Utrecht, the Netherlands

Correspondence to: Joyce Bosmans (J.H.C.Bosmans@uu.nl)

Abstract. Human impacts on global terrestrial hydrology have been accelerating during the 20th century. These human impacts include the effects of reservoir building and human water use, as well as land cover change. To date, many global studies have focussed on human water use, but only a few focus on or include the impact of land cover change. Here we use ~~the PCR-GLOBWB, a combined~~ global hydrological and water resources model ~~PCR-GLOBWB~~, to assess the impacts of land cover change as well as human water use ~~globally in different climatic zones~~. Our results show that land cover change has a strong effect on the global hydrological cycle, ~~at least as strong as~~ ~~on the same order of magnitude as~~ the effect of human water use (applying irrigation, abstracting water for e.g. industrial use, including reservoirs etc). Globally averaged, changing the land cover from 1850 to that of 2000 increases discharge through reduced evapotranspiration, ~~with~~. ~~The effect of land cover change shows~~ large spatial variability in magnitude and sign of change depending on e.g. the specific land cover change and climate zone. ~~Overall, land cover effects on evapotranspiration are largest for the transition of tall natural vegetation to crops in energy-limited equatorial and warm temperate regions~~. In contrast, the inclusion of irrigation, water abstraction and reservoirs reduces global discharge through enhanced evaporation over irrigated areas and reservoirs as well as ~~through~~ water consumption. Hence in some areas land cover change and water distribution both reduce discharge, while in other areas the effects may partly cancel out. The relative importance of both types of impacts varies spatially ~~across climatic zones~~. From this study we conclude that land cover change needs to be considered when studying anthropogenic impacts on water resources.

1 Introduction

The anthropogenic impact on the global terrestrial hydrological cycle has many aspects. Both emission-driven climate change as well as more direct human interventions such as dam building and water withdrawals (for domestic, industrial and agricultural use, including irrigation) have a strong impact on future water availability, floods and droughts (e.g. Hirabayashi et al., 2013; Haddeland et al., 2013). Additionally, humans have altered a large part of the land surface, replacing 33% (Vitousek et al., 1997) or even 41% (Sterling et al., 2013) of natural vegetation by anthropogenic land cover such as crop fields or pasture. Such land cover change can affect terrestrial hydrology by changing the evaporation to runoff ratio. To date, few studies focus on ~~or include~~ land cover change when assessing the anthropogenic impact on the global terrestrial hydrological cycle. Here, we compare the effects of land cover change, mainly the expansion of crop and pasture at the expense of natural vegetation, to human water use, i.e. water

abstraction for irrigation and non-irrigation use as well as reservoir building. We compare these effects globally as well as spatially, providing an in-depth analysis across climatic zones.

Studies that have assessed the impact of land cover change on global terrestrial hydrology generally find decreased evapotranspiration and increased discharge. Comparing potential (i.e. natural) to actual (present-day) vegetation, Gordon et al. (2005) suggest that decreased evapotranspiration due to deforestation is larger than the increase in evapotranspiration due to irrigation, globally averaged. Piao et al. (2007) emphasize that the observed increase in runoff over the 20th century was not only due to climate change, but that land cover change was equally important, if not more important in some regions, based on experiments with the ORCHIDEE model. Using the LPJmL model, Rost et al. (2008b) report reduced evapotranspiration through reduction of transpiration and interception as natural vegetation is replaced by crops and pasture (grazing land). They furthermore report that the land cover change impact is larger than the climate change impact as well as the impact of water abstraction for irrigation, globally averaged (Rost et al., 2008b, a). Sterling et al. (2013) focus solely on land cover change, and like Rost et al. (2008b) find reduced evapotranspiration due to land cover change, with the conversion of natural vegetation to (rainfed) crops contributing more to the evapotranspiration reduction than the conversion to pasture, despite the latter affecting a larger area. Reduced evapotranspiration results in increased river discharge, albeit covering regional differences in magnitude and sign of change. On a regional scale, similar conclusions are reached by Haddeland et al. (2007) for North America and Asia, with the largest land cover induced changes in runoff occurring over South-East Asia. Hence, despite large variations amongst studies concerning the actual amount and spatial variation of evapotranspiration and runoff changes due to land cover change, related to e.g. uncertainties in evapotranspiration reconstructions, models and land cover maps (Boisier et al., 2014), land cover change is overall thought to have reduced global evapotranspiration and increased runoff to an extent that is at least of similar magnitude as the impact of climate change or other anthropogenic impacts such as irrigation.

In this study we investigate the impact of land cover change as well as human water use, providing a detailed analysis of changes in the water balance across the major climatic zones. Our objective is twofold: first we create new land cover parameter sets for 1850 and 2000 for the PCR-GLOBWB global hydrological model. Second, we use these parameters in sensitivity experiments to study the effect of land cover change ~~on the global terrestrial hydrological cycle and compare the effect of land cover change in detail and compare~~ to the effect of ~~anthropogenic human~~ water use (through e.g. irrigation, demand for industry, reservoirs), with an emphasis on annual mean river flow. A brief overview of experiments is given in Table 1. ~~This~~ In addition to an in-depth analysis across climatic zones, this study adds to existing literature ~~on the global impact of land cover change~~ by introducing a novel land cover product and ~~a new model study investigating land cover change, by using the global hydrological and water resource model~~ PCR-GLOBWB (Van Beek et al., 2011; Wada et al., 2014; Dermody et al., 2014), ~~as well as assessing the impact of land cover change in different climate zones.~~ Our land cover parameterization ~~derives uses crop and pasture areas~~ from the harmonized land use data by Hurtt et al. (2011), for historical years based on HYDE (Klein Goldewijk et al., 2011), who provide crop and pasture cover used in historical as well as future climate scenarios in CMIP5, ~~combined with~~. We combine this with land cover type-specific parameters from GLCC (Global Land Cover Characterization, Olson (1994a, b) Olson 1994a, b) and MIRCA (Monthly Irrigated and Rainfed Crop Areas, Portmann et al. (2010) Portmann et al. 2010). Land cover parameters are allowed to vary per land cover type as well as

spatially. The methods of creating our land cover product are further detailed in Section 2, as is our experimental set-up. The resulting land cover change for 1850-2000 as well as its impact on global terrestrial hydrology are provided in Section 3, where land cover impacts are furthermore compared to the impact of human water use (e.g. dams, irrigation). A discussion of our methods and results is given in Section 4, followed by conclusions in Section 5.

5 2 Methods

2.1 PCR-GLOBWB global hydrological model

Here we apply the PCRaster Global Hydrological Water Balance model, PCR-GLOBWB, at $0.5^{\circ} \times 0.5^{\circ}$ globally (roughly $50 \times 50 \text{ km}$). This [global hydrological and water resources model includes the interaction between terrestrial water fluxes and human water use](#). It simulates the vertical water balance in two soil layers and an underlying groundwater layer, see Fig. 1.

10 Water can be stored in the canopy, snow, soil, rivers, lakes, and groundwater. PCR-GLOBWB takes sub-grid variability into account by including soil type distribution (FAO Digital Soil Map of the World), the simulated fraction of area of saturated soil (based on the Improved Arno Scheme, [Todini \(1996\)](#); [Hagemann and Gates \(2003\)](#) [Todini 1996](#); [Hagemann and Gates 2003](#)) and the spatio-temporal distribution of groundwater depth based on the high resolution digital elevation model (as referenced by [Van Beek et al. \(2011\)](#) [Van Beek et al. 2011](#)) and the simulated groundwater storage. Several land cover types can be considered
15 within one grid cell. These land cover types will be detailed in Section 2.2.

When human water use is included, irrigated crop fields receive additional water if precipitation and soil moisture alone do not satisfy the crop demands. Paddy irrigated fields (rice) are covered by 5 cm of water during the growing season. Irrigation demand over non-paddy irrigated fields is computed by the model based on green water availability (evapotranspiration without irrigation) and the demand of the irrigated areas based on crop factors, see Van Beek et al. (2011); Wada et al. (2014) for details.

20 Water demand for livestock, industry and domestic use is prescribed, using water demand estimates for [2010-2000](#) from Wada et al. (2014) based on livestock densities, population densities and country-statistics on socio-economic development. Irrigation and non-irrigation demand can be met by water from rivers, lakes, reservoirs and groundwater (Wada et al., 2011, 2014; De Graaf et al., 2014). Fossil groundwater abstraction is taken into account, which is the non-renewable part of groundwater abstraction not replenished by recharge. Fossil groundwater is a non-sustainable water source added to meet water demand, but
25 it is not part of the active hydrological cycle (Wada et al., 2012; De Graaf et al., 2014). In order to limit abstraction, data sets on the relative contribution of surface and groundwater are used and a regional limit on pumping capacity is applied (Erkens and Sutanudjaja, 2015). Furthermore, water can be lost through consumption, which is water abstracted for e.g. domestic, industrial and agricultural demand not returned to the hydrological cycle. For a [more](#) detailed model description, see Fig. 1 and Van Beek et al. (2011); Wada et al. (2014).

30 We force ~~the model with~~ [each model experiment with combined ERA-Interim and CRU-TS3.21](#) temperature, precipitation and reference potential evapotranspiration from 1979-2010, thus providing 32 years of output for each experiment (following a spin-up of up to 20 years). Reference potential evapotranspiration is computed using the FAO Penman-Monteith equation (Allen et al., 1998), and converted to vegetation specific potential evapotranspiration using crop factors (see below). The

monthly temperature, precipitation and reference potential evapotranspiration are then broken down into daily values using ERA-Interim reanalysis (see e.g. Van Beek (2008); Sutanudjaja (2012) for the same method applied to CRU-TS2.1 and ERA-40).

