

Dear Professor Yuan,

We sincerely appreciate you and the two anonymous reviewers for all the kind help and valuable comments, which greatly polish our work. According to the comments, we clarified the definition of water scarcity and water stress, adjusted the ill-structured result section and revised the figures.

Especially, in the Acknowledge section, we added our thanks for three anonymous reviewers (the third helps a lot for the language) for their great help on the quality improvement of the work.

The point-to-point replies have been listed as follows and the responses were highlighted in blue for a distinction from the comments.

Best wishes,

Yonghui Yang

RESPONSE

Response to Reviewer #1

I think the revised manuscript was improved by the authors. However, the results part was still not well organized. I take section 3.2.1 for example. You firstly talked about WTA, the details for each basin were given (L12-13), but you started to describe FI in L14. Then you described WTA again, and last FI again! I strongly recommend you to separate the descriptions of WTA and FI, and don't mix up them! In figure 4, you should mark clearly (by vertical line?) which basins are humid, semi-humid..., so that the readers can follow up easily what you were saying in the figure. The use of the definitions were also confusing. You've already defined the water scarcity by WAT and FI, so please do not use per capita water availability (L14) again in the results, but use FI (In contrast, sometimes you used WTA instead water use to availability (L16)). Last, I strongly recommend you rename the abbreviations, i.e., WTA to WS and FI to WA. Otherwise, the readers may be very easy to forget the meaning of the WAT (WAT seems water availability but actually refers to water stress in your definition, very misleading) and FI when they are reading the results.

[Response: We appreciate the reviewer for the value comments and the confirmation of our efforts. According to the comments, we reconsidered the definitions of WTA and FI, as well as water scarcity and water stress. Then we redefined the "scarcity" as both WTA and FI were talking about, and the "stress" as only WTA or FI was involved in. Besides, the ill-structured result part and the figures mentioned by reviewer have been revised. Please see the following responses for the detailed revisions.](#)

L20, you've defined WTA as water stress, so the "stress level" is misleading. The

readers may think you were only talking about WTA. Maybe change to scarcity level (because you were talking about both FI and WTA)? In summary, please use water stress, water availability, and water scarcity very strictly according to your definitions.
Response: Thank you very much for the insightful suggestion. Here the "stress" has changed to "scarcity" as suggestion. We redefined the "scarcity" as both WTA and FI were talking about, and the "stress" as only WTA or FI was involved in. The whole manuscript was reviewed and all the "stress" and "scarcity" have revised according to the rules.

L30, do not use per capita water availability but use FI or WTA suggested by me.

Response: All the "per capita water availability" has changed to "FI" in the context.

L26, how did you define the critical period? Why was 1980s critical when FI changed little? Apparently, you define the critical period by WTA, but why not FI?

Response: The "critical period" has changed to "turning point in WTA". The FI changed little because the water availability and population didn't change much. However, the reform and opening up policy made the water use increase dramatically. The paragraph is only related to WTA therefore we changed the "critical period" to "turning point".

P4L19, how was this gridded dataset generated? Please introduce the method briefly.

Response: The introduction of this gridded datasets has been added as "*The gridded datasets are produced by merging resampled GTOPO30 dataset and interpolated climate data from 2472 stations using TPS (Thin Plate Spline) method.*" in P4L21-22.

P5L27, how was R_a calculated?

Response: The explanation of R_a has been added in P5L29-30 as "*The calculation of extraterrestrial radiation R_a is followed by FAO56 method (Allen et al., 1998).*"

P6L13, WAT refers to water stress, how about FI? According to P10L7-8, both of them were stress. So the authors should make very clear definitions on water stress, water availability, water scarcity, and do not mix up them in the results. According the title, I think WTA refers to water stress, and FI refers to water availability. Both of them constituted the water scarcity.

Response: Sorry for the confused statements of "water stress", "water availability" and "water scarcity". We think that WTA refers to water use and FI refers to water availability. Following the suggestion, we redefined the "scarcity" when both WTA and FI were talking about, and the "stress" when only WTA or FI was involved in as mentioned above.

P9, figure 5 was not cited by the main text.

Response: Figure 5 has been cited in the context in P9L3.

P7, section 3.1. This section is to evaluate the reliability of the framework. So the

comparison of simulated and observed annual runoff during 1971-2010 was meaningless (runoff was not natural!). Quantitative indicators were needed to evaluate the framework during 1961-1970.

Response: The reliability of Budyko framework has been quantified using biases between observed runoff and simulated runoff during calibration period of 1961-1970 in P7L25-27 and P8L1 as *"The model captures well the fluctuations of observed discharge in both time and space during the calibration period of 1961-1970 in all catchments, with biases $(\sum Q_{sim} - \sum Q_{obs}) / \sum Q_{sim}$ of 4.8%, 1.2%, 10%, -0.2%, -1.3%, 0.3%, 2.5%, -0.5%, 0.8%, 0.9%, -2.2% and 8.2% for Yangtze, Xi, Min, Qiantang, Huai, Songhua, Yellow, Liao, Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins respectively (The calculation of biases for most stations using the downstream observed runoff while using upstream observed runoff for Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim)."*

P9L2-3, I think stressed should be used for WTA because WTA refers to water stress. I understand that both WTA and FI can be described as stress according to your definition (P6L13-15), but it is very confusing when the readers try to link the stress to either WTA or FI. So please avoid describing FI as stressed (the water availability can be described as low or high?).

Response: We appreciate the helpful suggestion. Here we consider that stress can be indicated by both WTA and FI and described as water use stress or water availability stress. According to this, the definition of stress has been revised in section 2.2.3 as *"WTA indicates moderate or high water use stress when over 0.2 or 0.4, respectively (Vörösmarty et al., 2000). FI indicates moderate, high and extreme water availability stresses when it drops below 1,700, 1,000 and 500 m³ cap-1 year-1, respectively (Falkenmark, 1997)."*

P9L3, here, you were talking about FI in the upstream, why was it related to water use?

Response: Thank you for pointing out it. The FI-related content has been moved to the next paragraph. Now the first paragraph in P9 describes WTA and the second paragraph describes FI.

P10, figure 8 was not cited by the main text.

Response: Figure 8 has been cited in P10L20 now.

Section 3.2.2, this section was not well organized neither. You first introduce FI, and then WTA, and last FI again. Please move "from the FI..." to the P9L12.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. The first paragraph has been rewritten to focus on WTA and the FI-related content has been moved to the next paragraph in P9L13-14.

P9L25, which basins?

Response: They are "Xi, Min, Yangtze and Songhua Basins" which have been added in P9L26.

Figure 6, how did you quantify the nexus? I guess by S1-S2? If I'm correct, please remove the S1 and S2, and only keep S1-S2.

Response: Yes, the difference in stress between two scenarios is used to quantify the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity. Figure 6 has been redraw to keep only S1-S2 (S2-S1).

Figure 7, I think the most extreme case for water scarcity is that when WTA is maximum and FI is minimum. So please change the direction of the X axis (i.e., from 10500 to 0) to make it more clear.

Response: The x-axis in Figure 7 has been reversed according to the helpful suggestion.

Figure 8, I can't understand this figure. What do the 3*3 grids mean?

Response: Sorry for the confused figure. Now the figure 8 has change the form from grids figure to bar figure and the explanation for figure 8 in section 3.4 has been revised to make it clearer.

P11L6-9, it seems that the work by Du et al. (2016) was about human interventions but you were talking about snow and glacier melt. In the mountainous area, the Budyko framework performed poorly, so I don't understand you can apply the framework directly in the mountainous sub-basins (L12).

Response: Thank you for pointing out it. In fact we were also willing to talk about the arid basins with intensive human interference in northwestern China. Du et al. (2016) also mentioned the intensive human interference in arid region of northwestern China (pp. 394). Therefore we corrected the sentence into "*What is more, previous studies proved that Budyko framework performed badly in extremely arid environments where water systems are typically unclosed with intense human interference and irrigation, e.g., the northwestern China.*" in P11L9-10.

P13L29-32, please give the details of water scarcity (i.e., WTA and FI). Water scarcity here is not easy to understand.

Response: The sentences have been revised as "*Our results show that some river basins in China have experienced a dramatic increase of WTA stress from 1970s to 2000s due to the rapid increase of water use, which mainly occurs in northern basins. In 2000s, the increase of upstream WTA stress and the decrease of downstream WTA stress occurs simultaneously, which is probably caused by the increasing upstream water use and the consequent decrease of downstream water availability outpaced by the decrease of downstream surface water use.*" in P14L4-8.

Response to Reviewer #2

The current manuscript still has some grammatical errors, which needs to be improved by the authors. The Authors need to include more explanation on 'why the modeled flow is less than the observed flow for some river basins?'. In addition, the authors are expected to explain the sectorial water usage and its impacts in each river basins considered in the study.

Response: We really appreciate for your valuable comments which greatly polishes our work. According to the comments, we explain the possible reasons for the underestimation of natural runoff in this response letter. The statistical water use in different sectors from 2003-2017 and its change trend are simply described in section 3.4. And we further clarify the definition of WTA and FI. Please see the following for detailed responses.

Line 1: "This is particular important for downstream areas where local-generated..." Please correct this sentence.

Response: This sentence has been rewritten as "*This is particular important for downstream areas where upstream inflow is need to satisfy downstream water demand exceeding local-generated water resources.*" in Page 2, Line 1-3.

Page3, Line 5-9: The paragraph is not clear. It would be good if the authors can clearly explain the aspects of water scarcity.

Response: The paragraph has been revised and the explanation of water scarcity is more clear. "*Water scarcity can be divided into two aspects: water availability and water use. Water availability induced scarcity is a 'demographic-driven scarcity' when a large population compete for limited water resources, leading to disputes. Water use caused scarcity refers to a 'demand-driven scarcity' which potentially occurs with low population and high water use.*"

Page 3: "It is difficult to compile historical data on long-term water use and the related water scarcity due to lack of data accessibility or no long-term data available." The sentence is not clear. Please rewrite.

Response: The sentence has been written as "*It is difficult to get long-term water use and the related water scarcity in China due to data inaccessibility.*"

Objective iii. "What are the main drivers contributing China's water scarcity..." There is a missing preposition.

Response: The sentence has been revised as "*What is the main factor that has driven China's water scarcity change.*"

Page 4: "population count data" - I think population data is the correct term. Change the heading to "Population data".

Response: The "*population count data*" in heading of 2.1.3 and its content has changed to "*Population data*".

Page 7: "zscore is calculated as"...The method is missing here? Please provide the method. In addition, the section 2.2.5 needs more explanation for a better understanding.

Response: The method has been added and more explanation is provided as "*where ΔWTA and ΔFI indicate the absolute difference between two periods i and j in WTA and FI standardized (zscore) by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation. Every decade is compared with its previous decade to get the stress change, for example, 2000s - 1990s, 1990s - 1980s and 1980s is set to 0.*"

Page 7: "The model captures well the fluctuations of observed discharge in both time and space during the simulation period of 1971-2010 in humid and semi-humid catchments, with small gaps between the observed and natural discharge (Fig. 2). Increasing gaps between the observed and natural discharge, however, are observed in semi-arid and arid basins, especially the Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins. These gaps are regarded as water use from anthropologic activities"

The above paragraph says the gap between modeled and observed flow is considered as water used for anthropogenic activities. But in the figure 2, some of the river basins experience a higher observed flow than modeled flow. Please give an explanation. How the authors can compare it with the real water usage from those (or all) watersheds? The models (statistical/hydrological) always try to overestimate the results. How the authors would incorporate this over estimation in the study?

