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# Abstract

An accurate estimation of annual evapotranspiration (*ET*) in humid catchments is essential in water-energy budget research and water resource management. Attempts on improving the estimated annual *ET* are made to meet *ET* from water balance equation, i.e., *ETwb*=*P-Q-ΔS* where *ΔS*~0, as common practice. While this improvement is not significant. Here we first presented the poorly estimated annual *ET* in 102 humid catchments over China based on commonly used Fu’s type of Budyko equation (*ETbudyko*) and hydrological models: abcd model and Xin’anjiang model, in comparison with *ETwb*. We then provided the possible explanation: the neglecting of annual water storage change (*ΔS*) in the water balance. Almost no improvement has been made in annual *ET* estimation based on the extended Budyko equation, which uses *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent precipitation at monthly timescale through high R2 achieved, which is due to the seasonal pattern within the year. Then we set out from the effect of ignoring variation of annual *ΔS* in water balance equation. Much improvement has been made when comparing *ETbudyko* + *ΔS* with *ETwb*. And ignoring the variation of annual *ΔS* increases the variability of real *ET* and leads to large deviation in modelled *ET* assessment in humid region. This provides a possible explanation for the poorly estimated annual *ET* and reveals the important role of annual *ΔS* in *ET* estimation and validation in humid catchments. We highlight that the common practice of ignoring annual *ΔS* in water balance, can lead to larger deviation in estimated *ET* assessment. Without reliable *ΔS*, *ET* estimation in humid catchments remains a challenge in bridging our gap in our knowledge of the hydrologic cycle.

# 1 Introduction

Evapotranspiration (*ET*) over terrestrial surface is the second largest component of the global water cycle because it returns about two thirds of precipitation (*P*) that falls over the land back into the atmosphere. Considering the conservation of mass and energy under steady state conditions, the Budyko hypothesis (Budyko, 1963;Budyko, 1974;Fu, 1981;Zhang et al., 2001;Zhang et al., 2004) is able to characterise the relations between precipitation (*P*) and runoff (*Q*); and that between evapotranspiration (ET) and the ratio of potential evapotranspiration (*PET*) to precipitation (*PET/P,* aridity index) into a consistent framework. (Milly, 1994;Yang et al., 2006;Donohue et al., 2007;Tekleab et al., 2011;Roderick et al., 2014). It is constrained by physical limits, namely, the limitation of available water (*ET*<*P*) in non-humid catchments and available energy (*ET*<*PET*) in humid catchments (Fu, 1981;Milly and Dunne, 2002). It has been widely applied in *ET* estimation in arid and semiarid catchments at inter- and intra-annual timescales around the globe (Ukkola and Prentice, 2013;Xu et al., 2013), e.g., America (Chen et al., 2013;Wang et al., 2009), Australia(Zhang et al., 2004;O'Grady et al., 2011) and China (Yang et al., 2006;Yang et al., 2007;Liang et al., 2015).

The Budyko hypothesis has also been used for *ET* estimation (hereafter denoted as *ETbudyko*) in humid catchments (*PET*/*P* < 1) (Xu et al., 2013;Tekleab et al., 2011;Zhang et al., 2012;Carmona et al., 2016;Gudmundsson et al., 2016), typically at intra-annual timescale(Chen et al., 2013;Ye et al., 2015;Zeng and Cai, 2015;Greve et al., 2015;Zhang et al., 2016;Peter et al., 2016;Moussa and Lhomme, 2016). To improve *Q* prediction (Vogel et al., 2015) and water resources management (Bierkens, 2015) at seasonal/monthly timescales, the Budyko framework has been extended to account for the concept of ‘equivalent’ precipitation, i.e., the difference between precipitation and water storage change (hereafter *ΔS,* includingsoil moisture change and ground water change), in intra-annual *ET* estimation(Chen et al., 2013;Moussa and Lhomme, 2016) and thus *Q* prediction and water resources management(Liang et al., 2015). Satisfactory results have been achieved and some kind of relationship are built with hydrologic relevant factors, e.g., vegetation(Chen et al., 2013;Ye et al., 2015), soil moisture(Feng et al., 2012;Gentine et al., 2012), *ΔS* (Chen et al., 2013;Zeng and Cai, 2015). Recent advance include an analytically derived a two-parameter Budyko function(Peter et al., 2016), which explicitly representing additional water availability, i.e., *P*-*ΔS*, to better estimate intra-annual *ET*.

However, there are some limitations in annual *ET* estimation in humid catchments. First, most inter- and intra-annual ET estimation research are focusing on areas containing both humid and non-humid catchments(Xu et al., 2013;Zhang et al., 2008;Zeng and Cai, 2015;Ye et al., 2015), while there is currently limited research containing humid catchments only(Zhang et al., 2012). Second, studies have showed that the annual ET estimation generally yield poor results in humid catchments when assessed against ET from water balance equation (hereafter denoted as *ETwb*). Zhang et al. (Zhang et al., 2012) evaluated the ability of some commonly used approaches (PML model (Leuning et al., 2008;Zhang et al., 2012), products from Jung(Jung et al., 2010) and the Budyko framework (Fu, 1981)) and found that none of them accurately captured the *ETwb* across 110 humid catchments distributed worldwide. Whilst Carmona et al. (Carmona et al., 2016) demonstrated that the introduction of scaling approach into the Budyko framework could improve the estimation of ET in the Amazon River basin, it remains unclear whether such approach would also produce reliable outcomes elsewhere. The effect of vegetation(Li et al., 2013;Donohue et al., 2010;O'Grady et al., 2011), soil moisture (Gentine et al., 2012;Feng et al., 2012), catchment topography (Shao et al., 2012) and climate change(Patterson et al., 2013) has been explored and considered in the Budyko framework in order to better estimate *ET*.