2.2 Land cover change

PCR-GLOBWB considers sub-grid variability in land cover by allowing for multiple land cover types per grid cell. Each land cover type is described by a different set of spatially and intra-annually varying parameter values, determining e.g. the amount of canopy interception, root depth etc. Here we include 6 land cover types: tall and short natural vegetation, pasture (~~both managed grassland and rangeland~~), and three types of crops (~~Pasture covers a wide range of ecosystems, including intensive managed grasslands in for instance North West Europe as well as extensive rangeland similar to natural vegetation in drier parts of the world. Crops are separated into~~ rainfed, non-paddy irrigated and paddy irrigated ~~)crops. We base the distinction between rainfed and irrigated crops on the MIRCA data set (Monthly Irrigated and Rainfed Crop Areas, Portmann et al. (2010)), and compute crop parameter values based on 26 spatially and temporally varying crop types.~~ Including pasture and rainfed crops separately is an extension of previous PCR-GLOBWB studies (e.g. Van Beek et al., 2011; Wada et al., 2011, 2014) as we focus on anthropogenic changes in land cover. ~~The distinction between rainfed or irrigated crops is based on MIRCA (Monthly Irrigated and Rainfed Crop Areas, Portmann et al. (2010)).~~ We use fractional crop and pasture cover for 1850 and 2000 provided by Hurtt et al. (2011) at 0.5°x0.5° resolution. The data by Hurtt et al. (2011) extend to 2100 per Representative Concentration Pathway, allowing us to include land cover change in later work focussing on anthropogenic impacts in the future. Other studies on land cover change are based on different sources. For instance, crop and / or pasture cover is often taken from Ramankutty and Foley (1999) instead of Hurtt et al. (2011) (e.g. Piao et al., 2007; Rost et al., 2008b; Sterling et al., 2013).

Per land cover type and per grid cell, PCR-GLOBWB requires various parameters, such as the vegetation fraction per grid cell, the root depths for the improved Arno Scheme, the crop factor to determine the land cover-specific potential evapotranspiration and the interception capacity to partition precipitation into interception and ~~throughfall~~throughfall. As there is no direct source of information on these parameters for historical (or future) land cover changes, we combine available data sets following the approach of Dermody et al. (2014), see Fig. 2. To identify which types of vegetation actually exist per grid cell per land cover type we first create a suitability map using the Global Land Cover Characterization (GLCC, (Olson, 1994a, b; Hagemann et al., 1999)) as well as the slope based on GTOPO30 digital elevation model at 30" (arcsec, roughly 1km x 1km, Van Beek et al. (2011)). Suitability is deemed highest in areas presently covered by crop or pasture according to GLCC, within which suitability decreases with increasing slope. Outside these areas, suitability further decreases with distance to these areas as well as with increasing slope. The suitability is used iteratively to select the most suitable cells until the area required by Hurtt et al. (2011) for ~~a certain year either 1850 or 2000~~ was met, first for crops and then for pasture. The remaining area, not filled with crop or pasture, is filled with reconstructed natural vegetation from the GLCC dataset (tall or short, based on the forest fraction). The resulting 30" information is then combined to the effective land cover parameter values per land cover type per grid cell at 0.5°x0.5° by taking the average of the GLCC parameter values over the grid cell area for natural vegetation or pasture and filling in the crop area using MIRCA input. Note that by moving from the 0.5°x0.5° model resolution to the 30"




Figure 1. Overview of the PCRaster Global Water Balance model, PCR-GLOBWB. The vertical structure, within the black dashed lines, consists of canopy, two soil layers and a groundwater reservoir. Potential evapotranspiration is broken down into canopy transpiration and bare soil evaporation. Evaporation can occur from the canopy, depending on interception capacity and precipitation intensity, from the soil (depending on soil saturation). Transpiration depends on soil moisture and crop coefficients. Discharge along the channel network consists of direct runoff, interflow or subsurface flow and baseflow. In experiment HUM2000 water abstraction, irrigation and reservoirs are included, as is the use of desalinated water (Wada et al., 2014), hence all fluxes including those outside the black dashed lines are computed. Figure courtesy of S. Pessenteiner.




Figure 2. Schematic of how land cover parameters are constructed. Each block represents a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ grid cell. LUH refers to harmonized land use data from Hurtt et al. (2011), DEM refers to digital elevation map (Van Beek et al., 2011), GLCC is the Global Land Cover Characterization (Olson, 1994a, b; Hagemann et al., 1999) and MIRCA refers to Monthly Irrigated and Rainfed Crop Areas Portmann et al. (2010). After Dermody et al. (2014).

resolution of GLCC and GTOPO we allow for different vegetation types, and therefore potentially different parameter values, to be included in the natural and pasture land cover types over time. [The grid cell and land cover type specific parameter values thus reflect a mixture of crop, pasture or natural vegetation types.](#) As an example, the spread of crop factors is given in appendix Fig. A1, as are the maximum crop factors in Fig. A2. [The spread represents the variation over space and time, e.g. higher crop factors occur during the growing season. Figures A3 and A4 show the root distribution in the two modeled soil layers. Crops, particularly irrigated crops, have root mainly in the upper soil layer, but for the other land cover types the root distribution varies spatially.](#)

30 Note that we use the term land cover types, whereas especially pasture could also be considered as a land use type. However, by using global input from GLCC and MIRCA we do allow for the parameter values to vary spatially; e.g. a pasture field consisting of managed grassland will have different parameter values than a pasture field with shrubs or savanna. [A table of GLCC ecosystems classified as pasture in experiment LC2000 is available in the supplementary materials \(Area_table_pasture.tbl\).](#) Tall natural vegetation can represent dense forest, but also savanna or shrubs. Rainfed and non-paddy irrigated crops also vary spatially depending on which crops grow where according to MIRCA. Therefore within the 6 land cover types we represent a larger variety of vegetation types, as opposed to studies that use for instance plant functional types (PFTs) which typically do not have spatial variability in the PFT characteristics (albeit allowing for different PFT combinations in different grid cells).

5 2.3 Experiments

To test the sensitivity of global terrestrial surface hydrology to land cover change we perform two experiments with exactly the same model version and boundary conditions, except for the land cover: LC1850 and LC2000. Changes in vegetation cover per land cover type are shown in Fig. 4 and are briefly described in Section 3.1. Note that human water use (applying irrigation, reservoirs, abstracting water for e.g. industrial use, ~~including reservoirs etc~~) is not taken into account in LC1850 or LC2000, so essentially only the model core in the black dashes in Fig. 1 is used and all crops are rainfed.

Furthermore, we repeated the LC2000 experiment but with human water use (HUM2000), so this experiment includes water withdrawals, reservoirs and the application of irrigation to the paddy and non-paddy irrigated land cover types (Fig. 1). Water demands for industry, domestic and livestock, water delivery from desalinization, and reservoirs are fixed for the year 2000 based on those used in Wada et al. (2014). Paddy and non-paddy irrigated areas are also fixed, as the land cover parameters in our experiments do not include interannual variability. These experiments should therefore be viewed as **sensitivity experiments** idealized sensitivity experiments, set up to study the direct impacts of land cover change and human water use separately and combined.

Using these three experiments (see Table 1) we can test how the sensitivity to land cover change compares to the sensitivity to human water use, i.e. comparing LC2000 to LC1850 as well as HUM2000 to LC2000. For the combined effect we compare HUM2000 to LC1850 in selected figures. Note that we only change either the land cover (LC2000 vs LC1850) or the water use (HUM2000 vs LC2000), ~~we do not include any feedbacks to the atmosphere.~~ PCR-GLOBWB does not take into account precipitation and / or energy flux feedbacks.

2.4 Comparison to GRDC discharge

PCR-GLOBWB is a suitable tool to investigate the global hydrological cycle, as the model is set up to study the terrestrial water cycle including the interaction with human water demand and use. Previous studies have shown that the model performs well compared to observations such as the Global Runoff Data Centre's (GRDC) discharge measurements, the Food and Agriculture Organisation's Aquastat product for water use and the total water storage of the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) (e.g. Wada et al., 2011, 2014). Here we present a brief comparison of discharge to 44 selected GRDC stations, representing the most downstream station of major rivers with catchment areas larger than 150,000 km². For the Amazon the second-most downstream station is used as the most downstream one has a much larger catchment area compared to the other stations. The statistics are based on monthly discharge for the period in which each station has data available within 1979-2010 period.

Figure 3 shows that on average, PCR-GLOBWB over-estimates discharge compared to GRDC measurements in all three experiments. However, the R² values are high for each experiment, with (marginally) higher R² values for more realistic boundary conditions (land cover of 2000 rather than 1850, including human water use). For these 44 stations, the combined average annual mean discharge for the periods in which GRDC data is available is 15618 km³/yr for LC1850, 15828 for

LC2000 and 15446 for HUM2000, compared to 13147 km³/yr for the measurements. Thus the bias (model minus measurements) is 2471, 2681 and 2299 km³/yr, respectively. Discharge in selected rivers per experiment is provided in Section 3.2.

- 5 The better fit of experiment HUM2000 becomes clearer when considering the root mean-square error (rmse) and the Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE, (Gupta et al., 2009; López López et al., 2017)). The rmse is lower for HUM2000 compared to LC2000 for 33 out of 44 stations, and lower compared to LC1850 for 28 out of 44 stations. Similarly, the KGE is higher for HUM2000 in these stations (Figure 3). Experiments LC1850 and LC2000 perform very similar in comparison to GRDC measurements. Note however that our experiments are set up as idealized sensitivity experiments (see Section 2.3), and that
- 10 while LC2000 has more crop and pasture cover representative of present-day, no irrigation is applied. Experiment HUM2000 does include irrigation, as well as water use for other purposes, thus resulting in a better fit to measurements, despite keeping water demand and irrigation requirements fixed using values for the year 2000 (see Section 2.3).

3 Results

In this section we first describe the land cover change between LC2000 and LC1850 (Section 3.1). We then describe the impact

15 of land cover change on the terrestrial hydrological cycle and compare this to the impact of human water use, by looking at differences in the results of LC2000 vs LC1850 as well as HUM2000 vs LC2000. We use several analyses. In Section 3.2 we focus on the changes in the water balance, mainly discharge and evapotranspiration, showing global averages as well as grid cell specific changes averaged over the 32 year experiments. In Section 3.3 we use the subbasins defined in Section 3.1 to investigate how the hydrological cycle responds to specific land cover change in different climate zones. Last, in Section 3.4,

20 we show a Budyko plot for the 100 largest river basins to investigate whether changes in land cover or human water use shift the water partitioning between evapotranspiration and runoff within larger basins.


3.1 Land cover change

Figure 4 shows the change in land cover between 1850 and 2000 per land cover type. There is an overall reduction of tall and short vegetation to the advantage of pasture and crops, affecting all areas except high northern latitudes and the deep tropics


25 (Amazon and Congo). Overall, natural vegetation reduces by $34.8 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$ between 1850 and 2000, roughly 26% of the total land surface. This is mostly taken over by pasture (increasing by $25.4 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$, 19%) and rainfed crops (increasing by $7.9 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$, 6%). The increase in irrigated area is about 1%, but irrigated areas will play a role in the HUM2000 experiment when surface evapotranspiration increases due to irrigation being applied. Note that in the land cover of 1850, some 10% of the area is already covered by crop or pasture, increasing to 36% in the 2000 land cover. The anthropogenic areas in 1850 are

30 mostly in eastern U.S. and western Europe, where some natural vegetation returns in the 2000 land cover (see Fig. 4).