Response: 1. The overestimation/underestimation in simulated runoff in specific year is considered as an intrinsic weakness of parameter calibration of hydrological models. The aim of parameter calibration is to minimize the biases between mean value of simulated and observed runoff. Therefore the fits of parameters are notoriously poor in producing extreme value by hydrological models. It reflects the need of further knowledge for extreme events in hydrological models.

2. The comparison between simulated water use and real water use is difficult here because 1) the simulated water use is only surface water consumption while real water use contains both surface and ground water consumption; 2) there is lack of long-term statistical water use data (from 2003-2017). However, the data is considered as reliable by domestic peer referee due to the reasonable FI value.

3. The higher value in natural runoff mainly occurs in the simulation period in semi-arid and arid basins. In fact, the model does not always overestimate runoff in calibration period. As mentioned in manuscript in P7L25-26, the biases between observed and simulated runoff ($(\sum Q_{sim} - \sum Q_{obs}) / \sum Q_{sim} \times 100\%$) is -0.2%, -1.3%, -0.5%, and -2.2% for Qiantang, Huai, Liao, and Shiyang River Basins respectively in period of 1961-1970.

Figure 4: Please provide the unit and explanation on the 'Y' axis. It would be easy to interpret.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. The unit and explanation has been added on the y-axis for better understanding.

Page 8: Please split the sentence "For most basins, 1980s is a critical period with rocketing WTA, for instance, 40% increase for Yangtze River Basin, 56% increase for Xi River Basin, 64% increase for Songhua River Basin, 52% increase for Yellow River Basin, 31% increase in Hai River Basin, 67% increase in Shiyang River Basin and 50% increase in national ranges."

Response: The sentence has been revised as "*For most basins, 1980s is a critical period with rocketing WTA. The magnitude of increase is 40% for Yangtze River Basin, 56% for Xi River Basin, 64% for Songhua River Basin, 52% for Yellow River Basin, 31% for Hai River Basin, 67% for Shiyang River Basin and 50% for in national ranges.*"

Page 9: "Quantifying upstream-downstream water nexus". In the introduction section the authors did not provide any explanation on "water nexus". Please provide some explanation for this term.

Response: The "*water nexus*" has changed to "*the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity*" in the context.

Page 10, Line8: "The other basins have plenty available water but the excessive water use makes the Tarim River Basin, the downstream of Hei River Basin and the upstream of Songhua River Basin experiencing WTA stresses". What are the probable sectorial water usage in that area? Please provide some explanations with references. In addition, please provide some real water usage examples for all the basins considered.

Response: The increase of water use in agricultural sector is the main factor to drive the WTA stress. This is explained in section 3.4 in Page 10 as "*The combined analysis of WTA and FI (Fig. 7) shows that the Hai, Yellow, Shiyang River basins and the middle stream of Hei River Basins are in both WTA and FI stress simultaneously. While the upstream of Pearl River Basin is experiencing FI stress, and the Tarim River Basin, the downstream of Hei River Basin and the upstream of Songhua River Basin are in WTA stress driven by agricultural sector (Nian et al., 2014; Feike et al., 2015). The water scarcity trajectories of stressed basins show that the WTA stress is still increasing in downstream of Hei, Tarim and Hai river basins and middle stream of Yellow River Basin, while decreasing in downstream of Yellow River Basin and upstream of Songhua and Hei River Basins. Statistical data in period of 2003-2017 showed that most basins have the decreasing water use in agricultural sector except Songhua (69-84%), Huai (65-67%) and Northwest inland (91-91%) River Basins (MWR, 2003-2017). However, agriculture is still the largest water-consuming sector with 84%, 67%, 61%, 69%, 67%, 48%, 59%, 45%, and 91% percent in Songhua, Liao, Hai, Yellow, Huai, Yangtze, Pearl, Southeast (Min and Qiantang) and Northwest inland (Shiyang, Hei and Tarim) River Basins respectively.*"

END RESPONSE

Reconstructed natural runoff helps to quantify the relationship between upstream water use and downstream water scarcity in China's river basins

Xinyao Zhou¹, Yonghui Yang¹, Zhuping Sheng², Yongqiang Zhang³

¹Key Laboratory of Agricultural Water Resources, Hebei Laboratory of Agricultural Water-Saving, Center for Agricultural Resources Research, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shijiazhuang 050021, China

²Texas A&M Agrilife Research Center, El Paso, Texas 79927, USA

³CSIRO Land and Water, GPO Box 1700, Acton 2601, Canberra, Australia

Correspondence to: Yonghui Yang (yonghui.yang@sjziam.ac.cn)

Abstract. The increasing conflicts for water resources between upstream and downstream regions appeal for chronological insight across the world. While the negative consequence of downstream water scarcity has been widely analysed, the quantification of influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity has received little attention. Here non-anthropologically intervened runoff (natural runoff) was first reconstructed in upstream, middle stream and downstream regions in China's 12 large basins in the 1970s to 2000s time period using the Fu-Budyko framework, and then compared with the observed data to obtain the developmental trajectories of water scarcity, including water use to availability (WTA) and per capita water availability (FI) in decadal scale. Furthermore, a contribution analysis was used to investigate the main drivers of water scarcity trajectories in those basins. The results show that China as a whole has experienced a rapid increase of WTA stress, with surface water use rapidly increasing from 161 billion m³ (12% of natural runoff) in 1970s to 256 billion m³ (18%) in 2000s, approximately 65% increase occurring in North China. In 2000s, the increase of upstream WTA stress, and the decrease of downstream WTA stress, occurred simultaneously for semi-arid and arid basins, which was caused by the increasing upstream water use and the consequent decreasing surface water use in downstream regions. The influence of upstream surface water use on downstream water scarcity was less than 10% in both WTA and FI for humid and semi-humid basins during the study period, but with an average of 26% in WTA and 32% in FI for semi-arid and arid basins, and the ratio kept increase from 10% in 1970s to 37% in 2000s for WTA and from 22% in 1980s to 37% in 2000s for FI. The contribution analysis shows that the WTA contribution greatly increases in 2000s mainly in humid and semi-humid basins while decreases mainly in semi-arid and arid basins. The trajectories of China's water scarcity are closely related to socioeconomic development and water policy changes, which provides valuable lessons and experiences for global water resources management.

Keywords: Water scarcity, Natural runoff reconstruction, Upstream-downstream relationship, Quantitative analysis, China

删除的内容: quantifying

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: for

删除的内容: period of

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: stress

删除的内容: water-scarce period

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: surface water scarcity

删除的内容: surface water scarcity

删除的内容: availability

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: the

删除的内容: s

删除的内容: water nexus,

删除的内容: analysis, contribution

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

1 Introduction

Water scarcity is one of major challenges for hampering the United Nations sustainable development goals. This is particularly important for downstream areas where ~~upstream water inflow is needed to satisfy downstream water demand exceeding~~ local-generated water resources. ~~It was estimated that up to 1 billion people would have water scarcity problem if~~

5 upstream water was not provided for downstream areas (Oki et al., 2001). Upstream drought and excessive water use would exacerbate downstream water scarcity, causing the consequent cooperative or conflictive events (Munia et al., 2016). These facts make it critical to understand the ~~influence of upstream water use on~~ downstream water ~~scarcity~~ under a changing climate and with intensified human activities.

~~Many studies have been~~ conducted to analyse the negative impacts of upstream water use on downstream environment (Poff et al., 2007; Arfanuzaman and Syed, 2018), biology (Brown and King, 2006; Petes et al., 2012), water quality (Dodds and Oakes, 2008), and socioeconomic issues (Jack, 2009; Nordblom et al., 2012; Al-Faraj and Tigkas, 2016). Despite the widespread recognition of the negative impacts, only limited quantitative research ~~studies~~ have been performed to unravel the upstream-downstream interactions on water resources and water scarcity. Munia et al. (2016) simulated water use and water availability ~~using the~~ PCR-GLOBWB (PCRaster Global Water Balance) model in global transboundary river basins in

15 2010, and found that 288 out of 298 middle-stream and downstream sub-basin areas experienced some change in stress level after accounting for upstream water use, affecting 0.29-1.13 billion people in transboundary river basins. Veldkamp et al. (2017) used global multi-model assessment to examine the impact of different human interventions (HI) on monthly water scarcity over the period 1971-2010. Their results showed that HI was the main driver ~~of water scarcity, aggravating water~~ scarcity for 8.8% of the global population but alleviating it for another 8.3%. Positive impacts of HI mostly occur upstream,

20 whereas HI aggravates water scarcity downstream. Duan et al. (2018) investigated the water availability and water stress over the conterminous United States (CONUS) from 1981 to 2010 using statistical water use data and simulated water supply ~~using the~~ WaSSI (Water Supply Stress Index) model. ~~They found that 12% of the CONUS land relied on upstream~~ incoming flow for adequate water supply, while local water alone was sufficient to meet the demand in another 74% of the area. Munia et al. (2018) developed a framework to quantify the dependency of downstream water stress on upstream water

25 supply and applied the framework to global transboundary river basins. Surprisingly, they found that the majority (1.15 billion) of those people (1.18 billion) currently suffer from water stress only because they excessively use water ~~within each basin~~ and the water use from upstream does not have ~~significant~~ impact on the downstream stress status. These studies, however, ~~either focusing on~~ transboundary river basins or dependency ~~analysis, indirectly indicated the importance of~~ ~~upstream water inflow to downstream water scarcity~~. There is a great need for ~~direct~~ quantification of influence of upstream

30 water use on downstream water scarcity in river basins as a whole. As one of three countries with greatest water risk hotspots, China is facing serious water stress, especially in its northeastern regions (OECD, 2017). Meanwhile, the downstream environment has been severely deteriorated in some arid basins (Li et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2016). Therefore, this study selected China to quantify the impact of upstream water

删除的内容: often cannot meet water demand, and water inflow from upstream becomes critical for relieving regional water scarcity.

删除的内容: -

删除的内容: nexus

删除的内容: There are lots of

删除的内容: by

删除的内容: s

删除的内容: by

删除的内容: preliminarily quantified the upstream-downstream relationship in water withdrawal and water scarcity,

删除的内容: they

删除的内容: focused

删除的内容: only

删除的内容: analysis.

删除的内容: further

use on downstream water scarcity. Understanding the past trajectories of China's water scarcity in upstream and downstream catchments and quantifying the relationships between upstream water use and downstream water scarcity can help to better define pathways to future sustainability, avoid further irreversible environmental degradation, and address future challenges of climate change and human interventions.

删除的内容:

5 Water scarcity can be divided into two aspects: water availability and water use (Kummu et al., 2016). Water availability induced scarcity is a “demographic-driven scarcity” when a large population compete for limited water resources, leading to disputes. Water use caused scarcity refers to a “demand-driven scarcity” which potentially occurs with low population and high water use (Falkenmark, 1997; Kummu et al., 2010). The combined use of the two aspects can therefore provide a complete picture to describe water scarcity.