Third, while performing model validation at an annual timescale, it is common to assume steady state conditions (*ΔS* ~ 0 at annual and multiannual timescales) and compare the estimated *Q* (=*P*-*ETbudyko*) against the observed Q. However, previous studies have shown that *ΔS* do not always approximate zero in humid catchments at annual timescale(Zhang et al., 2008;Wang, 2012;Bai et al., 2016;Tekleab et al., 2011;Wang and Alimohammadi, 2012;Wang and Zhou, 2015;Mao et al., 2016;Fang et al., 2016;Liu et al., 2016;Pan et al., 2016). And the *ΔS* has been considered to be one important factor that can affect inter- and intra-annual *ET* estimation in humid catchments. Milly (Milly, 1994) discussed the effect of soil moisture on *ET* theoretically and indicated a mediating effect on *ET* based on the Budyko framework. Istanbulluoglu et al.(Istanbulluoglu et al., 2012) presented the effect of groundwater storage, which built a climate memory in the hydrologic system, causing persistence and statistically significant trends in annual *Q* and thus *ET*. Moreover, the *ΔS* can affect the variability of *ET* in humid catchment as well.(Wang and Alimohammadi, 2012;Chen et al., 2013;Ye et al., 2015;Zeng and Cai, 2015) Zeng and Cai (Zeng and Cai, 2015) pointed out that the variability of *ΔS* made some contribution to the variability of *ET* in humid catchments, through it is much smaller than that in non-humid catchments (Wang et al., 2009;Wang and Zhou, 2015).

In this study, we present the fact of annual *ET* estimation, and consequence of neglecting annual *ΔS* in both Budyko equation and water balance equation in humid catchments over China. We aim to (1) present the annual *ET* estimation based on the commonly used Fu’s type of Budyko equation and hydrological models, i.e., abcd model and Xin’anjiang model, when assessed against annual *ETwb* on the ground that the *ΔS* is approximately zero, as common practice, in 102 humid catchments over China, and (2) examine how much improvement can *ΔS* make in annual *ET* estimation based on the extended Budyko equation, i.e., using *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent *P* at monthly timescale and then aggregated to annual timescale, (3) understand the consequence of neglecting annual *ΔS* in *ETwb* and assessment of ETbudyko. Section 2 summarises the methods used in *ET* estimation for humid catchments, and section 3 documents the data sources and selected catchments used in this study. Results and analysis are presented in section 4, followed by the conclusion and summary in section 5.

# 2 Methodology

The water balance equation has been widely used in *ET* calibration/validation for its simplicity. When *P* and *Q* are obtained from reliable measurement and *ΔS* is assumed to be zero in steady state, ETwb is more widely used as stand ET to make assessment of the modelled ET. (Milly and Dunne, 2002;Yang et al., 2006;Wang et al., 2009;Roderick and Farquhar, 2011;Liang et al., 2015). For any time period, the water balance equation can be written as:

 (1)

Here, we first use *ETwb* as standard *ET* to assess the modelled *ET* in humid catchments.

## 2.1 Hydrological models: abcd and Xin’anjiang models

In practice, application of water balance equation is often limited by the availability of reliable observations. Hence hydrologic models are indispensable tools in catchment hydrology studies. Here we apply two models, i.e., abcd and Xin’anjiang models, for their simplicity and adequate representation of runoff in humid catchments.

Briefly, the abcd model is a conceptual hydrological model with four parameters (*a, b, c,* and *d*) (Thomas, 1981). Whilst the model was originally developed for application at annual timescale, it was later evaluated and found applicable at monthly timescale (Alley, 1984). It has been used for water resources assessment (Martinez and Gupta, 2010) and climate change impact study (Sankarasubramanian and Vogel, 2002). It is relatively simple compared to many existing water balance models. The model inputs are monthly *P* and *PET,* and its outputs are monthly *Q*, soil moisture, groundwater storage and *ET*.

The partitioning of monthly *Pt*, which is determined by *PETt* and the initial storages in soil moisture and groundwater, *Smt-1* and *Gt-1*, into *Qt*, *ETt*, soil moisture storage *Smt*, and groundwater storage *Gt* is as follows:

 (2)

where *Yt* is the sum of monthly evapotranspiration and soil moisture storage at the end of the month, namely evapotranspiration opportunity, and *Wt* is the sum of monthly precipitation plus initial soil moisture, named as available water. The soil moisture at the end of period t is written as:

 (3)

the *ET* at the period t is the difference between evapotranspiration opportunity and soil moisture (*Yt –Smt*). The *Gt* and *Qt* are computed based on:

 (4)

 (5)

the four parameters: *a*, the propensity for *Q* to occur before the soil is saturated to capacity, *b*, the upper bound of *Yt.* *c* is equal to the fraction of *Q*, which arises from groundwater, equivalent to the base flow index and *d* is proportional to the base flow recession constant (Thomas, 1981).