For further analysis, we subdivided the world into subbasins, starting with subbasins larger than $30,000 \text{ km}^2$ (comparable in size to the Meuse basin in Europe or the Allegheny basin in the USA). Subbasins smaller than $30,000 \text{ km}^2$, mostly small endorheic or coastal basins covering only a few gridcells, were grouped. This resulted in 3995 subbasins, with a mean area of $33,396 \text{ km}^2$, ranging from 19.4 to $3,047,270 \text{ km}^2$. Within these subbasins a further division was made based on the dominant



(a) Average discharge Q in m/yr



(b) Root mean square error in m/yr



(c) Kling-Gupta efficiency

Figure 3. Comparison of discharge computed by PCR-GLOBWB and measurements from GRDC stations. Figure (a) shows annual mean discharge in m/yr (discharge in km³/yr divided by catchment area in GRDC or on the model grid) of each experiment compared to observed discharge. Figure (b) shows root mean-square error (in m/yr), comparing the model experiments. A lower rmse indicates a better agreement to the GRDC data, which is the case for the HUM2000 experiment in the majority of stations. Figure (c) shows the Kling-Gupta efficiency (KGE). A higher KGE indicates a better agreement to the GRDC data, which is the case for the HUM2000 experiment. 44 stations were selected for this comparison (see table Comparison_GRDC.xlsx in supplementary materials). KGE values range between -1 and 1 except for one station (4103200 on Yukon River) where KGE is -3.1 for all experiments. For plotting purposes these values are set to -1 in Figure (c).





Figure 4. Changes in land cover in each of the 6 land cover classes, expressed in percentage of grid cells. Note that in figures a-e the scale reaches 50%, while in figure f, for paddy irrigated crops, it reaches 10%. The numbers indicate the surface area covered by a land cover type in 1850 and 2000 in 10^6 km². Total land surface area in our experiments is 133×10^6 km² (Antarctica is excluded). In experiments LC1850 and LC2000 all crop fields are rainfed, only in HUM2000 do the paddy and non-paddy irrigated fields receive additional water.


land cover change (for instance mainly a reduction in tall natural vegetation and an increase in pasture, see Fig. A5) and the predominant Köppen-Geiger class, using the Köppen-Geiger classification of [climatic zones of Kottek et al. \(2006\)](#). Table 2 shows the areas in these subbasins. Most of the area within these subbasins experiences increased pasture cover at the expense of both tall and short natural vegetation (2000 minus 1850 land cover; green and red in Fig. A5, this also follows from Fig. 4). Conversion from tall natural vegetation to pasture is dominant in tropical South America, Africa as well as north and east Australia (note that tall natural vegetation includes e.g. savannas and shrubs, as well as forests, see Section 2.2). Over mid-west North America, southern South America, southern Africa, the Arabian Peninsula, central Asia and south-west Australia the main land cover change is from short natural vegetation to pasture. Conversion from tall natural vegetation to crops affects mainly parts of central-eastern US, eastern Europe and south east Asia. In terms of climate zones, conversion of tall natural vegetation to pasture is the most dominant change in equatorial and warm temperate climates (Köppen classes A and C), while in arid and polar climates (B, E) the dominant change is from short to pasture. Conversion to crop is mainly from tall natural vegetation, most of which occurs in snow climates (Köppen class D). In total, in terms of area, 93% (123.7 km²) of these subbasins experiences at least some conversion from natural (tall or short) to anthropogenic land cover (pasture or crop). Only 2% is converted from anthropogenic back to natural vegetation, mostly in western Europe and eastern North America, and 5% experiences no land cover change at all ('Other' and 'noLC' in Table 2).

3.2 Changes in global hydrology: water balance


Figure 5(a) shows discharge changes due to land cover changes. Land cover changes can in- or decrease discharge, with opposite changes occurring even within basins (e.g. Mississippi, Amazone). Global average annual mean discharge increases by ~~1058~~ [901](#) km³/yr (LC2000 vs LC1850). This amounts to a ~~2.21~~ [1.9](#)% increase in global discharge. Discharge changes can reflect both local and upstream changes in land cover, the latter is clear for instance in the high northern latitudes where there is no land cover change (see Fig. 5(a)). Compared to the effect of human water use, land cover change effects are of similar magnitude but ~~display a larger spread~~ [this global average masks a large spatial spread in sign and magnitude](#). Figure 5(b) shows that including human water use reduces discharge in all affected rivers (HUM2000 vs LC2000), as a result of water being stored in reservoirs and abstracted for e.g. irrigation or industrial use. Blue areas in Fig. 5(b), where discharge increases, correspond to reservoirs, which are included in HUM2000 but not in LC2000. There is some variation in which rivers are more affected by the land cover change or the human water use, see Fig. 5. Table 3 shows discharge changes in 26 main rivers for all three experiments. ~~The largest impact of land cover change is in the Nile and the Dniepr rivers.~~ [5 of the 6 of the](#) 26 rivers have decreased discharge due to land cover change, but this decrease is small compared to the impact of human water use. Also, amongst these ~~5~~ [6](#) is the Rhine where the overall of land cover change is a conversion of crop and pasture to natural vegetation, which on average decreases discharge. The large rivers in the tropics (Amazone and Congo) are not strongly affected by land cover change (Fig. 4) and therefore total discharge does not change (<1%, Table 3), although this masks some intra-basin in- and decreases. Of the 26 rivers in Table 3, ~~15 rivers are~~ [discharge to the ocean from 17 rivers is](#) more affected by human water use than land cover change. ~~However, globally~~ [Globally](#) averaged the reduction in discharge in HUM2000 compared to



(a) Impact of land cover change (LC2000-LC1850)



(b) Impact of water use (HUM2000-LC2000)



(c) Impact of both (HUM2000-LC1850)

Figure 5. Difference in annual average discharge between the experiments, averaged over 1979-2010, in m^3/s . Higher discharge for HUM2000 occurs over reservoirs, which are not included in LC1850 or LC2000.

LC2000 is 907-1185 km³/yr, which is comparable in magnitude ~~but slightly smaller than~~ to the discharge increase due to land cover change (+058-901 km³/yr).

As the only difference between experiments LC2000 and LC1850 is in the land cover, the changes in discharge can be explained by differences in actET (actual evapotranspiration from the land surface, Fig. 6(a)). An increase in actET reduces discharge by removing water that would have gone into the rivers, and vice versa. Upstream regions of for instance the Dnieper and the Nile, where the relative increase in discharge due to land cover change is largest/large, experience reduced actET. Globally averaged, actET is reduced by +080-917 km³/yr, or +91.6%, and total evapotranspiration (land surface evapotranspiration plus waterbody evaporation) is reduced by +048-888 km³/yr, or +81.5%. As expected, the increased discharge (+058-901 km³/yr) can almost fully be explained by changes in evapotranspiration, see Table 4. The remaining +0-13 km³/yr is small (the total discharge per experiment is ~47,000 km³/yr, see Table 3) and can be attributed to small changes in ~~storage or rounding errors~~ total terrestrial water storage (lower by 17 km³/yr in LC2000) and rounding errors in processing the model output.

Most actET changes occur over eastern US, central America, south-east South America, tropical North Africa, central Europe and South-East Asia (Fig. 6(a)). These are areas with large land cover change (Fig. 4), but not all areas with large land cover change experience a strong change in actET. For instance, central US, southern Africa, central Asia (along ~40°N) and Australia show little change in actET, despite strong changes in potential evapotranspiration due to land cover change (Fig. 7). These are generally water limited (potET > P), arid areas, where changes in potential evapotranspiration do not have a strong effect on actual evapotranspiration. In Section 3.3 we will further evaluate changes in different climate zones.

The effect of human water use on actET is slightly smaller than the effect of land cover change, as evapotranspiration is only increased over irrigated areas but shows a strong increase there (Fig. 6(b)). Globally averaged, evapotranspiration from the land surface is increased by 377-701 km³/yr, ~~which is the water consumed through irrigation. Another 156. Another 134~~ km³/yr evaporates from water bodies, mainly the reservoirs. ~~The 377 + 156 = 533~~ Total evapotranspiration is increased by 846 km³/yr ~~increase in evapotranspiration therefore does not balance the 907, which is not enough to balance the 1185~~ km³/yr ~~reduction~~ decrease in discharge. When including human water use, the simple hydrological budget of $P = Q + E + TWS$ does not hold, as it did for the land cover experiments, where the land cover-induced change in Q was compensated by the change in E and terrestrial water storage TWS (as P did not change between the experiments). For human water use in PCR-GLOBWB ~~three more terms need to be considered, as fossil groundwater and desalinated water are added and water consumption is lost. Fossil groundwater is a non-sustainable water source added to meet (parts of) the water demand, but it is not an active part of the hydrological cycle (Wada et al., 2012), and water consumption is water~~ there is an additional source of water besides precipitation, namely desalinated water, and water is also lost through consumption. The latter consists of water abstracted for e.g. domestic, industrial and livestock demand which is not returned to the hydrological cycle. ~~Comparing HUM2000 to LC2000, P does not change, so changes~~ Changes in the hydrological budget are ~~described by~~ $dGW_{fossil} +$ thus described by $dDesalinated = dQ + dE + dConsumption$. ~~Note that dE contains irrigation water consumption and dConsumption contains non-irrigation water consumption. With dTWS + dConsumption. With dDesalinated = 1, dQ = -907 km³/yr - 1185, dE = 533 km³/yr, dDesalinated 846 (including evapotranspiration from irrigation), dTWS = +1 km³/yr, dGW_{fossil} = -128 km³/yr - 185 and dConsumption = 505-499 km³/yr this the balance is practically closed, see Table 4.~~ Note that despite the fact that dQ is not

fully balanced by dE for human water use, locally the effect on evapotranspiration through irrigation is higher than the effect of land cover change, especially in water limited arid regions (further described in Section 3.3). Note that despite the fact that dQ is not fully balanced by dE for human water use, locally the effect on evapotranspiration through irrigation is strong, especially in water limited arid regions (further described in Section 3.3).