删除的内容: stress

删除的内容: Per capita water

删除的内容: (Falkenmark, 1997). Water stress is defined as water use to water availability and

删除的内容: (

删除的内容: indicators

删除的内容: compile historical data on

删除的内容: lack of

删除的内容: accessibility or no long-term data available.

删除的内容:

10 It is difficult to get long-term water use and the related water scarcity data in China due to data inaccessibility. As a substitution, the gap between observed runoff and modelled non-anthropologically intervened runoff (hereafter called natural runoff) can be treated as surface water use. There are numerous studies on natural runoff driven by process-based models such as VIC (Variable Infiltration capacity) (Wang et al., 2010; Chang et al., 2015), WBM (Water Balance Model) (Guo et al., 2017), ORCHIDEE (Organizing Carbon and Hydrology in Dynamics Ecosystems) (Piao et al., 2007), and SWAT (Soil and Water

15 Assessment Tool) (Luo et al., 2016). However, difficulties in calibrating complex parameters limit model application to one or a few basins (Zhang et al., 2007; Jiang et al., 2015; Zhai and Tao, 2017). In comparison, Budyko framework is widely used at an annual to decadal scale and in a large spatial scale (Zhang et al., 2001; Zhang et al., 2009; Zheng et al., 2009). Six Budyko framework models were tested here and eventually the one-parameter Fu-Budyko model was used to reconstruct natural runoff in the catchments because of its optimal performance (Fu, 1981). Fu-Budyko model has also been successfully validated across the globe (Teng et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2012; Li et al., 2013; Du et al., 2016). As such, this study used this model to reconstruct decadal natural runoff for the period of 1961–2010 in upstream and downstream regions within 12 large basins in China, which cover over 50% of mainland China.

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

In this study, we aim to answer following three questions, and provide experiences and lessons for global water resources management. They are:

- 25 i. How surface water scarcity developed in upstream and downstream regions of the selected basins in China during the past decades;
- ii. How to quantify the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity; and
- iii. What is the main factor that has driven China's water scarcity change.

删除的内容: are

删除的内容: drivers contributing

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

2.1.1 Hydrological data

5 Since digital runoff data is limited in China, we obtained runoff data from the following two-sources; official sources in Hai and Shiyang River Basins and published literature (Table 1). The reliability of the published annual runoff data was verified based on the following two criteria. First, for a specific gauge station, at least two related published data sources of overlapping study periods were prepared. Then the annual runoff data was extracted and a cross validation conducted to limit errors below 5%. Second, the published annual runoff data were further verified by comparing the trends in the processed data and in other data published coincidentally, such as published work for Dongting lake by Yang et al. (2015), for Huangpu river by Shi and Wang (2015) and so on.

10 **Insert Table 1 here**

The annual runoff measured in a total of 132 gauge stations was verified. Based on the record length and spatial distribution of the data, 37 gauge stations that are representative for upper, middle and lower reaches were used in this analysis. While the length of data from 29 out of 37 basins spanned for an entire period of 1961–2010, data from other 8 basins spanned for over 40 years. The basin boundaries were based on the delineations in “Data Sharing Infrastructure of Earth System Science” (<http://www.geodata.cn/>) and sub-basin boundaries were delineated in ArcHydro tool (Fig. 1).

15 **Insert Figure 1 here**

2.1.2 Climatic factors

20 Gridded monthly precipitation and temperature (maximum, minimum and mean temperature) for 1961–2010 were downloaded from “China Meteorological Data Sharing Service System” (<http://cdc.nmic.cn/>). The spatial resolution of the gridded dataset is $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$. The gridded datasets were produced by merging resampled GTOPO30 dataset and interpolated climate data from 2472 stations using the TPS (Thin Plate Spline) method. Also daily climate data at point-scale (maximum and minimum temperature, wind speed, relative humidity and sunshine hours) from 563 national weather stations for the period 1961–2010 were downloaded from the same website.

2.1.3 Population data

25 The population data from Gridded Population of the World (GPW) (<http://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/collection/gpw-v4>) was used to estimate the basin-scale population. Given the limitation of the data record length, the GPW data for 1990, 2000 and 2010 were respectively used to get the population for the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. The resolution was ~5 km for 1990 and 2000 datasets and ~1 km for 2010 dataset.

删除的内容: are hardly available

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: s

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: s

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$.

删除的内容: count

删除的内容: count

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Fu-Budyko framework

The Fu-Budyko framework is expressed as:

$$F(\varphi) = 1 + \varphi - (1 + \varphi^\theta)^{1/\theta} \quad (1)$$

where $F(\varphi)$ is evaporation ratio, φ is the Aridity index (AI), calculated from ratio of potential evapotranspiration (ET_0) to precipitation (P) on annual scale, the θ parameter is related to catchment characteristics with the range of 1~ ∞ . In this study, AI of each catchment was calculated at mean annual scale for the period of 1961-2010 and the catchments were classified into humid, semi-humid, semi-arid and arid for AI ranging from 0.375~0.75, 0.75~2, 2~5 and 5~12, respectively (Ponce et al., 2000; Arora, 2002). Annual natural runoff was calculated in unit of mm/year as $P*(1-F(\varphi))$, and then changed into discharge in units of $10^9 \text{ m}^3/\text{year}$ by multiplying the catchment area.

Studies have shown that anthropologic interventions had intensified across China since the 1980s, driven by the economic reform and the open door policy (Yang and Tian, 2009; He et al., 2013; Jiang et al., 2015). We therefore assumed that the observed runoff for 1961–1970 was natural and not (or less) disturbed by human activities. Using the observed ET_0 , P and observed discharge, the parameter θ was calculated using the least-square data fitting method for the period 1961–1970, then the fitted parameter was used to reconstruct decadal natural runoff for the period 1971–2010.

2.2.2 Estimation of ET_0 and P

Two equations – Hargreaves (HG) and Penman-Monteith (PM) – were used to estimate ET_0 (Allen et al., 1998). The HG- ET_0 was based on a gridded dataset at monthly scale while PM- ET_0 was based on a pointed dataset at daily scale. The PM equation ranked as the best equation for estimating ET_0 but the sparse distribution of climate stations limited its application in western China. The continuous spatial coverage of the gridded dataset can provide full estimation of HG- ET_0 in western China. However, large discrepancies between HG- ET_0 and PM- ET_0 were found in different regions over the world in previous studies (Temesgen et al., 2005; Gavilan et al., 2006; Trajkovic, 2007; Bautista et al., 2009; Sivaprakasam et al., 2011; Berti et al., 2014). Thus a more accurate ET_0 can be obtained by combining the two estimations.

Hargreaves equation is described as (Allen et al., 1998):

$$ET_0 = 0.0023(T_{mean} + 17.8)(T_{max} - T_{min})^{0.5} R_a \quad (2)$$

Where T_{mean} is the i th-month mean temperature; T_{max} is the i th-month mean maximal temperature; T_{min} is the i th-month mean minimal temperature; and R_a is the extraterrestrial radiation for the middle day of the i th-month. The standard values of empirical parameters are 0.0023, 17.8 and 0.5. The unit for both ET_0 and R_a is mm/day and then ET_0 was multiplied by the number of days in the i th-month to get monthly ET_0 . The extraterrestrial radiation R_a is calculated with FAO56 method (Allen et al., 1998).

FAO56 Penman-Monteith equation is described as below (Allen et al., 1998):

删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: opening up

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

删除的内容:

删除的内容:

带格式的: 英语(美国), 降低量 6 磅

删除的内容: net

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

$$ET_0 = \frac{0.408\Delta(R_n - G) + \gamma \frac{900}{T + 273} u_2 (e_s - e_a)}{\Delta + \gamma(1 + 0.34u_2)} \quad (3)$$

where R_n is the net radiation at the crop surface [$\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$], G is the soil heat flux density [$\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$], T is the mean daily air temperature at 2 m height [$^{\circ}\text{C}$], u_2 is the wind speed at 2 m height [m s^{-1}], e_s is the saturated vapour pressure [kPa], e_a is the actual vapour pressure [kPa], $e_s - e_a$ is the vapour pressure deficit [kPa], Δ is the slope of vapour pressure-temperature curve [$\text{kPa } ^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$], γ is the psychrometric constant [$\text{kPa } ^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$]

The monthly gridded HG- ET_0 and daily pointed PM- ET_0 were scaled up to an annual value. At the annual scale, HG- ET_0 was adjusted by multiplying the gridded coefficient (interpolated by the IDW method) as the ratio of the PM- ET_0 to HG- ET_0 . The gridded annual precipitation was aggregated from the gridded monthly precipitation data and then adjusted by the point-scale data as mentioned above. The basin-scale annual P and ET_0 were obtained by weighting the average of grid data within each basin.

2.2.3 Water stress and availability

Two indicators – WTA (Water use To Availability) and FI (Falkenmark Index, referring to per capita water availability) – were used for the developmental analysis in surface water scarcity. WTA indicates moderate or high water use stress when over 0.2 or 0.4, respectively (Vörösmarty et al., 2000). FI indicates moderate, high and extreme water availability stresses when it drops below 1,700, 1,000 and 500 $\text{m}^3 \text{cap}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$, respectively (Falkenmark, 1997). The calculation of WTA was conducted in decadal scale for 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, respectively, while FI was calculated in decadal scale for 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s due to the limited access of population data.

$$WTA = WU / WA \quad (4)$$

$$FI = WA / \text{Population} \quad (5)$$

$$WU = \begin{cases} Q_{nat} - Q_{obs} & \text{upstream} \\ WU_{local} - WU_{former} & \text{middle / downstream} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$WA = \begin{cases} Q_{nat} & \text{upstream} \\ Q_{nat} + Q_{in} & \text{middle / downstream} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

WU and WA indicates surface water use and water availability in each decade from the 1970s to 2000s, Q_{nat} and Q_{obs} are natural and observed discharge in the same decade, Q_{in} is the incoming observed discharge from upper reach, WU_{local} and WU_{former} are the surface water use in middle/downstream regions and its former regions, respectively.

For Hai, Shiyang, Hei and Tarim River Basins, natural discharge at the middle and lower reaches was assumed to be the same as the upper reaches or the aggregate discharge from upstream tributaries. This is because most of the water was subsequently consumed and therefore little runoff was generated in the downstream regions (Zhang et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2016).

删除的内容: Index

删除的内容: refers to water stress, which is

删除的内容: of the available water is consumed,

删除的内容: FI refers to per capita water availability which

删除的内容: yr^{-1} ,

删除的内容: count

删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: 小四, 英语(美国), 降低量 5 磅

删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: 小四, 英语(美国), 降低量 16 磅

删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: 小四, 英语(美国), 降低量 16 磅

删除的内容:

删除的内容: where

带格式的: 字体: 倾斜, 英语(美国)

删除的内容: taken as

删除的内容: discharge of

It is noted that only nine large basins were selected to analyze past changes in surface water scarcity in all three reaches (upper, middle and lower) because runoff data were not available in the downstream regions of Liao, Huai and Qiantang River Basins. For example, hydrological data at outlet station in Liao River Basin is available in 1984-2010; there were no hydrological data at outlet station in Huai River Basin; streamflow data were only available in tributary stations in Qiantang River Basin. For the above-mentioned three basins, we only used the available data from upper stream or tributaries for estimating WTA and FI.