We adopt the abcd model to provide monthly *ET* (hereafter *ETabcd*) and *ΔS* in this study. The *ΔS* is the soil moisture change plus groundwater change, and includes all other possible water loss except *Q* and *ET* in a catchment.

The Xin’anjiang model is a widely used lumped rainfall-runoff model developed by Zhao et al. (Zhao et al., 1980) and Zhao (Zhao, 1992) consisting three sub-models, a three layer evapotranspiration sub-model, a runoff generation sub-model and a runoff routing sub-model (Zhao, 1992). The parameters and schematic diagram can be found in many references (Li et al., 2009;Zhao, 1992) so we won’t give any unnecessary details. It has been widely used in runoff simulation and hydrological processes modelling in humid and semi-humid regions (Rui et al., 2012). Here we use the Xin’anjiang model in annual *ET* estimation in one selected typical humid catchment and to support the results from Budyko equation and abcd model.

## 2.2 The Budyko framework

The widely used Budyko framework, derived by Budyko(Budyko, 1963;Budyko, 1974) based on findings of Schreiber (Schreiber, 1904) and Ol’Dekop (Ol'Dekop, 1911), describes the water-energy balance status of a catchment using the well-known “Budyko curve”, which is empirically derived based on energy supply (represented by *PET*) and water availability (represented by *P*) on *ET*. Fu (Fu, 1981) gave the differential forms and achieved the analytical solutions of the Budyko hypothesis, providing a theoretical basis for the Budyko framework. Subsequently analysis on annual water-energy balance have proofed that the Fu’s equation can be used in both long-term and annual water-energy balances in non-humid catchments(Yang et al., 2007) and humid catchments as well (Tekleab et al., 2011;Xu et al., 2013). The Fu’s type of equation is as:

 (6.1)

where *w* is a dimensionless parameter related to the local factors.

Some have further extended the Budyko framework to *ET* estimation at seasonal (Chen et al., 2013) and monthly (Du et al., 2016) timescales by defined effective precipitation, which is taken as available water supply and is the difference between *P* and *ΔS*, i.e., *P*-*ΔS*. Well results have been achieved around the world(Ye et al., 2015;Zeng and Cai, 2015). So the monthly water-energy balance is redefined the ratios of  and . They are described as follows:

 (6.2)

Among which, the *PET* is estimated based on the widely used FAO-Penman equation (Allen et al., 1998):

 (7)

where *Rn*is net radiation (MJ/(m2·day)), *Δ* is slope of the vapor pressure curve in kPa/℃, *Gs* is soil heat flux (MJ/(m2·day)), *u2*(m/s)is the wind speed at 2 m height,  (kPa/℃) is the psychometric constant, *es* (kPa) is saturation vapor pressure at a given air temperature (*Ta*), *Rh* is the relative humidity.

We adopt the Budyko framework as one major approach to estimate annual and monthly *ET* in humid catchments.

# 3 Data

We select 102 humid catchments (*PET*/*P* < 1) in Southern China (Figure 1) with continuous monthly *P*, *PET* and observed *Q* (hereafter as *Qobs*). The dataset is concentrated in 1960-2013, and some catchments miss several years of *Qobs* during this period whilst the earliest data could trace back to 1950s. *P* is observed and obtained from daily meteorological dataset from China Meteorological Data Network (<http://data.cma.cn/>). *PET* is calculated using equation 7 based on daily meteorological datasets (containing the surface air temperature, sunshine duration, wind speed and the relative humidity) obtained from China Meteorological Data Network as well. And *Qobs* is obtained from the Annual Hydrological Report P. R. China: hydrological data from Yangtze River Basin, Pearl River Basin and Southeast Rivers Bain. While the *ΔS*, is obtained from the output of abcd model. Both *P* and *PET* are interpolated and extracted at catchment scale and then form the monthly and annual time series along with *Qobs* and *ΔS* in the following estimation and analysis.

The daily *P*, *PET* and *Qobs* for the selected typical catchment (black bold line defined and railed out by hydrological station *Dongbei* in Figure 1) over 2001-2012 are used for parameters calibration in Xin’anjiang model. And then we simulate daily *Q* (hereafter QXAJ) and *ET* (hereafter ETXAJ) for 1957-2013 (with available monthly *Qobs* for this period as validation). The Xin’anjiang model is chosen for its reliable runoff simulation in humid catchment in order to further verify the results from abcd model, which requires monthly inputs instead of that for the Xin’anjiang model at daily timescale.

<Figure 1>

# 4 Results and discussion

We adopt the commonly used Fu’s type of Budyko equation (equation 6.1) and hydrological models: abcd model and Xin’anjiang model in *ET* estimation in humid catchments. The estimated *ET* is comparison to ETwb (assuming that the *ΔS* is approximately zero) at both multiannual and annual timescales. The results are in sections 4.1 and 4.2 for multiannual and annual time scales, respectively, and analysis of the effect of *ΔS* are shown in sections 4.3 and 4.4.