The combined impact of land cover change and human water use (HUM2000 minus LC1850) would be a reduction in ~~evapotranspiration of 516~~ total evapotranspiration of 42 km³/yr, or ~~0.90.1%~~, and a discharge increase of ~~152-284~~ km³/yr, or ~~0.3%~~. ~~Discharge is sensitive to changes in both land cover as well as human water use (Fig. 5(e)), with a slightly larger impact of increased discharge due to 0.6%, see Table 4. The effect of~~ land cover change ~~compared to the reduced discharge due to,~~ increasing discharge, largely cancel out the effect of human water use, decreasing discharge. These global averages however mask spatial variability, with discharge changes due to land cover change covering both in- and decreases, see Fig. 5 and Table 3. Evapotranspiration is most sensitive to land cover change ~~, in the global average as well as in~~ most regions (Fig. 6(c)), but globally averaged the effects cancel out due to the strong impact of irrigation on evapotranspiration.

3.3 Changes in global hydrology: subbasin analysis

To further specify how the impacts of land cover and human water use vary amongst different land cover transitions and different climate zones, we use the subbasins defined in Section 3.1.


Specific changes in discharge per subbasin are represented in Fig. 8, showing ~~that land cover~~ discharge in experiment LC2000 versus LC1850 or HUM2000 for the different climate zones, with each color representing a land cover change. Land cover changes cause an increase in discharge in most subbasins, with most spread in the sign of change for the transition of short natural to pasture. On average the largest increase occurs when natural vegetation is replaced with crops, followed by the transition from natural vegetation to pasture. Furthermore, the largest discharge changes occur in arid climates (B), especially when tall natural vegetation is replaced by crops. Areas where natural vegetation replaces crop or pasture ('other') generally experience a decrease in discharge ~~-(more accurately reflected in Fig. A6).~~

Smallest discharge changes occur when short natural vegetation is replaced by pasture, except in polar climates (E), where other transitions hardly occur (see Table 2).


A similar picture arises when looking at relative changes in discharge (Fig. A6).

Changes in discharge per subbasin due to human water use are ~~generally smaller than the changes induced by land cover change. Only in~~ of the same order of magnitude overall, but have a larger effect in in warm temperate and snow climates (C, D) does human water use affect the discharge slightly more (Fig. 8). This could be related to population density and consequently high water demands in these areas. In all areas except polar climates (E) land cover change increases discharge, while human water use decreases discharge. Note that discharge within a subbasin may be affected by changes upstream.


Changes in actET and sensitivity to potET per subbasin are shown in Fig. 9. Areas more sensitive to changes in potET will have a stronger change in actET relative to the change in potET. Based on all subbasins (top left panel) there is an average reduction in actET, due to reduced potET as a result of land cover change (circles). Only the transition of natural to crop or pasture ('other') results in higher actET. The transition of short natural to pasture also results in higher actET on average, but there is a large spread in both the magnitude and sign of change. There is also quite some spread for subbasins where tall



(a) Impact of landcover change (LC2000-LC1850)



(b) Impact of human water use (HUM2000-LC2000)



(c) Impact of both (HUM2000-LC1850)

Figure 6. Difference in annual total land surface evapotranspiration between the experiments, averaged over 1979-2010, in mm/yr.




Figure 7. Difference in potential evapotranspiration, averaged over 1979-2010, between LC2000 and LC1850, in mm/yr (average of annual totals). Note that there is no difference in potential evapotranspiration between HUM2000 and LC2000.

natural vegetation is replaced by pasture, because natural vegetation and pasture can represent a variety of vegetation types ([see Section 2.2](#)). Areas where crop replaces natural vegetation generally show a larger reduction in actET and are most sensitive; changes in actET are high relative to changes in potET. This corresponds to larger discharge changes in such areas (Fig. 8) compared to areas where pasture replaces natural vegetation. Only in polar climates (E) is the effect of changing short natural vegetation to pasture largest, but other transitions hardly occur here (Table 2). Conversion from short natural to pasture in other climate zones shows the least sensitivity, as the largest changes in potET occur mostly in arid climates (B, lower left panel of Fig. 9). Furthermore, in some areas conversion from short natural to pasture does not change potET, such as north of the Caspian Sea (compare Fig. 4 and 7). Despite the low sensitivity of actET to potET in arid climates (B), there is still a large reduction in actET when tall natural vegetation is replaced with crop or pasture, ~~in-line-with-the-leading-to-a~~ strong increase in discharge for these transitions in arid areas (Fig. 8). Sensitivity is highest in the wetter equatorial and warm temperate climates (A and C), in which there are more energy limited areas ($\text{potET} < P$). Conversion of crop or pasture to natural vegetation ('other') results in higher evapotranspiration, with highest sensitivity in equatorial, warm temperate and snow climates (A, C and D).

15 Compared to land cover induced changes in actET, changes due to human water use are ~~overall-smaller,-but-always-positive~~ (Fig. 9). ~~Only in arid-larger in arid and warm temperate~~ climates (B) ~~)-does-and C~~. ~~In arid areas, increased~~ human water use cause a greater change in actET. ~~The only way human water use changes land surface evapotranspiration is by irrigation, i. e. adding water to crops, which increases actET especially in arid, water-limited areas~~ ~~in the form of irrigation has a strong effect on evapotranspiration as these areas are water limited areas ($\text{potET} > P$), whereas the water-limitation means that these regions~~

have a low sensitivity to changes in land cover. Warm temperate regions are less water limited but highly populated, which may explain the strong human impacts on actET. Note that there is no change in potET between HUM2000 and LC2000.

3.4 Changes in global hydrology: Budyko analysis

- 5 Another way of comparing the effects of land cover change to those of human water use is by representing river basins in the Budyko framework. Fig. 10 shows that human water use (HUM2000 vs LC2000) ~~generally increases~~ can strongly increase actET without changes in potET, moving basins towards or even over the supply limit of $\text{actET}=\text{P}$, by adding water to irrigated fields. The effect of human water use is larger than that of land cover in ~~26-33~~ out of the 100 basins plotted in Fig. 10, mostly in water-limited areas ($\text{potET} > \text{P}$) where actET is not sensitive to the land cover-induced change in potET (see Fig.9)
- 5 but where irrigation can greatly increase actET. Land cover changes affect both actET and potET, generally reducing both, except some areas, mainly water-limited basins where short natural vegetation is replaced by pasture. Such areas become more water-limited, while the majority of basins becomes more energy-limited (or less water-limited) due to land cover change.

4 Discussion

In this study we have shown that the impact of land cover change can be as important as the impact of human water use through
10 e.g. irrigation, abstraction and dams. The latter reduces discharge through increased evapotranspiration over irrigated areas and reservoirs as well as water consumption, while land cover change effects vary spatially but overall reduce evapotranspiration and increase discharge. Conversion to crops leads to the largest reduction in evapotranspiration and hence increase in discharge, despite conversion to pasture covering a larger area. Areas converted to pasture may experience less evapotranspiration changes due to less change in vegetation types and therefore smaller changes in potential evapotranspiration, as well as the fact that a
15 large part of this area is in arid, water-limited climatic conditions.

In this section we compare our results to previous studies on the impact of land cover change and / or human water use (Section 4.1), as well as provide a discussion on uncertainty due to input data (Section 4.2) and feedbacks that are not included (Section 4.3). We acknowledge that results are not only sensitive to input data but also to model physics, resolution and parameterization. A detailed discussion on model uncertainty is left out as our experiments are set up as sensitivity experiments;
20 judging model performance compared to observations was not our goal.

4.1 Comparison to previous studies

Our results are generally in line with previous studies, stating that land cover change reduces evapotranspiration and increases discharge, with land cover impacts of similar magnitude as the impact of human water use. Differences in magnitudes and patterns of changes may be explained by using different computational tools and models and different input data (see also
25 Section 4.2). A brief overview of global studies of the impacts of land cover and / or human water use is shown in Table 5, more detail is given in the text here.




Figure 8. River discharge (Q) changes in m³/s per subbasin for all Köppen classes in the top left as well as per Köppen class. The axes are on a log-scale. Each circle color represents a land cover change: tall to pasture (green), tall to crop (blue), short to pasture (red), short to crop (purple), or other (black, crop or pasture to short or tall natural). No circles are drawn in subbasins where no land cover change occurs. Grey crosses represent discharge in LC2000 and HUM2000. Köppen class A is equatorial, B is arid, C is warm temperate, D is snow and E is polar climates. In each figure the top left numbers are the average discharge change per land cover change m³/s, in the bottom right are the total land cover changes as well as the changes due to human water use. Areas and number of subbasins per land cover change are given in Table 2.




Figure 9. Changes in actual evapotranspiration (actET, y-axis) and potential evapotranspiration (potET, x-axis) from land per subbasin. Circles represent land cover change (LC2000 - LC1850), grey crosses represent human water use (HUM200 - LC2000). Note that there is no change in potET between HUM2000 and LC2000; the grey crosses have been moved along the x-axis for visibility. Each circle color represents a land cover change: tall to pasture (green), tall to crop (blue), short to pasture (red), short to crop (purple), or other (black, crop or pasture to short or tall natural). The top left panel represents all subbasins, the other figures represent a Köppen class. A is equatorial, B is arid, C is warm temperate, D is snow and E is polar climates. In each panel the top left numbers are the average actET change per land cover change and the change in actET divided by the change in potET, in the bottom right are the total land cover changes (ΔLC , LC2000 - LC1850) as well as the changes due to redistribution (ΔHUM , HUM2000 - LC2000). No circles are drawn for subbasins where no land cover change occurs. In all figures the 1:1 line is drawn in grey. Note that in some cases the change in actET is larger than the change in potET, or of opposite sign. This generally occurs where changes in potET are small, such as high latitudes or the Amazon or Congo basins. It may also reflect areas where changes in e.g. soil moisture content or rooting depth alters the response to changed potET. Areas and number of subbasins per land cover change are given in Table 2.




Figure 10. Annual climatological means of $actET/P$ (y-axis) and $potET/P$ (x-axis) for the 100 largest river basins (on our model grid). The x-axis is on a log scale. Circles represent $actET/P$ and $potET/P$ for the LC2000 experiment, colors indicate the land cover change, grey is for human water use. Arrows point from values for the LC1850 to those for the LC2000 experiment (colors), or from LC2000 to HUM2000 (grey), see the example. Solid arrowheads indicate that the change in $actET/P$ induced by human water use is larger than the change induced by land cover. This occurs in 26-33 of the 100 basins. Here we re-classified the land cover changes for the entire basins, we did not group the subbasins that were used in Section 3.3. Figure A7 shows which basins were used for this Budyko analysis.