2.2.4 Quantitative analysis

To quantify the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity, an experiment was designed by involving two scenarios: one with upstream water use (S1) and another without upstream water use (S2). In the first scenario (S1), the downstream water availability was the sum of local natural discharge and incoming observed flow; in the second scenario (S2), the downstream water availability was the aggregation of local natural discharge and natural discharge from the upper reaches.

2.2.5 WTA Contribution in water scarcity change

The contribution rate of WTA change in water scarcity change is estimated as follow:

$$Contribution_{WTA} = \frac{\Delta WTA}{\Delta WTA + \Delta FI} \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta WTA = |zscore(WTA)_i - zscore(WTA)_j| \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta FI = |zscore(FI)_i - zscore(FI)_j| \quad (10)$$

Where ΔWTA and ΔFI indicate the absolute difference between two periods i and j in WTA and FI, standardized (zscore) by subtracting the mean then dividing by the standard deviation. Every decade is compared with its previous decade to get the stress change, for example, 2000s vs. 1990s, 1990s vs. 1980s and 1980s is set to 0.

3 Results

3.1 Reliability of Fu-Budyko framework

The reliability of the Fu-Budyko framework in reconstructing annual natural discharge is summarized in Figure 2. The model captures well the fluctuations of observed discharge in both time and space during the calibration period of 1961-1970 in all catchments, with biases $(\sum Q_{sim} - \sum Q_{obs}) / \sum Q_{sim} \times 100\%$ of 4.8%, 1.2%, 10%, -0.2%, -1.3%, 0.3%, 2.5%, -0.5%, 0.8%, 0.9%, -2.2% and 8.2% for Yangtze, Xi, Min, Qiantang, Huai, Songhua, Yellow, Liao, Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins respectively (The calculation of biases for most stations using the downstream observed runoff while using upstream

删除的内容: in

带格式的: 英语(美国), 降低量 12 磅

删除的内容:

删除的内容:

删除的内容:

删除的内容:

where

删除的内容:

in

带格式的: 英语(美国), 非升高量 / 降

带格式的: 英语(美国), 非升高量 / 降

删除的内容:

WTA and FI between two periods, respectively. zscore

带格式的: 英语(美国), 非升高量 / 降

删除的内容:

calculated as

$$(X_i - \bar{X}) / std(X)$$

带格式的: 英语(美国), 非升高量 / 降

删除的内容:

删除的内容: simulation

删除的内容: 1971-2010

删除的内容: humid and semi-humid

删除的内容: small gaps between

observed runoff for Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim). Increasing gaps between the observed and natural discharge, however, are observed in semi-arid and arid basins, especially the Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins. These gaps are regarded as water use from anthropologic activities.

删除的内容: and natural discharge (Fig. 2).

Insert Figure 2 here

5 The magnitude of gaps between observed and natural discharge varies in different reaches and different periods as shown in Figure 3. For humid regions with large discharge, the natural discharge is quite consistent with the observed one, leading to small gaps during all study periods in both upstream and downstream regions. However, situations are different for arid
basins with small discharge, where the gap between observed and natural discharge in upstream and middle stream regions is relatively small from the beginning of the study period, and increases as time goes by. While in downstream regions, the gap
10 is large from the beginning, and rapidly increases with time going by, especially in 1980s and 1990s.

删除的内容: the

Insert Figure 3 here

3.2 Water scarcity trajectories

3.2.1 National range overview

15 Generally, the surface water has become scarcer from 1970s to 2000s in China, with national WTA increasing from 0.12 to 0.18 and surface water use increasing from 161 billion m^3 in 1970s to 256 billion m^3 in 2000s (Fig. 4). The 65% increase of surface water use occurs in northern basins, including Songhua, Huai, Yellow, Liao, Hai, Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins.

For humid (Xi, Min and Qiantang River Basins), semi-humid (Yangtze, Songhua and Huai River Basins), semi-arid (Yellow, Liao and Hai River Basins) and arid basins (Hei, Shiyang and Tarim River Basins), WTAs have increased from 0.1, 0.1, 0.36 and 0.81 in 1970s to 0.14, 0.15, 0.7 and 0.95 in 2000s, respectively. Meanwhile national FI decreases from 1,534 to 1,265 m^3 .
20 Regarding to different climate zones, FI has decreased from 1,943 in 1980s to 1,680 in 2000s for humid basins, and from 239 m^3 to 226 m^3 for semi-arid basins, but it has increased from 1,740 in 1980s to 1,772 m^3 in 2000s for semi-humid basins and from 866 m^3 to 1,255 m^3 for arid basins.

删除的内容: Meanwhile national per capita water availability decreases from 1,534 to 1,265 m^3 . The change magnitudes are different in different climate zones.

删除的内容: Per capita water availability

删除的内容: Stress level changes in WTA and FI .

删除的内容: water

删除的内容: water

删除的内容: water

删除的内容: water

删除的内容: water

删除的内容: (even though no overall water stress),

删除的内容: Critical period .

删除的内容: critical period

删除的内容: WTA, for instance, 40%

删除的内容: increase

删除的内容: increase

删除的内容: increase

删除的内容: increase in

删除的内容: increase in

删除的内容: crease in

删除的内容: per capita water availability

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman, 英语(美国)

删除的内容: opening up

25 According to FI, Xi River Basin changed from no stress ($1.782 m^3 cap^{-1} year^{-1}$) to moderate stress ($1.583 m^3 cap^{-1} year^{-1}$) and Tarim River Basin changed from high stress ($942 m^3 cap^{-1} year^{-1}$) to moderate stress ($1.467 m^3 cap^{-1} year^{-1}$) from 1980s to 2000s, while the stress level remained almost unchanged for all the other basins. According to WTA alone, stress level changed from low stress (0.14) to high stress (0.55) for Songhua River Basin, from low stress (0.19) to moderate stress (0.27) for Huai River Basin, from moderate stress to high stress for Yellow (0.33-0.7), Liao (0.36-0.43) and Shiyang (0.33-0.71) River Basins from 1970s to 2000s, while the rest remained at their original stress levels.

For most basins, 1980s is a turning point with rocketing WTA. The magnitude of WTA increase is 40% for Yangtze River Basin, 56% for Xi River Basin, 64% for Songhua River Basin, 52% for Yellow River Basin, 31% for Hai River Basin, 67% for Shiyang River Basin and 50% in national ranges. Meanwhile, FI changed little in the same period. The changes have probably
30 linked to the water use increase because of China's economic reform and the open door policy at the end of 1970s.

Insert Figure 4 here

3.2.2 Upstream and downstream relationship

Meanwhile, different basins experience different developmental trajectories in water scarcity for upstream, middle stream and downstream regions (Fig. 5). From the WTA perspective, most humid and semi-humid basins, for example the Min, Pearl and Yangtze River Basins, show the non-stress status and the fluctuations in WTA for both upstream and downstream regions during the study periods. Songhua River Basin shows continuous increase in WTA for both upstream and downstream regions, which has led the upstream regions into stressed status in 2000s. For semi-arid and arid basins, the elevated water use has led the upstream regions from no/low stressed status to high stress and the increasing WTA in downstream regions. It is noteworthy that WTA begins to decrease in downstream regions in 2000s (Hei River Basin shows the decrease in middle stream) while its upstream counterpart still increases. The decrease in WTA for downstream regions is caused by the reduced incoming discharge from upstream regions, which forces the downstream water users to exploit groundwater as a supplement source for water supply (Water Resources Bulletin of Hai River Basin, 2015).

Insert Figure 5 here

From the FI perspective, the decreasing trend is dominant in both upstream and downstream regions. The Yangtze, Min, Songhua, Hei and Tarim River Basins and the upstream of Pearl have no FI stress. FI has largely decreased in downstream regions compared to its upstream counterparts for eastern basins, however, the reverse is observed in western basins. This is driven by the migration during the study period. Since the end of 1990s, the rapid urbanization has formed some metropolis in downstream regions in eastern China, such as Beijing in the downstream of Hai River Basin, Shanghai in the downstream of Yangtze River Basin, Guangzhou in the downstream of Pearl River Basin, leading to population concentration and FI decrease in those regions (Yang and Chen, 2014). However, for northwestern inland basins, big cities are usually located in the middle reach oasis such as Zhangye in middle stream regions of Hei River Basin, or Aksu in middle stream regions of Tarim River Basin. Meanwhile, the exacerbated degradation of the downstream ecological environment has caused downstream inhabitants to migrate to the middle stream. Thus FI generally decreases in middle stream regions while it increases in downstream in northwestern river basins.

3.3 Quantifying influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity

Scenario analysis shows the quantitative influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity (Fig. 6). For humid and semi-humid river basins (Xi, Min, Yangtze and Songhua River Basins), the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity is negligible during the study period, with less than 10% difference in both WTA and FI between two scenarios. The influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity rapidly increased in 2000s for Songhua River Basin, with the WTA difference between two scenarios increasing from 12% in 1990s to 27% in 2000s and the FI's impact doubled from around $700 \text{ m}^3 \text{ cap}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}$ in 1990s to $1,400 \text{ m}^3 \text{ cap}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}$ in 2000s.

Insert Figure 6 here

In contrast, upstream water use largely exacerbates downstream water scarcity in semi-arid and arid basins, and the influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity continued to increase from 1970s to 2000s. On average, the WTA

删除的内容: d

删除的内容: FI

删除的内容: the Hei, Min, Songhua, Tarim and Yangtze Rivers and Pearl upstream are not stressed, however elevated water use could lead the Hei, Songhua, Tarim rivers into water scarcity from a non-scarcity status. Humid

删除的内容: .

删除的内容: with dramatic increase

删除的内容: increase in WTA in

删除的内容: middle stream regions and the decrease in

删除的内容: occurred simultaneously

删除的内容: .

删除的内容: The

删除的内容: per capita water availability in

删除的内容: Per capita water availability

删除的内容: per capita water availability

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: driven

删除的内容: migrating

删除的内容: per capita surface water availability

删除的内容: -

删除的内容: nexus

删除的内容: (except

删除的内容: Basin),

删除的内容: enlarged

删除的内容: 1400

删除的内容: kept increasing

5 impact extent for all the five semi-arid and arid basins increased from 10% in 1970s to 37% in 2000s and the FI impact extent increased from 22% in 1980s to 37% in 2000s. Among the five basins, Tarim River Basin is the largest human-intervened basin with the WTA increasing from 51% in 1970s to 86% in 2000s and FI increasing from 75% in 1980s to 86% in 2000s. Hai River Basin is the fastest scarcity-exacerbated basin with WTA increasing from 7% in 1970s to 87% in 2000s and FI increasing from 59% in 1980s to 87% in 2000s.