## 4.1 *ET* estimation at multiannual timescale

First, we plot the multiannual averages of *PET*/*P* and *ET*/*P* in 102 humid catchments in Figure 2a. The relationship between aridity index and the evaporative ratio fits the Budyko hypothesis, showing a clear feature of energy control in these humid catchments. Then we calibrate the parameter *w* in Fu’s equation using annual *P*, *PET*, and *Qobs* of each catchment (Figure 1), respectively. Then The value of parameter *w* varies greatly with maxima and minima of 4.16 and 1.33 and the majority distributed around 1.8~2.4 (25%~75% percentile), which indicating more about terrestrial feature (Figure S1).

We use these *w* values and the Fu’s type of Budyko equation to estimate annual *ETbudyko* in these 102 humid catchments over China. The comparison of multi-year averages between *ETbudyko* and corresponding *ETwb* are shown in Figure 2b. Good agreement has been achieved with very high determination coefficient (R2 ≈ 1.0) and slope of 0.95 when using the Budyko equation at multiannual timescale. Hence, the Budyko equation is suitable for *ET* estimation in humid catchments at steady state since its reliability is greatest when applied using long-term averages in both non-humid and humid catchments.

<Figure 2>

## 4.2 *ET* estimation at annual timescale

Reasonable estimation of annual ET provides invaluable information support for hydropower reservoirs (Kistenmacher and Georgakakos, 2015;Rheinheimer et al., 2016)and sustainable management and optimization of water resources(Oki and Kanae, 2006;Bierkens, 2015) etc. Hence, we adopt the Fu’s equation first to estimate annual *ET* in those humid catchments since it works well at multiannual timescale. However, poor results are achieved with R2 in more than 80 humid catchments lower than 0.1 and only a few higher than 0.3 (Figure 3a). These results concur Zhang et al. (Zhang et al., 2012) that the commonly used Budyko equation is not sufficiently accurate to estimate annual *ET* in humid regions.

Then we make attempt to estimate annual *ET* based on abcd model. The inputs includ the monthly *P*, *PET* and the outputs are simulated monthly runoff (donate as *Qabcd*), *ET* (donate as *ETabcd*) and *ΔS* (soil moisture change plus ground water change). The R2 between annual *Qabcd* and *Qobs* in these 102 selected humid catchments are all higher than 0.65, and the majority are around 0.8 (Figure S2), showing that abcd model can well simulate *Q* in humid region. However, when we compare the annual *ETabcd* with corresponding *ETwb*, the results are still unsatisfactory (Figure 3b and Figure S2). The R2 in all 102 catchments are smaller than 0.4, and about 60% of these humid catchments have R2 <0.1. This shows that the abcd model fails to quantify annual *ET* in humid catchments as well.

<Figure 3>

To further verify the results above, we adopt the Xin’anjiang model, which is famous for its well *Q* simulation in humid region. We select one typical catchment, which is governed by hydrological station *Dongbei* (shown in Figure 1), as case study to estimate annual *ET* and to support the results from Budyko equation and abcd model The inputs for Xin’anjiang model are including continuously daily *P* and *PET* over 2001-2012 for model calibration since we have accessed to the daily *Qobs*. To validate the model effectiveness, we first compare the R2 between daily *Qobs* and *QXAJ*, which is 0.792 and shows satisfactory estimation of *Q* in humid region. We then use the calibrated parameters to run Xin’anjiang model for 1957-2013 since monthly *Qobs* is available for this period. Together with the results from abcd model, the R2 between observed and simulated monthly Q over the whole period are 0.905 (Figure 4b), and 0.875 (Figure 4c). Moreover, the R2 between annual *Qobs* and *QXAJ* are 0.899 and 0.781 based on Xin’anjiang and abcd models, respectively. Hence, both two hydrological models work well in *Q* simulation in humid catchments and the Xin’anjiang model achieves better. However, very small R2 have been achieved with 0.056 for annual *ETXAJ*, and 0.002 for *ETabcd* when comparing against *ETwb* in this catchment. Therefore, the hydrological models work poorly in annual *ET* estimation in this humid catchment as well, through they can well simulate *Q*. And we can further concluded that the Xin’anjiang model would not work well in annual *ET* estimation in other humid catchments.

<Figure 4>

In summary, both the Budyko equation and the commonly used hydrological models do not accurately estimate in *ET* in humid catchments at annual timescale. An accurate *ET* estimation in humid catchments remains to be a universal challenge for bridging the gap in hydrologic cycle. Hence, causal analysis should be conducted in explaining the poorly annual *ET* in humid catchments.

## 4.3 The effect of *ΔS* on annual *ET* estimation based on the Budyko framework

Some have addressed the role of *ΔS* in the Budyko equation, and used *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent P at intra-annual timescale(Chen et al., 2013;Du et al., 2016). So we assess the impact of *ΔS* on Budyko equation (using equation 6.2) at monthly timescale, and aggregate to annual timescale for 102 humid catchments. The *ΔS* is adopted from the *abcd* output. The newly calibrated parameter *w* varies with average of 2.63 and 10th~90th percentile of 1.52~2.50 when using monthly dataset (Figure S1), and it is similar to the results based on annual dataset.