Gordon et al. (2005) report a reduction in evapotranspiration due to deforestation of $3000 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ and an increase due to irrigation of $2600 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$, comparing potential (natural) to actual (present-day) vegetation. Here we report ~~a 1048- an 888~~ km^3/yr decrease due to land cover change and ~~533-846~~ km^3/yr increase due irrigation and reservoirs. Our changes are smaller despite a larger area of change; Gordon et al. (2005) compare a fully potential (natural) vegetation to actual vegetation with a total area of change of $15.9 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$, with crop and grazing land replacing forest and woodland, while we find a reduction of natural vegetation (both tall and short) of $34.8 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$, replaced by crop and pasture, from 1850 to 2000. The reduction of tall natural vegetation alone is $17.3 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$ in our study. Gordon et al. (2005) only include deforestation, replaced by cropland or grazing land. The transition of tall natural vegetation to crop is causing the strongest decrease in evapotranspiration (actET) and increase in discharge in our study, followed by the transition of tall to pasture, but here it is balanced by a weaker response of the transition of short natural vegetation to crop or pasture and sometimes even an opposite response (such as conversion of crop back to natural vegetation or short natural vegetation to pasture in arid or polar climates). Results may also differ because Gordon et al. (2005) works with vegetation-specific coefficients, with for instance crop coefficients for a range of tall natural vegetation types but all grazing land (pasture) having the same values as natural grassland. This could explain a larger sensitivity of transition to grazing lands than the transition to pasture in our study, as pasture has spatially varying parameter values (like all land cover types) which in some areas are close to those of the natural vegetation it replaces ~~-in our study.~~

Rost et al. (2008b) have also addressed how global terrestrial evapotranspiration and discharge are impacted by land use and irrigation, using the dynamic global vegetation model LPJmL. Like Gordon et al. (2005) they use a ‘potential’ natural vegetation, whereas we use the 1850 land cover to compare to present-day (in our case 2000) land cover. Their impact of land cover change on actET ($-2361 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$, -3.8%) and discharge ($2349 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$, 6.6%) is larger than the changes we find here (~~-2.2-1.6%~~ and 1.9% respectively). Water redistribution includes only irrigation in Rost et al. (2008b), so they find smaller human water use induced changes than our study where we also include dams, water abstraction and consumption. Using only renewable water sources for irrigation they find increased actET of $483 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ (0.8%) and reduced discharge of $579 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ (-1.5%). In our study, actET from the surface (excluding evaporation from water bodies) is increased by ~~377-701~~ km^3/yr (HUM2000 vs LC2000), which is ~~comparable to larger than~~ the increased actET of Rost et al. (2008b) due to irrigation, ~~but smaller, likely due to despite~~ their comparison to potential natural vegetation vs our comparison to 1850 conditions. ~~Including non-renewable water resources increases the impact of irrigation on actET to 1325~~ This could be related to their finding of $483 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ in their study, even more than the combined effect of ET from irrigation and water bodies in our study; $533 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ ~~-This includes fossil groundwater being based on only renewable water sources. In PCR-GLOBWB fossil groundwater is included,~~ but limits on abstraction of this unsustainable source are enforced ~~in PCR-GLOBWB~~ (see Methods). In the study of Rost et al. (2008b), including non-renewable water resources to ensure no water stress on irrigated crops increases the impact of irrigation on actET to $1325 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$.

Another study reaching similar conclusions to ours, despite using different methods and land cover parameterization, is Sterling et al. (2013). They investigated the impact of global land cover change on the terrestrial water cycle using observations as well as land surface modelling (ORCHIDEE). They find that land cover change can have a similar or greater impact than other major drivers (mainly climate change and water consumption and withdrawals). Furthermore, both our study as well as

30 Sterling et al. (2013) find that conversion to crops causes the largest volume change in evapotranspiration, despite conversion to pasture covering a larger area. The latter may be related to a large part of conversion to pasture occurs in arid regions which are least sensitive to ET changes. The reduction in total evapotranspiration in our study (~~1048-888~~ km^3/yr , 1.8%) is smaller than in theirs ($3500 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$, 5%), which could be related to the larger anthropogenically impacted part of the global surface area in their ‘present day’ land cover (41%). This land cover is compared to a fully natural (‘potential’) land cover. Here, we compare land cover of 2000, with 36% of the surface covered with crops or pasture, to that of 1850, with 10% anthropogenic land surface. Hence we essentially increase the anthropogenically impacted surface area by 26%. ~~With a smaller change in evapotranspiration we also find a smaller increase in discharge (2.2% vs the 7.6% increase reported by Sterling et al. (2013)).~~ Note Furthermore, we note that Sterling et al. (2013) include evaporation from reservoirs and wetlands in their study, with wetland loss causing strong reduction in evapotranspiration, while we neglect reservoirs in the LC2000 and LC1850 experiments and wetlands are not included in any of our experiments. With a smaller change in evapotranspiration we also find a smaller increase in discharge (1.9% vs the 7.6% increase reported by Sterling et al. (2013)).

5 On a smaller scale, Haddeland et al. (2007) find increased runoff due to land cover change over North America and Asia using the Variable Infiltration Capacity model. They furthermore find that dams and reservoirs have the most important effects on river runoff, because reservoir operations can strongly change a river’s hydrograph. Here we have not included seasonal changes, but acknowledge that indeed the effects can vary seasonally (Haddeland et al., 2006). The impact of changing land cover of 1900 to 1992 is similar to the impact of irrigation and reservoirs in Asia, while in North America the impact of irrigation and reservoirs is larger (Haddeland et al. (2007), their Fig. 6). Here we also find that at least three of the major North American rivers included in Table 3 are impacted more by human water use (Mississippi, Columbia, Colorado). In Asia, the ~~largest river basin, Ganges-Brahmaputra-Mekong river~~ is impacted more by land cover change, ~~as is the Mekong river~~. Human water use has a larger impact on especially the Indus, but also the Ganges-Brahmaputra, Yangtze, Yenisey, Ob, Lena and Yellow rivers. Furthermore, in Haddeland et al. (2006) the consumptive irrigation water use is estimated at $98 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ for North America and $509 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ for Asia, which is ~~larger than the 377~~ on the same order of magnitude as the 776 km^3/yr of water lost globally through evaporation over irrigated areas stated in ~~this study~~ our HUM2000 experiment. Biemans et al. (2011) report a global reduction $930 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ (2.1%) in discharge due to ~~reservoirs and irrigation~~ irrigation over the 20th century using the LPJmL model, close to the ~~907-1185~~ km^3/yr (2.5%) reported in our study. Irrigation water supply from reservoirs is 460 km^3/yr in their study, versus 776 km^3/yr evaporation from irrigation in our HUM2000 experiment from reservoirs as well as other sources (precipitation, rivers, groundwater).

20 The reduction in evapotranspiration due to land cover change in our study is closer (globally averaged) to the $1260 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ (diagnosed based on ET products) or $760 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$ (simulated, LUCID LSMs) reported by Boisier et al. (2014) ~~as they~~. They compare 1992 to 1870 instead of a fully (potential) natural vegetation as in the studies above. However, note that Boisier et al. (2014) report large uncertainty margins on these numbers (1260 ± 850 and $760 \pm 720 \text{ km}^3/\text{yr}$, see Section 4.2). 25 Sterling et al. (2013) also report a large range of estimates (their Figure 2). This implies that the actual values are rather uncertain, as also exemplified by the various numbers reported above, but all studies point to decreased evapotranspiration due to land cover change. Thus, despite the idealized set-up or our experiments (for instance keeping land cover and water use fixed

at values for the year 2000 in HUM2000), the range of values previously reported, and the values reported here being smaller than the model bias (see Section 2.4), the findings for the impacts of land cover and water use are in line with those previously reported.

4.2 Uncertainty in input data

The numbers presented in this study are dependent on not only the model used but also the input data. Here we use fractions of crop and pasture from the harmonized land use data of Hurtt et al. (2011), which shows some differences to the SAGE dataset of Ramankutty and Foley (1999), used by e.g. Gordon et al. (2005); Haddeland et al. (2007); Sterling et al. (2013). Haddeland et al. (2007) discuss some differences between SAGE, the dataset of Ramankutty and Foley (1999), and HYDE (Klein Goldewijk et al., 2011), which is used for the historical part of the dataset of Hurtt et al. (2011). For present-day, SAGE has 15% of global land area identified as cropland, while HYDE identifies 11% as cropland and 23% as pasture. Furthermore, deforestation in SAGE is 11.5% but 17% in HYDE. Hence using different sources of crop and pasture cover, combined with each study / model representing vegetation parameters in their own way, introduces differences in results.

Even in studies aimed at representing present-day hydrological conditions, a different land cover dataset can impact the results. Müller Schmied et al. (2014) present a sensitivity analysis of the global hydrological model WaterGAP to input data, model structure, human water use and calibration. They find that using different land cover products (MODIS vs GLCC) has a bigger effect on grid cell fluxes such as actET and Q, than human water use. At the global scale ~~it~~ this effect averages out and human water use is more important for global sums of Q, while land cover is more important for actET. Our study agrees on the latter, but here we find that land cover change has a comparable effect on global discharge sums as the effect of human water use, which may be related to the fact that we apply a larger land cover change (1850 vs 2000 instead of two different land cover datasets for present-day). However, both studies underline the importance of land cover in terrestrial hydrological fluxes.

Boisier et al. (2014) discuss land-use induced changes in actET based on various observations as well as model studies, reporting a decrease in actET of 1260 ± 850 and 760 ± 720 km³/yr respectively, based on LUCID intermodel comparison of land surface models. Differences can arise from distinct land surface parameterizations in models as well as different land cover maps and different crop evapotranspiration rates in different land cover products. Therefore, Boisier et al. (2014) state that ‘comparisons between independent estimates might be misleading’, as one needs to take into account different computational methods or models, different land cover input products, as well as whether or not a study includes e.g. irrigation.