删除的内容: 's contribution

删除的内容: for WTA

3.4 Driven factors of water scarcity trajectories

10 The combined analysis of WTA and FI (Fig. 7) shows that the Hai, Yellow, and Shiyang River basins and the middle stream of Hei River Basin are in both WTA and FI stress simultaneously. While the upstream of Pearl River Basin is experiencing FI stress, and the whole Tarim River Basin, the downstream of Hei River Basin and the upstream of Songhua River Basin are in WTA stress driven by agricultural sector (Nian et al., 2014; Feike et al., 2015). The water scarcity trajectories show that the WTA stress is still increasing in downstream of Hei, and Hai river basins and middle stream of Tarim and Yellow River Basins, while decreasing in downstream of Tarim and Yellow River Basins and upstream of Songhua and Hei River Basins. Statistical data in period of 2003-2017 showed that most basins have the decreasing water use in agricultural sector except Songhua (69-84%), Huai (65-67%) and Northwest inland (91-91%) river basins (MWR, 2003-2017). However, agriculture is still the largest water-consuming sector in 2017 with 84%, 67%, 61%, 69%, 67%, 48%, 59%, 45%, and 91% percent in Songhua, Liao, Hai, Yellow, Huai, Yangtze, Pearl, Southeast (Min and Qiantang) and Northwest inland (Shiyang, Hei and Tarim) river basins respectively.

删除的内容: , Yellow

删除的内容: Basins, the upstream of Pearl

删除的内容: s

删除的内容: the

删除的内容: , while Hai, Yellow, Shiyang River Basins and the middlestream of Hei River Basins are in the WTA stress

删除的内容: The other basins have plenty available water but the excessive water use makes the

删除的内容: experiencing

删除的内容: .

删除的内容: of stressed basins

删除的内容: Tarim

删除的内容: Basin,

删除的内容: greatly

删除的内容: mainly

删除的内容: (Xi, Min, Songhua, and Tarim River Basins)

删除的内容: mainly

删除的内容: (Yangtze, Yellow, Hai, Hei and Shiyang River Basins). The same change direction in WTA contribution in

删除的内容: .

删除的内容: and whole basins happens in Yangtze, Songhua and Shiyang River Basins. The upstream WTA change is the main driver of water scarcity trajectories for Min, Yellow and Hei River Basins,

删除的内容: the

删除的内容: WTA change is the main driver of water scarcity for Tarim River Basin. For Hai and Xi River Basins, the inconsistent change of WTA contribution in upstream/downstream and whole basin implies other water supply as the supplements of surface water resources.

删除的内容: as

Insert Figure 7 here

20 The contribution analysis shows that as a whole the WTA's influence increases in 2000s in most humid and semi-humid basins (XI, MIN) while decreases in most semi-arid and arid basins (YL, HAI, HEI, SY) (Fig. 8a). For upstream regions in most basins, the WTA's influence becomes less in 2000s (Fig. 8b). On the contrary, in downstream regions, WTA's influence decreases in most humid and semi-humid basins while increases in most semi-arid and arid basins in 2000s (Fig. 8c). This indicates that there are more intensive human interventions in downstream regions, especially those semi-arid and arid basins over China.

Insert Figure 8 here

4 Discussions

4.1 Suitability of Fu-Budyko framework

30 The fitted parameter θ was greatly influenced by topography. Taking three basins with different climates – humid Yangtze River Basin, semi-arid Yellow River Basin, and arid Hei River Basin – for example, the values of θ are 1.7, 1.7 and 1.3 respectively for upstream regions while those are 2.0, 2.3 and 2.0 respectively for downstream regions. Given the fact that steeper terrains in upstream and flatter terrains in downstream, the values of θ are probably related to topography. The result

is consistent with that from Sun et al. (2007), who found that three factors – infiltration rate, water storage capacity and average slope – had impact on θ in Fu-Budyko framework. Other influential factors were also indicated in other studies, such as vegetation cover (Li et al., 2013), aridity index (Du et al., 2016), and soil characteristic (Gerrits et al., 2009).

Note that Fu-Budyko framework was suitable for annual or mean annual studies while the application in finer temporal scale was restrained. This has been proved by Zhang et al. (2008), who has tested the Budyko model over 265 Australian catchments at different time scales, including mean annual, annual, monthly and daily. They found at the annual scale, the model works well for most of the catchments with 90% of them having values of the coefficient of efficiency greater than 0.5 and less than 3% of the catchments have bias values greater than 10%.

What is more, previous studies proved that Budyko framework performed badly in extremely arid environments where water systems are typically unclosed with intense human interference and irrigation, e.g., the northwestern China. Here we found that Du et al. (2016) successfully applied a Budyko framework in Hei River Basin by dividing the basin into six sub-basins. They calibrated the model separately in different sub-basins and found the model performed quite well in the upper mountainous regions with little human interventions while the model was almost impossible to validate in downstream sub-basins. Thus, we also divided the arid basins (including Hai, Shiyang, Hei and Tarim River Basins) into upper little disturbed mountainous sub-basins and downstream intensively interfered sub-basins. The Fu-Budyko framework was directly applied in the mountainous sub-basins.

4.2 The link between China's water policies and water use changes

After the end of 1970s when China's economic reform and open-door policy started, economic development was set as the primary goal, leading to rapid economic advancement in the 1980s, with the GDP increasing fourfold from 364.5 billion RMB in 1978 to 1699.2 billion RMB in 1989 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2017). Our study showed that with rapid economic increase, surface water use also rocketed from 79 billion m^3 in 1970s to 138 billion m^3 in 1980s for the 12 basins, with the increase in surface water use of 25.4 billion m^3 (63%) for humid basins, 18.6 billion m^3 (120%) for semi-arid basins, 9.8 billion m^3 (59%) for semi-humid basins and 5.1 billion m^3 (90%) for arid basins. Meanwhile, the increase of surface water use simultaneously occurred in both upstream and downstream regions in this period, and the increase in magnitude of surface water use was higher in upstream regions from humid to arid basins. In some cases, the expansion of arable land was the main driver for the increase of surface water use (Yang and Tian, 2009). While in another case, due to the lower priority in water allocation the share of agricultural water use decreased from 64% to 35% from 1985 to 2001, leading to industrial sector being the major contributor in water use increase (Lohmar et al., 2003). In summary, the water resources management was fragmented and sector-oriented due to overlapping responsibilities and lack of effective coordination, leading to rapid increase in surface water use and conflicts between upstream and downstream and different sectors.

Aiming to address conflicts and shortfalls of the deficient and fragmented system that arose during the 1970s and early 1980s, the 1988 Water Law was implemented as the first fundamental legislation regulating water activities (Shen, 2014). By

删除的内容: arid and cold basins where snow and glacier melt contribute a lot to runoff.

删除的内容: opening

删除的内容: increase

删除的内容: in

删除的内容: due to the lower priority,

删除的内容: rocketed

encouraging utilization of water resources rather than water saving, the law facilitated the booming of thousands of engineering projects but failed to effectively address water shortages and environmental degradation in China's water resources during the period of 1990s (Jiang, 2017). Our study showed that total surface water use continuously increased from 138 billion m³ in 1980s to 178 billion m³ in 1990s, with 23.8 billion m³ increase (36%) from humid basins, 7.4 billion m³ increase (28%) from semi-humid basins, 6.2 billion m³ increase (18%) from semi-arid basins and 2.6 billion m³ increase (25%) from arid basins. Meanwhile, the surface water use in upstream regions also increased, while downstream regions were divergent with upward trend in humid and semi-humid basins and downward trend in semi-arid and arid basins due to decrease in water availability. Consequently, 1990s was known as a period with the frequent outbreaks of water-related crises, such as the disappearance of the inland Juyanhai Lake of Hei River Basin in 1992 (Jiang, 2017), the annual average of 107 dry days of the main channel of Yellow river in 1990s (CPSP, 2005), the rapid drop of groundwater table in North China Plain (Jia, 2011), and the severe pollution in surface water and ground water in major rivers (Wu et al., 1999). To summarize, the 20-years rapid development and the neglect of environmental issues caused an extremely tense water-human relationship and threatened the human well-beings and regional sustainable development in 1990s.

When entering into 2000s, in view of the failure of the traditional principle of water use, managing water resources in a sustainable and efficient manner was of increasing significance (Shen, 2014; Jiang, 2017). Reflecting a significant transition in water governance from construction and utilization (project oriented) to conservation and protection (resource oriented), Chinese government has initiated an ambitious water reform "Building a water-saving society", which aims to achieve "harmonious coexistence between man and nature" (Wang, 2006). Our study showed that surface water use slightly decreased from 178 billion m³ in 1990s to 177.6 billion m³ in 2000s, with 10.7 billion m³ decrease in humid basins, 9.2 billion m³ increase in semi-humid basins, 270 million m³ increase in semi-arid basins and 870 million m³ increase in arid basins. Noteworthy, the decrease in surface water use mainly occurred in downstream regions in most basins except Songhua and Yangtze River Basins, while surface water use continuously increased in upstream regions at a slower rate. The theory of water rights and water markets was viewed as a fundamental policy regime in the water reform. For example, the water deal between Dongyang and Yiwu counties in Zhejiang Province in 2000, the water rights trading in Zhangye city in 2002 and water allocation in Yellow River Basin in 2000s (Jiang, 2017). However, the statistical data starting in 2000 still suggested an increase of total water use and water stress between 2000 and 2010 across China (Wang et al., 2017; China Water Resources Bulletin, 2000-2010).

The story in post-2000s looks encouraging. A strict water resources management strategy – three redlines – was implemented in 2012 and statistical data showed that it began to show a slight decrease in total water use over China and each basin (China Water Resources Bulletin, 2011-2016). Our future study will keep tracing the changes of water use and water availability and their links with water policy.

删除的内容:

删除的内容: that in

删除的内容: crisis,

删除的内容: disappeared

删除的内容: the

删除的内容: how to manage

删除的内容: thinking

删除的内容: Meanwhile,

删除的内容: the still increasing

删除的内容: rising

删除的内容: The strictest

删除的内容: slightly

4.3 The lessons and experiences from China's water governance

The section 4.2 ~~explained~~ the lagging of water governance behind water crisis. Hence we would like to raise a question:

What is the most suitable water governance for each region?

There are two different policies adopted to relieve water scarcity across the vast water-scarce northern China: Water

5 allocation ~~based on~~ ~~water rights~~ and transboundary water transfer. The former policy is currently being applied in northwestern catchments including Shiyang, Hei and Tarim River Basins. Meanwhile, the latter policy is mainly being applied in Hai River basin, which is the destination of famous "South-to-North Water Transfer" project. The two policies are being combined in Yellow River Basin to relieve its water scarcity.

This study suggested that appropriate/optimized water allocation should be adopted in regions with high WTA and FI, while

10 physical water transfer should be applied in regions with high WTA and low FI. For the situation of high WTA and FI, the main problem is that the imbalanced increase of water use in up and middle reaches ~~leads~~ to the consequent terminal lake vanishing, vegetation death, and desertification in downstream regions. Moreover, considering that the upstream complex terrains would increase the difficulties of construction of water projects, it is appropriate to adopt water allocation accompanied with water right and water price for solving environmental problems in lower reaches.