We first compare the results at monthly timescale, and the R2 between *ETbudyko* and *ETwb* for each month in 102 humid catchments are shown in Figure 5. Much improvement has been made in relatively dry months (Oct ~ Feb), and some in March, April, May, August and September. Little improvement has been made in June and July, when they are relatively humid within a year in South China. This shows that the monthly *ET* based on the extended Fu’ s equation can better estimate *ET* in dry season than that in wet season.

<Figure 5>

<Figure 6>

We aggregate the monthly *ETbudyko* and *ETwb* to annual timescale for 102 humid catchments. Their R2 are shown in Figure 6a along with the R2 between *ETbudyko* and *ETwb*at monthly timescale. Although much improvement has been made at monthly timescale, the aggregated annual ET are poorly estimated. We then present the R2 of this annual result in comparison with the original one in section 4.2 (Figure 6b). There is nearly no improvement at all in aggregated annual *ET* when we account for *ΔS* in the Budyko equation at monthly timescale. Similar result can be achieved when taking *ΔS* from VIC output (obtained from <http://hydro.igsnrr.ac.cn/>, (Zhang et al., 2014)) (Figure S5.1) or from GLDAS product (Figure S5.2) when using the extended Budyko equation.

In addition, the annual *ΔS* is quite small when comparing with annual *P* in humid catchments, and using annual *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent P in Fu’s equation would not change the annual *ET* estimation much. We test this and there is almost no improvement this way (Figure S5), which is concur with some previous work (Gudmundsson et al., 2016;Greve et al., 2015).

One explanation for the relative higher R2 at monthly timescale is the seasonal pattern within the year. And when aggregated to annual timescale, this seasonal pattern has been eliminated and strong correlation has been removed from the comparison. Hence, the *ΔS* hardly affects the annual *ET* estimation based on the Budyko equation.

## 4.4 The effect of *ΔS* on annual *ET* validation based on water balance equation

From another perspective, the neglecting annual *ΔS* in water balance has prone to errors associated with ungauged subsurface runoff transfer in humid catchments. Therefore it produces relatively unreliable *ETwb* as real *ET* in hydrology and the assessment of modelled *ET*. Hence, unreliable input of annual *ΔS* in *ETwb* could probability be one possible reason that leads to the estimated results above.

As a matter of fact, the majority of selected catchments in the southwest China are distributed in karst region, and are more or less with ungauged subsurface *Q* transfers (Figure 1). And the catchments in the east and southeast are experiencing urbanization expansion, which is accompanied by groundwater extraction, inter-basin water transfer like South-to-North Water Transfer Project in China, etc, which might have introduced large bias in annual *ΔS*. Hence, the unreliable *ETwb* may thus lead to irresponsible real *ET*, and further poorly modelled *ET* assessment in humid catchments. Therefore, a probable explanation based on the role of the *ΔS* in annual ETwb is launched.

### 4.4.1 Analytical explanation of the effect of neglecting *ΔS* on annual ETwb

The annual *ΔS* is often seen as zero in arid and semiarid catchments since most of annual *P* turns into *ET*, leaving the majority of the rest *P* turn to annual *Q* and very small proportion to *ΔS*(Yang et al., 2007;Wang et al., 2009). Therefore it would be acceptable to neglect annual *ΔS* in *ETwb* calculation and calibration/validation in arid and semiarid catchments. While it is uncertain whether it is applicable in humid catchments. The above comparison between *ETbudyko* and *ETwb*, i.e., roughly seen as *ETbudyko*+*ΔS*, is shown in Figure 7. Extra deviation would emerge when annual *ΔS* is not zero. And the larger the annual *ΔS* is, the larger this deviation could be. Besides, the low R2 between *ETbudyko* and *ETwb* in humid catchments above can to some extent, reflect the effect of annual *ΔS* on *ETwb*.

<Figure 7>

<Figure 8>

We first adopt the analytical explanation to explain the effect of *ΔS* on annual ETwb. There is no available observed annual *ΔS* at catchment scale, and inaccuracy and uncertainty exists in almost all models output so far. So it would be acceptable to make simple assumption that annual *ΔS* is linearly related to *P* as well, since clear linear relation exists between *P* and *Qobs* in humid catchments (Figure S6). Hence, the relation between annual *P* and *ΔS*, *Q* are assumed as,

 (8.1)

 (8.2)

where and are both dimensionless parameters, and is the runoff coefficient. The ratio of estimated *ET* against *ETwb* is as,

 (9)

which indicates the effect of *ΔS* on annual *ETwb* and thus modelled *ET* estimation and calibration/validation. We set the range of parameter to be -0.5~0.5 and to be 0~1.