Concerning the impact of human water use, there is some spread in literature in the actual estimates as well. Part of this spread results from taking into account different aspects of human water use, whether it be only irrigation (e.g. Rost et al., 2008b) or also reservoirs (e.g. Haddeland et al., 2007; Sterling et al., 2013). Here we take both into account, but keep irrigated areas and reservoirs fixed at 2000, in order to set up sensitivity experiments in line with the land cover experiments in which land cover is kept fixed during the experiment. One potentially influential assumption we make is that the relative cover of rainfed and irrigated crops is fixed according to the MIRCA dataset (Portmann et al., 2010). In our HUM2000 experiment, irrigation can be applied over an area of 2.99×10^6 km² (paddy and non-paddy combined), close to the 3.07×10^6 km² equipped

for irrigation according to FAO (Siebert et al., 2013). However, the distribution of irrigated areas is different, here we for instance do not include irrigated areas west of the Black Sea, which are included in FAO based irrigated areas as used by e.g. Wada et al. (2014). Taking a different pattern of irrigated areas, or reservoirs and human water demand from another year than 2000, would likely influence the reported changes in actET and discharge in HUM2000 compared to LC2000. Lastly, we overestimate the irrigated area in 1850 by applying fixed rainfed and irrigated crop cover ratios from MIRCA, but this should not affect our land cover induced changes because in the LC1850 experiment no irrigation is applied, all crops are rainfed.

Despite the variety in estimates of land cover and / or human water use impacts in literature, the general conclusion that land cover changes reduce actET and increase discharge, with a similar order of magnitude as the impact of human water use, is robust amongst studies.

4.3 Uncertainty due to feedbacks not included

5 Our aim was to use idealized sensitivity experiments to investigate the direct effects of land cover effects as well as the effects of human water use. The actual values may be affected by e.g. model physics and parameter values or different input sources as discussed above. Also, feedbacks that are generally not included in global hydrological model studies may affect the outcomes. In this paper we use the same climatic forcing for all experiments, with no feedbacks to the atmosphere. We therefore do not include the effect that changing evaporation has on precipitation, which is known to affect precipitation particularly
10 over irrigated areas (e.g. Tuinenburg et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2015; Pei et al., 2016). We note that by using reanalysis data as climatic forcing (CRU-ERA-Interim, see Section 2.1) the observed changes in precipitation that reflect such feedbacks are likely included.

Furthermore, by applying climatic forcing representative of present-day to the LC1850 experiment we do not take into account that besides a change in land cover, the climatic forcing around 1850 was slightly different. Neither do we take into
15 account that the vegetation parameters used may be different under different climate conditions, such as the instance lower CO₂ levels and temperatures in 1850. However, by keeping the climate forcing and the parameter values per land cover type equal, we can investigate the direct effect of land cover change.

PCR-GLOBWB is a hydrological and water balance model, it does not compute the energy balance; the potential evapotranspiration can be computed from e.g. radiation and vapor pressure and then be provides as a boundary condition, but the model does not
20 compute how the land surface affects e.g. the radiation fluxes back to the atmosphere. We thus cannot compare how including the land-atmospheric energy balance changes as a result of land cover change or human water use and how this may affect the water balance. Land surface models such as ORCHIDEE used in (Sterling et al., 2013) do typically include the energy balance. For a full inclusion of both the energy balance and precipitation feedbacks, general circulation models are used, but those studies typically do not focus on the water balance, nor have an accurate representation of the interaction between the hydrological cycle and human water use.

5 5 Conclusions

In this study we used the PCR-GLOBWB global hydrological model to investigate the hydrological impacts of global land cover change as well as human water use. Land cover change is broken down into transitions of short or tall natural vegetation into crop or pasture, as well as a few areas where natural vegetation returns. Globally averaged, changing the land cover from 1850 to that of 2000 decreases evapotranspiration by ~~1048-888~~ 901 km³/yr (~~1.81.5~~ 2.21.9%). There is spatial variability in the response to land cover change, especially for the transition of short natural vegetation to pasture. The strongest ~~response generally occurs~~ responses generally occur when tall natural vegetation is replaced by crops and in energy-limited equatorial and warm temperate regions. The globally averaged response to the inclusion of human water use is a discharge decrease of ~~907-1185~~ 534-846 km³/yr, ~~slightly smaller but~~ on the same order of magnitude as the impact of land cover change on discharge. Part of the discharge decrease is related to enhanced evapotranspiration over irrigation and reservoirs (~~534-846~~ 534-846 km³/yr), which can result in larger evapotranspiration changes than land cover change locally. The exact numbers reported here depend on choices in input data and model set-up, but we conclude that land cover change needs to be included in studies assessing the anthropogenic impact on the global hydrological cycle.

Appendix A: Supplementary figures

Areas covered by selected subbasins (3995 in total, see Table 2 and Section 3.1). Green areas indicate where the main change in the subbasin is from tall natural to pasture, blue represents tall natural to crops, red represents short natural to pasture and purple represents short natural to crops. Grey indicates subbasins where the main change is from crops or pasture to tall or short natural (e.g. in western Europe, eastern North America). Dashed black indicates where there is no land cover change (e.g. high polar latitudes). Color intensity indicates the change in natural vegetation, with near-white indicating almost no change and most saturated colors indicating that tall or short natural vegetation has de- or increased at least 50%. Table 2 shows the surface areas in each of these areas.




Figure A1. Variation in crop factor (k_c) in LC2000, used to compute land cover-specific potential evapotranspiration ($ET_{pot} = k_c * ET_{refpot}$), per continent and per land cover type. All daily k_c values are included. Box plots indicate the minimum and maximum values by the whiskers, the interquartile range (between the first and third quartile) by the box and the median value by the black line within the box. Width of the boxes is proportional to the amount of grid cells within a continent where a land cover type is present. The spread for paddy irrigated crops is high because k_c is high during the growing season but rather low (near 0.2) outside the growing season. Continental masks were derived using basins (see Fig. A2), with North and South America separated through central Mexico, Europe and Africa separated through the Arabian Peninsula, Europe and Asia separated through the Ural mountains, and Asia and Oceania separated roughly along the border of Malaysia and Indonesia.




Figure A2. Maximum crop factors (k_c) in LC2000 per land cover type, used to compute land cover-specific potential evapotranspiration ($ET_{pot} = k_c * ET_{refpot}$). For each grid cell the maximum value is given, which may occur at different times during the year. Values are given where a land cover type covers more than 1 % of a grid cell. Black lines indicate the masks used for the continents in Figure A1. Note that short natural vegetation includes desert areas where the crop factor is set to a minimum value of 0.2, hence the low crop factors for short natural vegetation in e.g. Africa (see Fig. A1). Low crop factors for short natural vegetation in North Africa derive from Arctic vegetation.




Figure A3. Root fraction in soil layer 1 (upper soil layer, reaching 0.13 to 0.3m depth) in LC2000 per land cover type, used to compute land cover-specific transpiration. A fraction of 1 indicates that all roots are in the upper layer, i.e. no water is taken by the roots from the deeper soil layer. Values are given where a land cover type covers more than 1 % of a grid cell.




Figure A4. Root fraction in soil layer 2 (lower soil layer, reaching 0.52 to 1.2m depth) in LC2000 per land cover type, used to compute land cover-specific transpiration. The higher the root fraction, the more root is in the lower soil layer (and thus able to pick up moisture from both layers). Values are given where a land cover type covers more than 1 % of a grid cell.




Figure A5. Areas covered by selected subbasins (3995 in total, see Table 2 and Section 3.1). Green areas indicate where the main change in the subbasin is from tall natural to pasture, blue represents tall natural to crops, red represents short natural to pasture and purple represents short natural to crops. Grey indicates subbasins where the main change is from crops or pasture to tall or short natural (e.g. in western Europe, eastern North America). Dashed black indicates where there is no land cover change (e.g. high polar latitudes). Color intensity indicates the change in natural vegetation, with near-white indicating almost no change and most saturated colors indicating that tall or short natural vegetation has de- or increased at least 50%. Table 2 shows the surface areas in each of these areas.






Figure A6. River discharge (Q) changes in % per subbasin for all Köppen classes in the top left as well as per Köppen class. Change due to human water use is represented on the x-axis (HUM, (HUM2000-LC2000)*100/LC2000), change due to land cover change is given on the y-axis (LC, (LC2000-LC1850)*100/LC1850). Each circle color represents a land cover change: tall to pasture (green), tall to crop (blue), short to pasture (red), short to crop (purple), or other (black, crop or pasture to short or tall natural). Grey crosses represent subbasins where no land cover change occurs. Köppen class A is equatorial, B is arid, C is warm temperate, D is snow and E is polar climates. In each figure the top right numbers are the average discharge change per land cover change in %, in the bottom right are the total land cover changes as well as the changes due to human water use in %. Areas and number of subbasins per land cover change are given in Table 2. One subbasin in B, short to pasture, was removed from this figure; with very low Q ($< 1 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$), dQ in this basin became $> 1000\%$. Figure 8 shows the absolute changes.



(a) 100 largest basins, randomly color coded



(b) Average potET/P per basin

Figure A7. The 100 largest basins on our model grid (a) and the average potET/P per basin (b). potET (potential evapotranspiration) is taken from experiment LC2000, annual averages of potET and P (precipitation) were used. Blue areas are energy limited (potET < P), red areas are water limited (potET > P), with darker colors indicating a stronger energy or water limit.

Author contributions. All authors contributed to the design of the experiments and the writing of this manuscript. J. Bosmans and R. van Beek prepared the land cover parameterization. E.H. Sutanudjaja and J. Bosmans adapted the model code of PCR-GLOBWB to run with the 6 land cover types used in this study.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

- 15 *Acknowledgements.* The authors would like to thank dr. Menno Straatsma, dr. Niko Wanders and dr. Yoshi Wada for valuable discussions and technical support while setting up these experiments and analyses. This study is funded by Utrecht University through its strategic theme Sustainability, sub-theme Water, Climate & Ecosystems.