15 For the situation of high WTA and low FI, water allocation is not feasible here because water scarcity happens everywhere. If

more surface water is forced to be released to downstream, the upstream regions will face more severe water resource ~~shortages~~,

and consequent environmental deterioration. For example, Shanxi province, the upstream province of Hebei, Beijing and

Tianjin, ~~hasn't~~ had enough surface water to satisfy their own demand ~~since 1970s (Sun et al., 2016)~~. Consequently, the

development of Shanxi province heavily relied on groundwater at amount of 3.6 billion m³, or 64% of total water use, in 2004

20 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2004). The excessive exploitation of groundwater has resulted in a series of

environmental and geological problems, such as land subsidence, earth fissures, and ~~a~~ great reduction of river water flow

~~downstream (Sun et al., 2016)~~. Moreover, considering the higher economic value per unit water in downstream regions, for

instance, ~~15.6 and 58.4 m³/10⁴ GDP in 2016 in Beijing and Shanxi, respectively (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2016)~~,

the increase of alternative water supply is a more feasible policy, including water recycling, transbasin water transfer and

25 brackish water/sea water desalination.

Overall, the formulation of water governance policies is challenging. The quantitative analysis of past trajectories of water

scarcity in upstream, middle stream and downstream ~~provides~~ a sound basis for developing and implementing water

governance in China.

5 Conclusions

30 The unconstrained water use in ~~the~~ upstream of a river basin has led to negative impacts on economy, society, and ecosystems

in downstream regions. However, the ~~quantified relationship of upstream water use and downstream water scarcity still~~,

remains ~~unclear~~ in China due to lack of long-term water use data. By comparing observed runoff (1970s to 2000s) and

删除的内容:

删除的内容: showed that

删除的内容: accompanying with

删除的内容: right,

删除的内容: , leading

删除的内容: s shortage

删除的内容: haven't

删除的内容: in long run.

删除的内容: to the

删除的内容: ,

删除的内容: provided

删除的内容: -

删除的内容: nexus

删除的内容: still

reconstructed theoretical runoff, we analyse the trajectories of surface water use and per capita surface water availability in upstream, middle stream and downstream of China's major river basins. The scenario analysis further quantifies the impact of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity. Finally, the contribution analysis is used to identify the main drivers of water scarcity changes. Our results show that some river basins in China have experienced a **dramatic increase of WTA stress** from 1970s to 2000s **due to** the rapid increase of water **use, which** mainly occurs in northern basins. In 2000s, the increase of upstream **WTA stress** and the decrease of downstream **WTA stress** occurs simultaneously, which is probably caused by the increasing upstream water use and the consequent decrease of downstream water availability outpaced by the decrease of downstream surface water use. The influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity is less than 10% for humid and semi-humid basins, while it is quite large for semi-arid and arid basins with WTA-impact increase from 10% in 1970s to 37% in 2000s and FI-impact increase from 22% in 1980s to 37% in 2000s. The contribution analysis shows that the WTA contribution greatly increases in 2000s mainly in humid and semi-humid basins, **while it** decreases mainly in semi-arid and arid basins. **The trajectories of China's water scarcity are closely related to the socioeconomic development and water policy,** which thus provides valuable lessons and experiences for global water management.

删除的内容: water-scarce period

删除的内容: and

删除的内容: scarcity

删除的内容: surface water scarcity

删除的内容: surface water scarcity

删除的内容: but

删除的内容:

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Professor Keith Richards from Cambridge University for the constructive **feedback given on the study. We appreciate the efforts of three anonymous reviewers whose valuable comments helped us improve the quality of manuscript.** This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 41671021.

删除的内容: suggestion given on the study.

References

Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., and Smith M.: Crop evapotranspiration - Guidelines for computing crop water requirements, FAO Irrigation and drainage paper 56. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 1998.

Al-Faraj, F.A.M., and Tigkas, D.: Impacts of multi-year droughts and upstream human-induced activities on the development of a semi-arid transboundary basin, *Water Resources Management*, 30, 5131-5143, 2016.

Arfanuzzaman, Md., and Syed, Md.: Water demand and ecosystem nexus in the transboundary river basin: a zero-sum game, *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 20, 963-974, 2018.

Arora, V.K.: The use of the aridity index to assess climate change effect on annual runoff, *Journal of Hydrology*, 265, 164-177, 2002.

Bautista, F., Bautista, D., Delgado-Carranza, C.: Calibration of the equations of Hargreaves and Thornthwaite to estimate the potential evapotranspiration in semi-arid and subhumid tropical climates for regional applications, *Atmósfera*, 22(4), 331-348, 2009.

删除的内容: Resour. Manage.,

删除的内容: Environ. Dev. Sustain.,

- Berti, A., Tardivo, G., Chiaudani, A., Rech, F., and Borin, M.: Assessing reference evapotranspiration by the Hargreaves method in north-eastern Italy, *Agricultural Water Management*, 140, 20-25, 2014.
- Brown, C.A., and King, J.M.: Implications of upstream water uses on downstream ecosystems and livelihoods, *International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Sciences*, 32(1), 1-10, 2006.
- 5 Chang, J., Wang, Y., Istanbuluoglu, E., Bai, T., Huang, Q., Yang, D., and Huang, S.: Impact of climate change and human activities on runoff in the Weihe River Basin, China, *Quaternary International*, 380-381, 169-179, 2015.
- CSPS (Country Policy Support Programme): *Water Policy Issues of China: study outcomes and suggested policy interventions*, 2005.
- Changjiang Water resources commission of the ministry of water resources: *Changjiang Sediment Bulletin: 2010*. Wuhan, Changjiang River Publishing Group (in Chinese), <http://www.cjw.gov.cn/zwzc/bmgb/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2010.
- 10 China Water Resources Bulletin: The Ministry of Water Resources of China, <http://www.mwr.gov.cn/sj/tjgb/szygb> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2000-2016.
- Dai, S., Yang, S., Gao, A., Liu, Z., Li, P., and Li, M.: Trend of sediment flux of main rivers in China in the past 50 years (in Chinese), *Journal of Sediment Research*, 2, 49-58, 2007a.
- 15 Dai, S., Yang, S., and Cai, A.: Variation of sediment discharge of the Pearl River Basin from 1955 to 2005(in Chinese), *ACTA GEOGRAPHICA SINICA*, 62(5), 545-554, 2007b.
- Dodds, W.K., and Oakes, R.M.: Headwater influences on downstream water quality, *Environmental Management*, 41, 367-377, 2008.
- Du, C., Sun, F., Yu, J., Liu, X., and Chen, Y.: New interpretation of the role of water balance in an extended Budyko hypothesis in arid regions, Hydrology Earth System Sciences, 20, 393-409, 2016.
- 20 Falkenmark, M.: Meeting water requirements of an expanding world population, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 352, 929-936, 1997.
- Duan, K., Sun, G., Caldwell, P.V., McNulty, S.G., and Zhang, Y.: Implications of upstream flow availability for watershed surface water supply across the conterminous United States, *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 54(3), 694-707, 2018.
- 25 Feike, T., Mamitim, Y., Li, L., and Doluschitz, R.: Development of agricultural land and water use and its driving forces along the Aksu and Tarim River, P.R. China. Environmental Earth Sciences, 73(2), 517-531, 2015.
- Fu, B. P.: On the Calculation of the Evaporation from Land Surface, Scientia Atmospherica Sinica, 5, 23-31, 1981.
- Gavilan, P., Lorite, I.J., Tornero, S., Berengena, J.: Regional calibration of Hargreaves equation for estimating reference ET in a semiarid environment, Agricultural Water Management, 81, 257-281, 2006.
- 30 Gerrits, A. M. J., Savenije, H. H. G., Veling, E. J. M., and Pfister, L.: Analytical derivation of the Budyko curve based on rainfall characteristics and a simple evaporation model, Water Resources Research, 45, W04403, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008WR007308>, 2009.

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: Hydrol.

删除的内容: Syst. Sci.,

带格式的: 字体: Times New Roman

删除的内容: Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.

删除的内容: Sci. Atmos. Sin.,

删除的内容: Agric.

删除的内容: Manage.,

删除的内容: Resour. Res.,

- Guo, Q., Su, N., Yang, Y., Li, J., and Wang, X.: Using hydrological simulation to identify contribution of coal mining to runoff change in the Kuye River Basin, China, *Water Resources*, 44(4), 586-594, 2017.
- He, Y., Lin, K., and Chen, X.: Effect of land use and climate change on runoff in the Dongjiang Basin of South China, *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2013(1), 14-26, 2013.
- 5 Jack, B.K.: Upstream-downstream transactions and watershed externalities: Experimental evidence from Kenya, *Ecological Economics*, 68, 1813-1824, 2009.
- Jia, Y.: Groundwater issues and management in the North China Plain, Chapter 4, Findikakis, 13-24, 2011.
- Jiang, M.: Towards tradable water rights – water law and policy reform in China, *Global Issues in Water Policy* 18, 2017.
- Jiang, C., Zhang, L., Li, D., and Li, F.: Water discharge and sediment load changes in China: Change patterns, causes, and implications, *Water*, 7, 5849-5875, 2015.
- 10 Kumm, M., Ward, P.J., de Moel, H., and Varis, O.: Is physical water scarcity a new phenomenon? Global assessment of water shortage over the last two millennia, *Environmental Research Letters*, 5, 034066, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/5/3/034006, 2010.
- Kumm, M., Guillaume, J.H.A., de Moel, H., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., Veldkamp, T.I.E., and Ward, P.J.: The world's road to water scarcity: shortage and stress in the 20th century and pathways towards sustainability, *Scientific Reports*, 6, 38495, doi: 10.1038/srep38495, 2016.
- 15 Li, F., Zhu, G., and Guo, C.: Shiyang River ecosystem problems and countermeasures, *Agricultural Sciences*, 4(2), 72-78, 2013.
- Li, D., Pan, M., Cong, Z., Zhang, L., and Wood, E.: Vegetation control on water and energy balance within the Budyko framework, *Water Resources Research*, 49, 969-976, doi:10.1002/wrcr.20107, 2013.
- 20 Lohmar, B., Wang, J., Rozelle, S., Huang, J., and Dawe, D.: China's agricultural water policy reform: increasing investment, resolving conflicts, and revising incentives, Market and Trade Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Information Bulletin Number 782, 2003.
- Lu, Z., Wei, Y., Xiao, H., Zou, S., Ren, J., and Lyle, C.: Trade-offs between midstream agricultural production and downstream ecological sustainability in the Heihe River basin in the past half century, *Agricultural Water Management*, 152, 233-242, 2015.
- 25 Luo, K., Tao, F., Moiwo, J.P., and Xiao, D.: Attribution of hydrological change in Heihe River Basin to climate and land use change in the past three decades, *Scientific Reports*, 6, 33704, doi:10.1038/srep33704, 2016.
- [Nian, Y., Li, X., Zhou, J., and Hu, X.: Impact of land use change on water resources allocation in the middle reaches of the Heihe River Basin in northwestern China. *Journal of Arid Land*, 6\(3\), 273-286, 2014.](#)
- 30 Ministry of Water Resources: Gazette of river sediment in China. Beijing: China WaterPower Press. (in Chinese), <http://www.mwr.gov.cn/sj/tjgb/zghlmsgb/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2002-2017.
- Munia, H., Guillaume, J.H.A., Mirumachi, N., Porkka, M., Wada, Y., and Kumm, M.: Water stress in global transboundary river basins: significance of upstream water use on downstream stress, *Environmental Research Letters*, 11, 014002, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/1/014002, 2016.