We plot the change of this ratio in Figure 8a with both the change of parameter in the range of (-0.5, 0.5) and parameter in the range of (0, 1). The ratio varies greatly, which indicates the various effect of *ΔS* on *ETwb* with the change of *ΔS*. The smaller this *ΔS* is, the more approaching to 1.0 this ratio could be, and thus indicating more insignificant effect of *ΔS* on *ETwb* estimation and assessment.

We choose a few typical values of parameter , representing different proportional of *ΔS*, and the changes of ratio are shown in Figure 8b. Apart from the various effects of *ΔS* on *ETwb*, the runoff coefficient can affect this ratio as well. We choose two runoff coefficient, 0.57 (average of runoff coefficients over 102 humid catchments here, blue dash in Figure 8b) and 0.11 (average of runoff coefficients over 108 non-humid catchments in China, red dash, the relevant data are provided by Fubao Sun(Yang et al., 2007)). The results show that the larger the runoff coefficient is, the greater effect of *ΔS* on *ETwb* under the same proportional of *ΔS*. Hence, it is worth noticing that the neglecting of annual *ΔS* would increase uncertainty in *ETwb* in humid catchments than that in arid and semiarid catchments. And this can therefore, lead to inaccurate real *ET* based on water balance equation in humid catchments.

### 4.4.2 The effect of *ΔS* on ETwb in humid catchments over China

We adopt the annual *ETbudyko*, the *ΔS* from abcd output, and make the following comparison to verify the speculation above. First, we use the selected typical catchment as case study, and the annual time series of *ETwb*, *ETbudyko* and *ETbudyko* +*ΔS* for 1957-2013 in the selected typical catchment are shown in Figure 9a. Through the *ETwb* and*ETbudyko* are both fluctuated around their multiannual average (about 761.8 mm/yr, 755.8 mm/yr), the *ETwb* fluctuates more severe with variability of about 12518 mm2/yr2 than the variability of *ETbudyko*, which is only about 745 mm2/yr2. Interestingly, the *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* can better capture its fluctuates with variability of 10611 mm2/yr2 and multiannual averages of 757.2 mm/yr. Moreover, the original R2 between *ETwb* and *ETbudyko* of 0.02 has improved to 0.58 when comparing *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* with *ETwb* in this catchment (Figure 9b). This shows that the annual *ΔS* plays an important role in water balance equation and it should not be seen as zero in this humid catchment. The exclusion of annual *ΔS* can increase the fluctuations of annual *ETwb*, and therefore, lead to small R2 in modelled *ET* assessment.

<Figure 9>

<Figure 10>

<Figure 11>

Using similar approach, we make the comparison in all 102 humid catchments, which are divided into 3 categories based on their area (Figure 10). We found that improvement can be made when we take annual *ΔS* into consideration in *ET* validation in humid catchments. The averaged R2 between *ETwb* and *ETbudyko* are smaller than 0.1 for both small sized (41 catchments with the area all smaller than 5000 km2) and moderate sized catchments (33 catchments, and the area greater than 5000 km2 but smaller than 10000 km2), and about 0.12 for large sized catchments (28 catchments with area greater than 10000 km2). And the R2 within 10%~90% percentile, the small and moderate sized catchments are around 0~0.15, and large catchments varies around 0~0.4. In comparison, the R2 between *ETwb* and *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* promisingly shows that, their averages improve to 0.18, 0.33 and 0.48 for three categories, respectively. In particular, the R2 within 10%~90% percentile, all showing satisfactory improvements with about 0.02~0.38 for small sized catchments, 0.11~0.50 for moderate sized catchments and 0.25~0.65 for large sized catchments.

For further interpretation, we present the spatial distribution of variabilities of *ETbudyko*, *ETwb* and PET in 102 humid catchments (Figures 11a~11c), and the statistical information of variabilities of *P*, *PET*, *ETwb*, *ETbudyko* and *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* (Figure 11d). The variability of *P* varies greatly around 20,800~97,000 mm2/yr2 within 10%~90% percentile for 102 humid catchments. While the variability of *PET* is only about 1,465~4,008 mm2/yr2, which shall limit the variability of *ET* in humid catchments since it is controlled by *PET*(Fu, 1981). The variability of *ETbudyko* meets this limitation with min-max of 186~2,414 mm2/yr2, and 10%~90% percentile of 412~1355 mm2/yr2. While the variability of *ETwb* (min-max of 2,835~50,114 mm2/yr2 and 10%~90% percentile of 7,161~26,142 mm2/yr2) goes far beyond this limitation

The above shows that when using *ETwb* as real *ET* in humid region, the ignoring annual *ΔS* can directly affect the *ETwb* calculation, and more importantly, affect the of simulated *ET* calibration and validation. It increases the variability of real *ET* and leads to large deviation in modelled annual *ET* assessment. And above all, this inaccurate *ETwb* in humid region would lead to biased effort in hydrological model correction.

# 5 Conclusion and summary

Attempts on improving the annual *ET* estimation in humid catchments based on the Budyko framework and some commonly used hydrological models have been made to meet the *ETwb* on the ground that *ΔS* is zero at annual timescale. While this improvement is not significant and an accurate estimation of annual *ET* in humid catchments remains to be a huge challenge in hydrology. In this research, we adopt the commonly used Fu’s type of Budyko equation and hydrological models, i.e., the abcd model and Xin’anjiang model in annual *ET* estimation in 102 humid catchments over China. We are motivated to explore the possible explanation of poorly annual *ET* estimation in humid catchments.