References

- Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., Smith, M., et al.: Crop evapotranspiration-Guidelines for computing crop water requirements-FAO
20 Irrigation and drainage paper 56, FAO, Rome, 300, D05 109, 1998.
- Biemans, H., Haddeland, I., Kabat, P., Ludwig, F., Hutjes, R., Heinke, J., Von Bloh, W., and Gerten, D.: Impact of reservoirs on river discharge
and irrigation water supply during the 20th century, *Water Resources Research*, 47, 2011.
- Boisier, J. P., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., and Ciais, P.: Historical land-use-induced evapotranspiration changes estimated from present-day
observations and reconstructed land-cover maps, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18, 3571–3590, doi:10.5194/hess-18-3571-2014,
25 <http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/18/3571/2014/>, 2014.
- Cook, B. I., Shukla, S. P., Puma, M. J., and Nazarenko, L. S.: Irrigation as an historical climate forcing, *Climate Dynamics*, 44, 1715–1730,
2015.
- De Graaf, I., van Beek, L., Wada, Y., and Bierkens, M.: Dynamic attribution of global water demand to surface water and groundwater
resources: effects of abstractions and return flows on river discharges, *Advances in Water Resources*, 64, 21–33, 2014.
- 30 Dermody, B., Van Beek, R., Meeks, E., Klein Goldewijk, K., Scheidel, W., van Der Velde, Y., Bierkens, M., Wassen, M., Dekker, S., et al.:
A virtual water network of the Roman world, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18, 5025–5040, 2014.
- Erkens, G. and Sutanudjaja, E.: Towards a global land subsidence map, *Proceedings of the International Association of Hydrological Sci-
ences*, 372, 83, 2015.
- Gordon, L. J., Steffen, W., Jönsson, B. F., Folke, C., Falkenmark, M., and Johannessen, Å.: Human modification of global water vapor flows
35 from the land surface, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 7612–7617, 2005.
- Gupta, H. V., Kling, H., Yilmaz, K. K., and Martinez, G. F.: Decomposition of the mean squared error and NSE performance criteria:
Implications for improving hydrological modelling, *Journal of Hydrology*, 377, 80–91, 2009.
- Haddeland, I., Skaugen, T., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Anthropogenic impacts on continental surface water fluxes, *Geophysical Research Letters*,
33, 2006.
- Haddeland, I., Skaugen, T., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Hydrologic effects of land and water management in North America and Asia: 1700-
1992, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 11, 1035–1045, doi:10.5194/hess-11-1035-2007, [http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/11/
5 1035/2007/](http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/11/1035/2007/), 2007.
- Haddeland, I., Heinke, J., Biemans, H., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Hanasaki, N., Konzmann, M., Ludwig, F., Masaki, Y., Schewe, J., et al.: Global
water resources affected by human interventions and climate change, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111, 3251–3256,
2014.
- Hagemann, S. and Gates, L. D.: Improving a subgrid runoff parameterization scheme for climate models by the use of high resolution data
10 derived from satellite observations, *Climate Dynamics*, 21, 349–359, 2003.
- Hagemann, S., Botzet, M., Dümenil, L., and Machehauer, B.: Derivation of global GCM boundary conditions from 1 km land use satellite
data, *MPI Report*, 289, 1999.
- Hirabayashi, Y., Mahendran, R., Koirala, S., Konoshima, L., Yamazaki, D., Watanabe, S., Kim, H., and Kanae, S.: Global flood risk under
climate change, *Nature Climate Change*, 3, 816–821, 2013.
- 15 Hurtt, G. C., Chini, L. P., Frolking, S., Betts, R., Feddema, J., Fischer, G., Fisk, J., Hibbard, K., Houghton, R., Janetos, A., et al.: Harmoniza-
tion of land-use scenarios for the period 1500–2100: 600 years of global gridded annual land-use transitions, wood harvest, and resulting
secondary lands, *Climatic change*, 109, 117–161, 2011.

- Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., Van Drecht, G., and De Vos, M.: The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database of human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20, 73–86, 2011.
- 20 Kottek, M., Grieser, J., Beck, C., Rudolf, B., and Rubel, F.: World map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification updated, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 15, 259–263, 2006.
- López López, P., Sutanudjaja, E. H., Schellekens, J., Sterk, G., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Calibration of a large-scale hydrological model using satellite-based soil moisture and evapotranspiration products, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21, 3125–3144, doi:10.5194/hess-21-3125-2017, <https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/21/3125/2017/>, 2017.
- 25 Müller Schmied, H., Eisner, S., Franz, D., Wattenbach, M., Portmann, F. T., Flörke, M., and Döll, P.: Sensitivity of simulated global-scale freshwater fluxes and storages to input data, hydrological model structure, human water use and calibration, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18, 3511–3538, doi:10.5194/hess-18-3511-2014, <http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci.net/18/3511/2014/>, 2014.
- Olson, J.: Global ecosystem framework-definitions, USGS EROS Data Center Internal Report, Sioux Falls, SD, 37, 1994, 1994a.
- Olson, J.: Global ecosystem framework-translation strategy, USGS EROS Data Center Internal Report, Sioux Falls, SD, 39, 1994, 1994b.
- 30 Pei, L., Moore, N., Zhong, S., Kendall, A. D., Gao, Z., and Hyndman, D. W.: Effects of irrigation on summer precipitation over the United States, *Journal of Climate*, 29, 3541–3558, 2016.
- Piao, S., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Labat, D., and Zaehle, S.: Changes in climate and land use have a larger direct impact than rising CO₂ on global river runoff trends, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 15 242–15 247, 2007.
- Portmann, F. T., Siebert, S., and Döll, P.: MIRCA2000—Global monthly irrigated and rainfed crop areas around the year 2000: A new
35 high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological modeling, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 24, 2010.
- Ramankutty, N. and Foley, J. A.: Estimating historical changes in global land cover: Croplands from 1700 to 1992, *Global biogeochemical cycles*, 13, 997–1027, 1999.
- Rost, S., Gerten, D., Bondeau, A., Lucht, W., Rohwer, J., and Schaphoff, S.: Agricultural green and blue water consumption and its influence on the global water system, *Water Resources Research*, 44, 2008a.
- Rost, S., Gerten, D., and Heyder, U.: Human alterations of the terrestrial water cycle through land management, *Advances in Geosciences*, 18, 43–50, 2008b.
- Siebert, S., Henrich, V., Frenken, K., and Burke, J.: Update of the digital global map of irrigation areas to version 5, Rheinische Friedrich-
5 Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn, Germany and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 2013.
- Sterling, S. M., Ducharme, A., and Polcher, J.: The impact of global land-cover change on the terrestrial water cycle, *Nature Climate Change*, 3, 385–390, 2013.
- Sutanudjaja, E. H.: The use of soil moisture-remote sensing products for large-scale groundwater modeling and assessment, 2012.
- Todini, E.: the ARNO rainfall-runoff model, *Journal of Hydrology*, 175, 339–382, 1996.
- 10 Tuinenburg, O., Hutjes, R., Stacke, T., Wiltshire, A., and Lucas-Picher, P.: Effects of irrigation in India on the atmospheric water budget, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 15, 1028–1050, 2014.
- Van Beek, L.: Forcing PCR-GLOBWB with CRU data, Report Department of Physical Geography, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2008.
- 590 Van Beek, L., Wada, Y., and Bierkens, M. F.: Global monthly water stress: 1. Water balance and water availability, *Water Resources Research*, 47, 2011.
- Veldkamp, T., Wada, Y., Aerts, J., Döll, P., Gosling, S., Liu, J., Masaki, Y., Oki, T., Ostberg, S., Pokhrel, Y., et al.: Water scarcity hotspots travel downstream due to human interventions in the 20th and 21st century, *Nature Communications*, 8, 2017.

- Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J., and Melillo, J. M.: Human domination of Earth's ecosystems, *Science*, 277, 494–499, 1997.
- 595 Wada, Y., Van Beek, L., Viviroli, D., Dürr, H. H., Weingartner, R., and Bierkens, M. F.: Global monthly water stress: 2. Water demand and severity of water stress, *Water Resources Research*, 47, 2011.
- Wada, Y., Beek, L., and Bierkens, M. F.: Nonsustainable groundwater sustaining irrigation: A global assessment, *Water Resources Research*, 48, 2012.
- 600 Wada, Y., Wisser, D., and Bierkens, M.: Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and consumptive use of surface water and groundwater resources, *Earth System Dynamics*, 5, 15, 2014.
- Wanders, N. and Wada, Y.: Human and climate impacts on the 21st century hydrological drought, *Journal of Hydrology*, 526, 208–220, 2015.
- Winsemius, H. C., Aerts, J. C., van Beek, L. P., Bierkens, M. F., Bouwman, A., Jongman, B., Kwadijk, J. C., Ligtvoet, W., Lucas, P. L., van Vuuren, D. P., et al.: Global drivers of future river flood risk, *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 381–385, 2016.

Experiment	Land cover	Water use
LC1850	1850	No
LC2000	2000	No
HUM2000	2000	Yes

Table 1. Overview of experiments. Water use includes water for domestic, industrial and livestock use, irrigation, dams and reservoirs as well as desalinated water used in coastal areas (Wada et al., 2014).

	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Tall to pasture 10^6 km ²	22.7	7.0	7.4	6.0	0.0	43.1
# subbasins	676	244	213	200	1	1334
Tall to crops 10^6 km ²	7.7	0.8	6.1	12.2	0.1	26.9
# subbasins	227	31	190	348	1	797
Short to pasture 10^6 km ²	0.6	28.4	3.4	8.2	5.4	45.9
# subbasins	18	820	99	240	47	1224
Short to crops 10^6 km ²	0.3	3.2	2.3	2.0	0.0	7.8
# subbasins	14	115	52	79	1	261
Other 10^6 km ²	0.0	0.1	1.6	1.1	0	2.9
# subbasins	9	1	50	15	0	75
noLC 10^6 km ²	0.0	0.5	0.0	3.7	2.6	6.8
# subbasins	17	28	10	153	96	304
Total 10^6 km ²	31.2	40.0	20.9	33.2	8.1	133.4
# subbasins	961	1239	614	1035	146	3995

Table 2. Area (in 10^6 km² and number of subbasins) per land cover change and per Koppen-Geiger classification, based on 2000 minus 1850 land cover. A represents equatorial climates, B is arid, C is warm temperate, D is snow and E is polar (Kottek et al., 2006). Subbasins are divided into land cover change groups based on which natural land cover reduces most and which anthropogenic land cover increases most in a subbasin. Rainfed and irrigated crops are grouped together, as this subdivision will be used to analyse the impact of land cover change, where all crop land cover types are rainfed (LC2000 vs LC1850). ‘Other’ refers to those areas where tall or short natural vegetation is replacing crops or pasture. ‘noLC’ refers to subbasins where no land cover change occurs. See also Fig. A5.