删除的内容: Resour.,

删除的内容: Environ. Res.Lett.,

删除的内容: Resour. Res.,

删除的内容: 2002-2010.

删除的内容: Environ. Res. Lett.,

- Munia, H., Guillaume, J.H.A., Mirumachi, N., Wada, Y., and Kummu, M.: How downstream sub-basins depend on upstream inflows to avoid scarcity: typology and global analysis of transboundary rivers, [Hydrology, Earth System Sciences](#), 22, 2795-2809, doi:10.5194/hess-2017-537, 2018.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China: China Statistical Yearbook: 2004, China Statistics Press, Beijing, China, 2004.
5 <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2004.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China: China Statistical Yearbook: 2016, China Statistics Press, Beijing, China.
<http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2016.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China: China Statistical Yearbook: 2017, China Statistics Press, Beijing, China.
<http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2017.
- 10 Niu, Z., Zhao, W., Huang, W., and Chen, X.: Impact of ecological water diversion on temporal and spatial change of water resources in Heihe Downstream (in Chinese), *Journal of China Hydrology*, 31(5), 52-56, 2011.
- Nordblom, T.L., Finlayson, J.D., and Hume, I.H.: Upstream demand for water use by new tree plantations imposes externalities on downstream irrigated agriculture and wetlands. *Australian Agricultural and Resource Economics Society*, 56, 455-474, 2012.
- 15 OECD: Water risk hotspots for agriculture, *OECD Studies on Water*, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2017.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264279551-en>
- Oki, T., Agata, Y., Kanae, S., Kanae, S., Saruhashi, T., Yang, D., and Musiake, K.: Global assessment of current water resources using total runoff integrating pathways. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 46(6), 983-995, 2001.
- Pan, Z., Ruan, X., Zhu, Y., and Li, R.: Analysis of variation in runoff of the main stream of Huaihe River in the past 50 years (in
20 Chinese), *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 27(1), 51-59, 2013.
- Petes, L.E., Brown, A.J., and Knight, C.R.: Impacts of upstream drought and water withdrawals on the health and survival of downstream estuarine oyster populations, *Ecology and Evolution*, 2(7), 1712-1724, 2012.
- 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, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 104(39), 15242-15247, 2007.
- 25 Pohlert, T.: Non-Parametric trend tests and change-point detection, 2018.
[<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/trend/vignettes/trend.pdf>, last assess on 17-Nov-2018]
- Ponce, V.M., Pandey, R.P., Ercan, S.: Characterization of drought across the climate spectrum, [Journal of Hydrologic Engineering](#), 5(2), 222-224, 2000.
- Poff, N.L., Olden, J.D., Merritt, D.M., and Pepin, D.M.: Homogenization of regional river dynamics by dams and global
30 biodiversity implications, [PNAS](#), 104, 5732-5737, 2007.
- Ren, L., Lu, X., and Fan, Z.: Changes in hydrologic process and its enlightenment to ecological water conveyance in the Lower Heihe River (in Chinese), *Yellow River*, 37(11), 53-57, 2015.
- Shen, D.: Post-1980 water policy in China, *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 30(4), 714-727, 2014.

删除的内容: Hydrol.

删除的内容: Syst. Sci.,

删除的内容: J. Hydrol. Engng, ASCE

删除的内容: P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA,

- Shi H., and Wang, G.: Impacts of climate change and hydraulic structures on runoff and sediment discharge in the middle Yellow River, *Hydrology Processes*, 29, 3236-3246, 2015.
- Sivaprakasam, S., Murugappan, A., and Mohan, S.: Modified Hargreaves equation for estimation of ET₀ in a hot and humid location in Tamilnadu State, India, *International Journal of Engineering, Science and Technology*, 3(1), 592-600, 2011.
- 5 Song, X., Mu, X., Gao, P., Wang, S., and Wang, F.: Trends of runoff variation from 1900 to 2005 at Harbin station of Songhua River (in Chinese), *Journal of Natural Resources*, 24(10), 1803-1809, 2009.
- Sun, F., Yang, D., Liu, Z., and Cong, Z.: Study on coupled water-energy balance in Yellow River basin based on Budyko Hypothesis (in Chinese), *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 38(4), 409-416, 2007.
- Sun, X., Peng, J., Cui, X., and Jiang, Z.: Relationship between ground fissures, groundwater exploration and land subsidence in
10 Taiyuan basin (in Chinese), *The Chinese Journal of Geological Hazard and Control*, 27(2), 91-98, 2016.
- Temesgen, B., Eching, S., Davidoff, B., and Frame, K.: Comparison of some reference evapotranspiration equations for California, *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*, 131(1), 73-84, 2005.
- Teng, J., Chiew, F.H.S., Vaze, J., Marvanek, S., and Kirono, D.G.C.: Estimation of Climate change impact on mean annual runoff across continental Australia using Budyko and Fu equations and hydrological models, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 13,
15 1094-1106, 2012.
- Trajkovic, S.: Hargreaves versus Penman-Monteith under humid conditions, *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*, 133(1), 38-42, 2007.
- Tu, G., Li, S., Sun, L., and Yao, Y.: Temporal variation of observed runoff in Songhua River and Liaohe River Basins and its relationship with precipitation (in Chinese), *Progressus Inquisitiones De Mutatione Climatis*, 8(6): 456-461, 2012.
- 20 Veldkamp, T.I.E., Wada, Y., Aerts, J.C.J.H., Döll, P., Gosling, S.N., Liu, J., Masaki, Y., Oki, T., Ostberg, S., Pokhrel, Y., Satoh, Y., Kim, H., and Ward, P.J.: Water scarcity hotspots travel downstream due to human interventions in the 20th and 21st century, *Nature Communication*, 8, 15697, doi:10.1038/ncomms15697, 2017.
- Vörösmarty, C.J., Green, P., Salisbury, J., and Lammers, R.B.: Global water resources: Vulnerability from climate change and population growth, *Science*, 289, 284-288, 2000.
- 25 Wang, J., Hong, Y., Gourley, J., Adhikari, P., Li, L., and Su, F.: Quantitative assessment of climate change and human impacts on long-term hydrologic response: a case study in a sub-basin of the Yellow River, China. *International Journal of Climatology*, 30, 2130-2137, 2010.
- Wang, J., Zhong, L., and Iceland, C.: China's water stress is on the rise, World Resources Institute, 2017. [https://www.wri.org/blog/2017/01/chinas-water-stress-rise, last access on 17-Nov-2018]
- 30 Wang, S.: Resource-oriented water management: Towards harmonious coexistence between man and nature, 2nd ed. (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing; Beijing: WaterPower Press, 2006.
- Wu, C., Maurer, C., Wang, Y., Xue, S., and Davis, D.L.: Water pollution and human health in China, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 107(4), 251-256, 1999.

删除的内容: Hydrol. Process.,

删除的内容: Int. J. Eng. Sci. Technol.,

删除的内容: J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. ASCE,

删除的内容: J. Hydrometeorol.,

删除的内容: J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. ASCE,

删除的内容: Nat.Comm.,

删除的内容: Int. J. Climatol.,

- Water Resources Bulletin of Hai River Basin: Haihe River Water Conservancy Commission. <http://www.hwcc.gov.cn/hwcc/wwgj/xxgb/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2015.
- Wei, Q., Sun, C., Wu, G., and Pan, L.: Haihe River discharge to Bohai Bay, North China: Trends, climate, and human activities, *Hydrology Research*, 48(4), 1-13, 2016.
- 5 Yang, Q., and He. Q.: Interrelationship of climate change, runoff and human activities in Tarim River Basin (in Chinese), *Journal of Applied Meteorological Science*, 14(3), 309-321, 2003.
- Yang Y., and Tian, F.: Abrupt change of runoff and its major driving factors in Haihe River Catchment, China, *Journal of Hydrology*, 374, 373-383, 2009.
- Yang, Z., and Chen, J.: Housing Reform and the Housing Market in Urban China. Chapter two, Housing Affordability and
 10 Housing Policy in Urban China, XI, 134p, ISBN: 978-3-642-54043-1, 2014.
- Yang, S.L., Xu, K.H., Milliman, J.D., Yang, H.F., and Wu, C.S.: Decline of Yangtze River water and sediment discharge: Impact from natural and anthropogenic changes, *Scientific Reports*, 5, 12581, doi:10.1038/srep12581, 2015.
- Yellow river conservancy commission of MWR: Yellow River sediment Bulletin, <http://www.yellowriver.gov.cn/nishagonggao/> (last access: 20 July 2018), 2000-2010.
- 15 Zhai, R., and Tao, F.: Contributions of climate change and human activities to runoff change in seven typical catchments across China, *Science of the Total Environment*, 605-606, 219-229, 2017.
- Zhang, A., Zheng, C., Wang, S., and Yao, Y.: Analysis of streamflow variations in the Heihe River Basin, northwest China: Trends, abrupt changes, driving factors and ecological influences, *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 3, 106-124, 2015.
- Zhang, J., Zhang, S., Wang, J., and Li, Y.: Study on runoff trends of the six larger basins in China over the past 50 years (in
 20 Chinese), *Advances in Water Science*, 18(2), 230-234, 2007.
- Zhang, L., Dawes, W., Walker, G.: Response of mean annual evapotranspiration to vegetation changes at catchment scale, *Water Resources Research*, 37, 701-708, 2001.
- Zhang, L., Potter, N., Hickel, K., Zhang, Y., and Shao, Q.: Water balance modelling over variable time scales based on the Budyko framework – Model development and testing, *Journal of Hydrology*, 360, 117-131, 2008.
- 25 Zhang, L., Nan, Z., Xu, Y., and Li, S.: Hydrological impacts of land use change and climate variability in the headwater region of the Heihe River Basin, Northwest China, *PLoS ONE*, 11(6), e0158394, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158394>, 2016.
- Zhang, Y., Hu, C., and Wang, Y.: Analysis on variation characteristics and influential factors of runoff and sediment of Liaohe River Basin (in Chinese), *Yangtze River*, 45(1), 32-35, 2014.
- 30 Zhang Y, Chiew FHS, Zhang L, Leuning R, Cleugh H: Estimating catchment evaporation and runoff using MODIS leaf area index and the Penman-Monteith equation, *Water Resources Research*, 44, W10420, DOI: 10.1029/2007WR006563, 2009
- Zhao, Y., Wei, Y., Li, S., and Wu, B.: Downstream ecosystem responses to middle reach regulation of river discharge in the Heihe River Basin, China, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 20, 4469-4481, 2016.

删除的内容: Hydrol. Res.,

删除的内容:

删除的内容: J. Hydrol.,

删除的内容: Sci.

删除的内容: Environ.,

删除的内容: Resour. Res.,

Zhao, R., Chen, Y., Li, W., Chen, Z., and Hao, X.: Trends in runoff variations of the mainstream of the Tarim River during the last 50 years (in Chinese), *Resources Science*, 32(6), 1196-1203, 2010.