We estimated *ET* in humid catchments and assessed against *ETwb* on the ground that the *ΔS* is approximate zero at multiannual and annual timescales, as common practice. At multiannual timescale, the Budyko equation works well and is well recommended in *ET* estimation in humid catchments. At annual time scale, neither the Budyko equation nor these hydrological models performed satisfactorily.

To explore the possible explanation for the poorly estimated annual *ET* in humid catchments, we set out from the effect of neglecting *ΔS,* and took monthly *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent *P* in the extended Budyko equation first. However, almost no improvement has been made when comparing the aggregated annual *ETbudyko* with *ETwb* at annual timescale, through relatively high R2, which is due to the seasonal pattern within the year, has been achieved between monthly *ETbudyko* and *ETwb*. Then we began with the effect of neglecting annual *ΔS* in water balance equation, which would add more inaccuracy and uncertainty in *ETwb* in humid catchments than that in arid and semiarid catchments. We adopted *ETbudyko* and the *ΔS* from abcd output, and made comparison with *ETwb*. The results show that much improvement could be made when comparing *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* with *ETwb*. And the neglecting of annual *ΔS* in *ETwb* increases the variability of real *ET* greatly. Hence, the neglecting of annual *ΔS* in *ETwb* can directly affect the reliability of real *ET* calculation, and more importantly, the simulated *ET* calibration and assessment seriously in humid region. And above all, the inaccurate *ETwb* would lead to biased effort in hydrological model correction, especially in humid region.

Above all, we highlight that the common practice of ignoring variation of annual *ΔS* in water balance, can lead to significant deviation in modelled *ET* assessment. Without reliable *ΔS*, *ET* estimation in humid catchments remains an important scientific challenge.
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# Figure captions

Figure 1 Spatial distribution of humid catchments (*PET*/*P*< 1) over southern China along with their corresponding parameter *w* in Fu’ equation, and one selected typical catchment used as case study accompanied with its controlling hydrological station: *Dongbei* Station.

Figure 2 The Budyko framework for 102 humid catchments over China in (a), and (b) the comparison of ETwb (ET calculated based on water balance equation) against ETbudyko (ET estimated based on Fu’s equation) at multi-annual timescale for these humid catchments.

Figure 3 The statistical information of catchments grouped by R2 between annual ETBudyko and ETwb in (a), and the same for ETabcd (ET estimated based on abcd model) in (b).

Figure 4 The monthly time series of *P* over 1957-2013 for the selected typical catchment in (a), and (b) the corresponding observed runoff (Qobs) and simulated one based on the Xin’anjiang model (QXAJ), along with output from the abcd model (Qabcd) in (c).

Figure 5 The box plot of R2 between monthly ETwb and ETbudyko using the extended Budyko equation, i.e., *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent *P*, and *ΔS* is obtained from abcd model.

Figure 6 The R2 between *ETwb* and *ETBudyko* at monthly timescale and that aggregated to annual timescale in (a), and (b) the boxplot of R2 of this aggregated annual ETbudyko and the original R2 of annual *ETbudyko* and *ETwb* (same as Figure 3a).

Figure 7 The schematic of *ΔS* in Budyko equation and water balance equation in humid catchments (energy limited). ET is estimated based on given *P* and *PET*, and validated against ETwb , i.e., *P*-*Qobs-ΔS* where *ΔS*~0.

Figure 8 The effect of ΔS to ETwb on various proportion of *Q* and ΔS. (a) The changes of ratio (ET/(ET+ΔS)) with the change of parameter p1 in range of (-0.5, 0.5) in vertical axis, and parameter p2 of (0, 1) in horizontal axis (parameters p1 and p2 are in equations 10 and 11, respectively). The value of ratio (ET/(ET+ΔS)) in range of (0, 2) are colored as color bar, and value greater than 2 in right-bottom triangle area is set as wine red. (b) The changes of ratio with the change of runoff coefficient (i.e., parameter p2) in several selected typical proportion of ΔS (i.e., parameter p1), the red dash is the chosen runoff coefficient representing the effect of ΔS to ET in non-humid (*PET*/*P*>1) region, and blue dash for humid (*PET*/*P*<1) region.

Figure 9 The annual time series of *PET*, *ETwb*, *ETbudyko* and *ETBudyko* + *ΔS* over 1957-2013 for the selected typical catchment (a), and (b) the comparison between ETbudyko, *ETBudyko* + *ΔS* against *ETwb* in this catchment.

Figure 10 The box plot of R2 between *ETbudyko*, *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* against *ETwb* for 102 humid catchments, which are categorized by catchment area.

Figure 11 The spatial distribution of variabilities of *ETBudyko*, *ETwb* and *PET* in humid catchments over China in (a), (b) and (c), respectively, and their statistics information accompanied by the variabilities of annual *P* and *ETbudyko*+*ΔS* for 102 humid catchments in (d), the left blue y-axis is for variability of *P*, and the right black y-axis is for the variabilities of *PET*, *ETwb*, *ETBudyko*, and *ETbudyko*+*ΔS*.