River	LC1850	LC2000	HUM2000	Δ LC (%)	Δ HUM (%)
Amazone	6642.6 <u>6642.5</u>	6654.1 <u>6652.8</u>	6650.3 <u>6648.9</u>	11.5 <u>10.3</u> (0.2)	-3.8 <u>-3.9</u> (0.1)
Orinoco	1438.0 <u>1437.8</u>	1454.5	1449.7 <u>1449.5</u>	16.6 <u>16.7</u> (1.2)	-4.8 <u>-5.0</u> (-0.3)
Uruguay	315.0 <u>314.9</u>	328.5 <u>327.7</u>	326.1 <u>324.5</u>	13.6 <u>(4.3)12.7</u> (4.0)	-2.5 <u>(-0.8)3.1</u> (-1.0)
MacKenzie	172.1	174.5	172.8	2.4 (1.4)	-1.7 (-1.0)
Congo	2116.5 <u>2116.4</u>	2117.2 <u>2117.1</u>	2116.8 <u>2116.7</u>	0.8 <u>0.7</u> (0.0)	-0.5 <u>-0.4</u> (0.0)
Nile	460.7 <u>439.0</u>	574.6 <u>549.9</u>	572.1 <u>502.3</u>	113.9 <u>(24.7)110.8</u> (25.2)	-2.5 <u>(-0.4)47.5</u> (-8.6)
Niger	393.6 <u>393.5</u>	453.2 <u>452.8</u>	447.5 <u>446.2</u>	59.5 <u>59.3</u> (15.1)	-5.7 <u>(-1.3)6.6</u> (-1.5)
Dniepr	70.7 <u>70.4</u>	90.3 <u>89.9</u>	77.7 <u>76.5</u>	19.6 <u>(27.8)19.5</u> (27.6)	-12.6 <u>(-13.9)13.4</u> (-14.9)
Amur <u>Mekong</u>	366.7 <u>537.7</u>	379.3 <u>555.5</u>	369.1 <u>548.2</u>	12.7 <u>(3.5)17.9</u> (3.3)	-10.3 <u>(-2.7)7.3</u> (-1.3)
Mekong <u>Amur</u>	541.0 <u>366.4</u>	571.7 <u>376.8</u>	565.0 <u>362.7</u>	30.6 <u>(5.7)10.4</u> (2.8)	-6.7 <u>(-1.2)14.1</u> (-3.7)
Ganges-Brahmaputra	1245.7 <u>1211.0</u>	1279.5 <u>1232.11</u>	1254.7 <u>1182.1</u>	33.8 <u>(2.7)21.1</u> (1.7)	-24.8 <u>(-1.9)50.0</u> (-4.1)
Mississippi	1061.4 <u>1060.9</u>	1076.9 <u>1072.7</u>	1035.2 <u>1022.9</u>	15.6 <u>(1.5)11.8</u> (1.1)	-41.8 <u>(3.9)49.8</u> (-4.6)
Columbia	163.6	166.1 <u>165.1</u>	157.4 <u>152.9</u>	2.5 <u>(1.5)1.6</u> (1.0)	-8.7 <u>(-5.3)12.2</u> (-7.4)
Euphrat-Tigris	77.8 <u>77.3</u>	80.3 <u>78.5</u>	58.3 <u>50.6</u>	2.5 <u>(3.2)1.2</u> (1.5)	-21.9 <u>(-27.3)27.9</u> (-35.5)
Danube	241.7 <u>241.4</u>	260.2 <u>259.7</u>	241.0 <u>240.2</u>	18.5 <u>18.4</u> (7.6)	-19.2 <u>(-7.4)19.6</u> (-7.5)
Yenisey	437.4	442.7 <u>442.9</u>	435.6 <u>435.8</u>	5.4 <u>(1.2)5.6</u> (1.3)	-7.2 <u>-7.1</u> (1.6)
Ob	392.2 <u>361.4</u>	405.2 <u>372.1</u>	390.2 <u>359.3</u>	13.0 <u>(3.3)10.7</u> (3.0)	-15.0 <u>(-3.7)12.7</u> (-3.4)
Lena	402.6	402.9 <u>403.0</u>	401.0 <u>401.1</u>	0.3 <u>0.4</u> (0.1)	-1.9 (-0.5)
Yangtze	1059.5 <u>1035.7</u>	1097.1 <u>1063.1</u>	1058.6 <u>1012.4</u>	37.6 <u>(3.6)27.6</u> (2.7)	-38.5 <u>(-3.5)50.8</u> (-4.8)
Indus <u>Murray-Darling</u>	172.4 <u>169.5</u>	172.8 <u>176.9</u>	145.6 <u>164.2</u>	0.4 <u>(0.3)7.3</u> (4.3)	-27.2 <u>(-15.7)12.6</u> (-7.1)
Murray-Darling <u>Indus</u>	169.5 <u>196.4</u>	176.8 <u>166.6</u>	167.9 <u>84.8</u>	7.3 <u>(4.3)2.8</u> (-1.7)	-8.9 <u>(-5.0)81.8</u> (-49.1)
Parana	1410.4	1404.9 <u>1403.0</u>	1383.0 <u>1381.1</u>	-5.5 <u>(-0.4)7.4</u> (-0.5)	-21.9 (1.6)
Colorado	38.3 <u>37.9</u>	37.2 <u>36.5</u>	30.5 <u>23.9</u>	-1.2 <u>(-3.1)1.3</u> (-3.5)	-6.6 <u>(-17.9)12.6</u> (-34.5)
Orange	33.1	32.5	29.0 <u>28.2</u>	-0.6 <u>(-1.7)1.8</u>	-3.5 <u>(-10.8)4.2</u> (-13.1)
Yellow	107.7 <u>106.2</u>	107.7 <u>105.6</u>	93.1 <u>77.7</u>	-0.0 <u>(-0.0)0.6</u> (-0.6)	-14.6 <u>(-13.6)27.9</u> (-26.4)
Rhine	79.3 <u>79.2</u>	78.6 <u>78.4</u>	71.7 <u>71.3</u>	-0.8 (-1.0)	-6.8 <u>(-8.7)7.1</u> (-9.1)
Global	47163 <u>47010</u>	48222 <u>47911</u>	47315 <u>46726</u>	1058.3 <u>(2.2)901.2</u> (1.9)	-906.8 <u>(-1.9)1185.3</u> (-2.5)

Table 3. Discharge to the ocean from 26 rivers in km³/yr for LC1850, LC2000 and HUM2000 in the first three columns, and differences (%) given in brackets) in the last two columns. Δ LC represents land cover change (LC2000 minus LC1850), Δ HUM represents human water use (HUM2000 minus LC2000). Of these 26 river basins, the impact of land cover change is larger than that of human water use in the first ~~11~~ 9. In the last ~~5~~ 6 basins, both land cover as well as human water use act to decrease discharge. Note that discharge of the Nile is much larger than observed (pre-Aswan), PCR-GLOBWB does not perform well for the Nile so the absolute values need to be considered with caution.

	<u>LC1850</u>	<u>LC2000</u>	<u>HUM2000</u>	<u>dLC (%)</u>	<u>dHUM (%)</u>	<u>dTot (%)</u>
<u>Q</u>	<u>47010</u>	<u>47911</u>	<u>46726</u>	<u>901 (1.9)</u>	<u>-1185 (-2.5)</u>	<u>-284 (-0.6)</u>
<u>ET</u>	<u>58760</u>	<u>57872</u>	<u>58718</u>	<u>-888 (-1.5)</u>	<u>846 (1.5)</u>	<u>-42 (-0.1)</u>
<u>Desalinization</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>0 (-)</u>	<u>1.2 (-)</u>	<u>1.2 (-)</u>
<u>Consumption</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>499</u>	<u>0 (-)</u>	<u>499 (-)</u>	<u>499 (-)</u>
<u>TWS</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>-17 (-7.4)</u>	<u>-185 (-85)</u>	<u>-202 (-93)</u>

Table 4. Overview of water balance terms in km³/yr, with percentages in brackets for the last three columns except for desalinization and consumption as these are not included in LC1850 and LC2000. Q is the total global discharge. ET reflects total evapotranspiration. TWS is terrestrial water storage (including water bodies). Note that the positive values for TWS indicate a positive trend in each experiment in km³/yr, reflecting a drift, and that TWS in HUM2000 is larger than in the other experiments (not evident from this table; in this case PCR-GLOBWB includes reservoirs and fossil groundwater).

<u></u>	<u>dLC</u>	<u>dHum</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Notes</u>
<u>This study</u>	<u>ET -888 (1.5%)</u> <u>Q + 901 (1.9%)</u>	<u>ET +846 (1.5%)</u> <u>Q - 1185 (2.5%)</u>	<u>PCR-GLOBWB</u> <u>sensitivity exp.</u>	<u>6 land cover types, spatial variation representing various vegetation,</u> <u>crop and pasture types, fixed land cover and water use.</u>
<u>Gordon et al. (2005)</u>	<u>ET -3000 (4%)</u>	<u>ET +2600</u>	<u>GIS</u>	<u>potential vs. actual vegetation, focus on deforestation</u> <u>pasture represented by natural grasslands</u>
<u>Rost et al. (2008b)</u>	<u>ET -2361 (-3.9%)</u> <u>Q +2349 (+6.6%)</u>	<u>ET +483</u> <u>Q -579</u>	<u>LPJmL</u> <u>PFTs & CFTs</u>	<u>potential vs. actual vegetation, using renewable water only for</u> <u>irrigation (dHum ET +1325 when non-renewable is included)</u>
<u>Sterling et al. (2013)</u>	<u>ET -3500 (5%)</u> <u>Q +7.6%</u>	<u>-</u> <u>-</u>	<u>GIS &</u> <u>ORCHIDEE</u>	<u>potential vs. actual vegetation</u> <u>dLC includes wetland losses and reservoirs</u>
<u>Biemans et al. (2011)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>Q -930 (2.1%)</u>	<u>LPJmL</u>	<u>Q decreased due to reservoir building and irrigation over 20th century</u>
<u>Boisier et al. (2014)</u>	<u>ET -1260 ± 850</u> <u>ET -760 ± 720</u>	<u>-</u> <u>-</u>	<u>ET products</u> <u>LUCID LSMs</u>	<u>1992 vs 1870 vegetation cover</u>

Table 5. Overview of studies assessing impacts of land cover change and / or human water use globally. Values given in km³/yr. See Discussion in section 4.1.