Zheng, H., Zhang, L., Zhu, R., Liu, C., Sato, Y., and Fukushima, Y.: Responses of streamflow to climate and land surface change in the headwaters of the Yellow River Basin, *Water Resources Research*, 45(7), W00A19, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007WR006665>, 2009.

Zhou, X., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, H., Vaze, J., Zhang, L., Yang, Y., and Zhou, Y.: Benchmarking global land surface models against the observed mean annual runoff from 150 large basins, *Journal of Hydrology*, 470-471, 269-279, 2012.

删除的内容: Resour. Res.,

删除的内容: J. Hydrol.,

Figure captions

Figure 1 The locations of the 12 basins and 37 hydrologic stations. Upstream, middle stream and Downstream were identified by red, green and yellow, respectively.

Figure 2 The comparison of observed and natural annual discharge at the outlet stations in 12 basins. Natural discharge in most of the basins was measured at the outlet stations, but that in four basins (Hai, Shiyang, Hei and Tarim) was the discharge in the upstream tributaries because of negligible runoff generated in the downstream regions.

Figure 3 The comparison of observed and natural annual discharge (log10 transformed) in upper, middle and lower reaches. Black triangles indicate 1960s, black dots indicate 1970s, dark grey dots indicate 1980s, light grey dots indicate 1990s and white dots indicate 2000s.

Figure 4 Changes of WTA and FI in 12 basins and China from 1970s/1980s to 2000s. YZ, XI, MIN, QT, SH, HUA, YL, LIA, HAI, HEI, SY, TA and NA represent Yangtze, Xi (Pearl), Min, Qiantang, Songhua, Huai, Yellow, Liao, Hai, Hei, Shiyang, Tarim River Basins and National range, respectively.

Figure 5 Trajectories of WTA and FI in upstream, middle stream and downstream regions for 9 large basins from 1970s/1980s to 2000s.

Figure 6 Quantitative impact of upstream water use on downstream WTA_{\downarrow} (a) and FI_{\downarrow} (b). S1 is a scenario that downstream WTA (FI) is contributed by upstream water use while S2 is a scenario that downstream WTA (FI) is not contributed by upstream water use. S1-S2 (S2-S1) indicates the **difference in stress between the two scenarios**. YZ represents Yangtze River

删除的内容: surface water stress

删除的内容: per capita surface water availability

删除的内容: upstream water use.

Basin, XI represents Pearl River Basin, MIN represents Min River Basin, SH represents Songhua River Basin, YL represents Yellow River Basin, HAI represents Hai River Basin, SY represents Shiyang River Basin, HEI represents Hei River Basin, and TR represents Tarim River Basin. Asteroid sign indicates that the values are enlarged by 10 times for Hai River Basin to make them visible for comparison purpose.

删除的内容: 0

5 **Figure 7** The combined analysis of WTA and FI showing the water scarcity trajectories in 9 river basins in the period of 1980s - 2000s. YZ represents Yangtze River Basin, XI represents Pearl River Basin, MIN represents Min River Basin, SH represents Songhua River Basin, YL represents Yellow River Basin, HAI represents Hai River Basin, SY represents Shiyang River Basin, HEI represents Hei River Basin, and TR represents Tarim River Basin.

10 **Figure 8** The WTA contribution in water scarcity trajectories for whole basin, upstream and downstream between different periods.

15

Table1: Sources of hydrological data from office and published literatures.

Basin (Climate)	Hydrologic station (lat/lon)	Reference
Pearl (humid)	Liu Zhou ^u (24.53/109.11), Qianjiang ^u (23.68/109.1)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Dai et al., 2007a,b
	Nanning ^u (22.82/108.19), Gaoyao ^d (23.26/112.22)	
Min (humid)	Qilijie ^u (27.01/118.29), Yangkou ^u (26.77/117.97)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Dai et al., 2007a
	Shaxian ^u (26.4/117.83), Zhuqi ^d (26.12/119.15)	
Qiantang (humid)	Huashan(29.62/120.83), Zhuji(29.72/120.23), Quxian(28.98/118.87)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010)
Yangtze (semi-humid)	Yichang ^u (30.75/111.3), Hankou ^m (30.58/114.28)	Changjiang Sediment Bulletin (2010); Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010)
	Datong ^d (30.77/117.6)	
Huai (semi-humid)	Bengbu(32.74/117.23)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Pan et al., 2013; Dai et al., 2007a
Songhua (semi-humid)	Harbin ^u (45.8/126.67), Jiamusi ^d (46.83/130.13)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Tu et al., 2012; Song et al., 2009
Yellow (semi-arid)	Toudaoguai ^u (39.25/106.78), Huayuankou ^m (34.9/113.66)	Yellow River Sediment Bulletin (2000-2010); Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010)
	Lijin ^d (37.5/118.25)	
Liao (semi-arid)	Tieling(42.14/122.48)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Zhang et al., 2014; Dai et al., 2007a
Hai (semi-arid)	Zhangjiafen ^u (40.62/116.78), Xiangshuibao ^u (40.51/115.18)	Official source, Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010)
	Xiahui ^u (40.62/117.17), shixiali ^u (40.25/114.73)	
	Daomaguan ^u (39.08/114.63), Xiaoju ^e (38.38/113.72), Pingshan ^u (38.25/114.17)	Official source
	Haiheza ^d (39.02/117.73)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Dai et al., 2007a; Wei et al., 2016
Hei (arid)	Yingluoxia ^u (38.8/100.17), Zhengyixia ^m (39.82/99.45)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin (2002-2010); Niu et al., 2011
	Langxinshan ^d (41.03/100.32)	
Shiyang (arid)	Caiqi ^u (38.21/102.75), Hongyashan ^d (38.41/102.9)	Official source
Tarim	Alar ^u (40.5/80.99)	Chinese river sediment Bulletin

- 带格式表格
- 已下移 [1]: Yichang^u(30.75/111.3), Hankou^m(30.58/114.28), Datong^d(30.77/117.6)
- 已移动(插入) [2]
- 删除的内容: Changjiang Sediment Bulletin (2010);
- 删除的内容: Yangtze
- 已下移 [3]: Toudaoguai^u(39.25/106.78), Huayuankou^m(34.9/113.66), Lijin^d(37.5/118.25)
- 已移动(插入) [4]
- 删除的内容: Yellow River Sediment Bulletin (2000-2010);
- 删除的内容: Yellow
- 拆分的单元格
- 已下移 [5]: Zhangjiafen^u(40.62/116.78), Xiangshuibao^u(40.51/115.18), Xiahui^u(40.62/117.17), shixiali^u(40.25/114.73)
- 已移动(插入) [6]
- 删除的内容: Official source,
- 删除的内容: Hai
- 已移动(插入) [1]
- 已移动(插入) [7]
- 已移动(插入) [8]
- 已移动(插入) [11]
- 已移动(插入) [12]
- 已移动(插入) [3]
- 已移动(插入) [9]
- 已移动(插入) [10]
- 已移动(插入) [5]

(arid)		(2002-2010); Zhao et al., 2010; Yang and He, 2003
	Yingbaza ^m (41.17/84.22), Qiala ^a (40.97/86.7)	Zhao et al., 2010; Yang and H

Superscript: ^u represents upstream gages, ^m represents middle stream gages, and ^l represents downstream gages.

- 已上移 [7]: e, 2003
- 已上移 [8]: 32.74/117.23)
- 删除的内容: et al.,
- 已上移 [2]: 2007a
- 删除的内容: (
- 删除的内容: (23.26/112.22) ...
- 已上移 [4]: 2007a,b
- 删除的内容: (26.12/119.15) ...
- 已上移 [6]: 07a
- 删除的内容: (28.98/118.87) ...
- 已上移 [9]: 2-2010)
- 删除的内容: (
- 已上移 [10]: 42.14/122.48)
- 删除的内容: et al., 2
- 已上移 [11]: 007a
- 删除的内容: Songhua ...
- 已上移 [12]: 46.83/130.13)

5





Figure 1: The locations of the 12 basins and 37 hydrologic stations. Upstream, middle stream and Downstream were identified by red, green and yellow, respectively.



删除的内容:





Figure 2: The comparison of observed and natural annual discharge at the outlet stations in 12 basins. Natural discharge in most of the basins was measured at the outlet stations, but that in four basins (Hai, Shiyang, Hei and Tarim) was the discharge in the upstream tributaries because of negligible runoff generated in the downstream regions.

5

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文



删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文





Figure 3: The comparison of observed and natural annual discharge (log10 transformed) in upper, middle and lower reaches. Black triangles indicate 1960s, black dots indicate 1970s, dark grey dots indicate 1980s, light grey dots indicate 1990s and white dots indicate 2000s.

带格式的: 字体: (中文) +中文正文



删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: (中文) +中文正文





Figure 4: Changes of WTA and FI in 12 basins and China from 1970s/1980s to 2000s. YZ, XI, MIN, QT, SH, HUA, YL, LIA, HAI, HEI, SY, TA and NA represent Yangtze, Xi (Pearl), Min, Qiantang, Songhua, Huai, Yellow, Liao, Hai, Hei, Shiyang, Tarim River Basins and National range, respectively.

带格式的: 字体: (中文) +中文正文



删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: (中文) +中文正文





Figure 5: Trajectories of WTA and FI in upstream, middle stream and downstream regions for 9 large basins from 1970s/1980s to 2000s.

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文



删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文

5

10

15

Influence of upstream water use on downstream water scarcity





Figure 6: Quantitative impact of upstream water use on downstream WTA (a) and FI (b). S1 is a scenario that downstream WTA (FI) is contributed by upstream water use while S2 is a scenario that downstream WTA (FI) is not contributed by upstream water use. S1-S2 (S2-S1) indicates the difference in stress between the two scenarios. YZ represents Yangtze River Basin, XI represents Pearl River Basin, MIN represents Min River Basin, SH represents Songhua River Basin, YL represents Yellow River Basin, HAI represents Hai River Basin, SY represents Shiyang River Basin, HEI represents Hei River Basin, and TR represents Tarim River Basin. Asteroid sign indicates that the values are enlarged by 10 times for Hai River Basin to make them visible for comparison purpose.



- 删除的内容:
- 删除的内容: surface water stress
- 删除的内容: per capita surface water availability
- 删除的内容: upstream water use.
- 删除的内容: 0

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文, 小五, 加粗





Figure 7: The combined analysis of WTA and FI showing the water scarcity trajectories in 9 river basins in the period of 1980s - 2000s. YZ represents Yangtze River Basin, XI represents Pearl River Basin, MIN represents Min River Basin, SH represents Songhua River Basin, YL represents Yellow River Basin, HAI represents Hai River Basin, SY represents Shiyang River Basin, HEI represents Hei River Basin, and TR represents Tarim River Basin.



删除的内容:
带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文




Figure 8: The WTA contribution in water scarcity trajectories for whole basin, upstream and downstream between different periods.

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文

Whole Basin	
Yangtze	0
	0.73
	0.43
Min	0
	0.03
	0.47
Yellow	0
	0.58
	0.15
Hei	0
	0.47
	0.14
Tarim	0
	0.38
	0.93

删除的内容:

带格式的: 字体: (中文) + 中文正文