# Figure

C:\Users\Wangtt\Desktop\wDistribution.tif

Figure 1 Spatial distribution of humid catchments (*PET*/*P*< 1) over southern China along with their corresponding parameter *w* in Fu’ equation, and one selected typical catchment used as case study accompanied with its controlling hydrological station: *Dongbei* Station.

D:\mytest\Article\004Budyko\004OepnReview\Fig2.tif

Figure 2 The Budyko framework for 102 humid catchments over China in (a), and (b) the comparison of *ETwb* (*ET* calculated based on water balance equation) against *ETbudyko* (*ET* estimated based on Fu’s equation) at multi-annual timescale for these humid catchments.
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Figure 3 The statistical information of catchments grouped by R2 between annual *ETBudyko* and *ETwb* in (a), and the same for *ETabcd* (*ET* estimated based on abcd model) in (b).
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Figure 4 The monthly time series of *P* over 1957-2013 for the selected typical catchment in (a), and (b) the corresponding observed runoff (*Qobs*) and simulated one based on the Xin’anjiang model (*QXAJ*), along with output from the abcd model (*Qabcd*) in (c).

D:\mytest\Article\004Budyko\004OepnReview\Fig5.tif

Figure 5 The box plot of R2 between monthly *ETwb* and *ETbudyko* using the extended Budyko equation, i.e., *P*-*ΔS* as equivalent *P*, and *ΔS* is obtained from abcd model.
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Figure 6 The R2 between ETwb and ETBudyko at monthly timescale and that aggregated to annual timescale in (a), and (b) the boxplot of R2 of this aggregated annual ETbudyko and the original R2 of annual ETbudyko and ETwb (same as Figure 3a).
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Figure 7 The schematic of ΔS in Budyko hypothesis in humid catchments (energy limited). *ETbudyko* is estimated based on given *P* and *PET*, and validated against *ETwb*, i.e., *P*-*Qobs*-*ΔS* where *ΔS*~0.
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Figure 8 The effect of ΔS to ETwb on various proportion of *Q* and ΔS. (a) The changes of ratio (ET/(ET+ΔS)) with the change of parameter p1 in range of (-0.5, 0.5) in vertical axis, and parameter p2 of (0, 1) in horizontal axis (parameters p1 and p2 are in equations 10 and 11, respectively). The value of ratio (ET/(ET+ΔS)) in range of (0, 2) are colored as color bar, and value greater than 2 in right-bottom triangle area is set as wine red. (b) The changes of ratio with the change of runoff coefficient (i.e., parameter p2) in several selected typical proportion of ΔS (i.e., parameter p1), the red dash is the chosen runoff coefficient representing the effect of ΔS to ET in non-humid (*PET*/*P*>1) region, and blue dash for humid (*PET*/*P*<1) region.
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Figure 9 The annual time series of *PET*, ETwb, ETbudyko and ETBudyko + ΔS over 1957-2013 for the selected typical catchment (a), and (b) the comparison between ETbudyko, ETBudyko + ΔS against ETwb in this catchment.

D:\mytest\Article\004Budyko\004OepnReview\Fig10.tifFigure 10 The box plot of R2 between ETbudyko, ETbudyko+ΔS against ETwb for 102 humid catchments, which are categorized by catchment area.
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Figure 11 The spatial distribution of variabilities of ETBudyko, ETwb and *PET* in humid catchments over China in (a), (b) and (c), respectively, and their statistics information accompanied by the variabilities of annual *P* and ETbudyko+ΔS for 102 humid catchments in (d), the left blue y-axis is for variability of *P*, and the right black y-axis is for the variabilities of *PET*, ETwb, ETBudyko, and ETbudyko+ΔS.

# List of notations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable name | Variable description | Units |
| water balance components | | |
| *P* | Precipitation | mm |
| *PET* | Potential evaporation | mm |
| *ET* | Evapotranspiration | mm |
| *Q* | Streamflow | mm |
| *ΔS* | Water storage change | mm |
|  | Runoff coefficient |  |
|  | Proportional of ΔS to *P* |  |
| *w* | parameter in Fu’s equation |  |
| abcd model | | |
| *a* | Propensity for runoff to occur before the soil is saturated to capacity |  |
| *b* | Upper bound of Yt |  |
| *c* | Base flow index |  |
| *d* | Proportional to the base flow recession constant |  |
| *Smt* | Soil moisture storage at the end of period t | mm |
| *Gt* | Groundwater storage at the end of period t | mm |
| *Yt* | Evapotranspiration opportunity at the end of period t | mm |
| *Wt* | Available water at the end of period t | mm |
| FAO-Penman model | | |
| *Rn* | Net radiation | MJ/(m2·day) |
| *Gs* | Soil heat flux | MJ/(m2·day) |
| *Δ* | Slope of the vapor pressure curve | kPa/℃ |
| *u2* | Wind speed at 2 m height | m/s |
|  | Psychometric constant | kPa/℃ |
| *es* | Saturation vapor pressure | kPa |
| *Rh* | Relative humidity |  |