How is Baseflow Index (BFI) impacted by water resource management practices?

John P. Bloomfield¹, Mengyi Gong^{2,3}, Benjamin P. Marchant¹, Gemma Coxon⁴, Nans Addor⁵

¹British Geological Survey, Wallingford, OX10 8BB, UK
 ²British Geological Survey, Keyworth, NG12 5GG, UK
 ³Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YFR, UK
 ⁴University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1SS, UK
 ⁵University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK

Correspondence to: John P. Bloomfield (jpb@bgs.ac.uk)

- 10 Abstract. Water resource management (WRM) practices, such as groundwater and surface water abstractions and effluent discharges, may impact baseflow. Here the CAMELS-GB large-sample hydrology dataset is used to assess the impacts of such practices on baseflow index (BFI) using statistical models of 429 catchments from Great Britain. Two complementary modelling schemes, multiple linear regression (LR) and machine learning (random forests, RF), are used to investigate the relationship between BFI and two sets of covariates (natural covariates only and a combined set of natural and WRM
- 15 covariates). The LR and RF models show good agreement between explanatory covariates. In all models, the extent of fractured aquifers, clay soils, non-aquifers, and crop cover in catchments, catchment topography and aridity are significant or important natural covariates in explaining BFI. When WRM terms are included, groundwater abstraction is significant or the most important WRM covariate in both modelling schemes and <u>effluent</u> discharge to rivers is also identified as significant or influential, although natural covariates still provide the main explanatory power of the models. Surface water abstraction is a
- 20 significant covariate in the LR model but of only minor importance in the RF model. Reservoir storage covariates are not significant or are unimportant in both the LR and RF models for this large-sample analysis. Inclusion of WRM terms improves the performance of some models in specific catchments. The LR models of high BFI catchments with relatively high levels of groundwater abstraction show the greatest improvements, and there is some evidence of improvement in LR models of catchments with moderate to high effluent discharges. However, there is no evidence that the inclusion of the WRM covariates
- 25 improves the performance of LR models for catchments with high surface water abstraction or that they improve the performance of the RF models. These observations are used to formulatediscussed within a conceptual framework for baseflow generation that incorporates WRM practices. A wide range of schemes and measures are used to manage water resources in the UK. These include conjunctive use and low flow alleviation schemes and hands-off flow measures. Systematic information on such schemes is currently unavailable in CAMELS-GB and their specific effects on BFI cannot be constrained by the
- 30 <u>current study.</u> Given the significance or importance of WRM terms in the models, iIt is recommended that information on WRM, particularly groundwater abstraction, should be included where possible in future large-sample hydrological data sets and in the analysis and prediction of BFI and other measures of baseflow.

1 Introduction

65

Baseflow, defined as streamflow fed from the deep subsurface and shallow subsurface storage between precipitation and/or

- 35 snowmelt events (Tallaksen, 1995; Price, 2011; Zhang et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2019; Gnann et al., 2019), is a hydrological phenomenon that represents a whole catchment response to meteorological and other environmental signals (Bloomfield et al., 2011). It is important as it sustains surface flows particularly during relatively dry periods and droughts (Smathkin, 2001; Miller et al., 2016), because it supports ecological flows and ecosystem functioning (Poff et al., 1997; Boulton 2003), and is a factor in regulating streamflow quality and temperature (Jordan et al., 1997; Gomez-Velez et al., 2015; Hare et al., 2021). It
- 40 integrates the outcomes of a wide range of natural and human-influenced surface and sub-surface catchment processes (Price et al., 2011; Gnann et al., 2019) that . These-include geomorphological controls related to surface topography (Santhi et al., 2008) and soils processes (Vivoni et al., 2007; Price et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2019; Yao et al., 2021) and (hydro)geological processes that controls on baseflow (Longobardi and Villani, 2008; Bloomfield et al., 2009; Kuentz et al., 2017; Carlier et al., 2018). Land use and land cover (LULC) change may also have profound effects on baseflow generation (Zhang and Schilling,
- 45 2006; Wang et al., 2014), including effects of changing forest cover and agriculture (Juckem et al., 2008; <u>Ahiablame et al., 2017;</u> Zhang et al., 2017) and urbanization (Simmons and Reynolds, 1982; Chang 2007; Dow, 2007; McGrane 2015). Through these processes, the dynamics of baseflow generation is modulated by meteorological variability over a range of spatial and temporal scales (<u>Beck et al., 2013;</u> Van Loon and Laaha, 2015; Longobardi and Van Loon, 2018) <u>including large-scale circulation patterns (Cheng et al., 2021)</u>. There is <u>also growing evidence for the potential impact of climate change on baseflow</u>
- 50 across a variety of climate and catchment settings (Wang et al., 2014; Ficklin et al., 2016; <u>Ahiabalme et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2019</u>) and it has been proposed that this should be viewed in the context of increasing sensitivity of changes in droughts and low flows to wider anthropogenic influences (Van Loon et al., 2016; Sankarasubramanian_et al., 2020).

Despite this extensive work on baseflow generation dynamics, Gnann et al., (2019) observed that there is still no general theory to explain variations in baseflow between catchments despite the strong evidence that it is largely controlled by

- 55 the interaction of climate and landscape processes. They explored the role of climate in baseflow generation using baseflow data from the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK) and found that in humid settings baseflow can be highly variable due to variations in catchment storage and wetting potential, whereas in more arid settings baseflow has much lower variability and is primarily controlled by vaporization limits. In a complementary study of 435 catchments across the contiguous US and the UK, Yao et al., (2021) found that soil water storage capacity is an important control on baseflow
- 60 and that generally, BFI increases with storage capacity for a given a climate condition and decreases with aridity for a given storage capacity.

In addition to climate and <u>geophysical_catchment_controls_on baseflow</u>, there is evidence that baseflow may be impacted by water resource management (WRM) practices. Here WRM practices is a loosely defined term that encompasses a wide range of activities related to the management of groundwater and surface water resources that are specifically distinct from wider 'human influences' or 'human activities' (Zhang et al., 2019; Mo et al., 2021) that affect LULC, such as of

2

urbanization, deforestation, and land-management practices. Wang and Kai (2009) referred to WRM practice as 'direct human interferences'. Some examples of WRM practices include abstraction and discharge, changes in conveyance of streams due to changes in channel structure for example for damming, flow regulation and flood management, and development of structures for water storage within catchments including dams and artificial wetlands.

- 70 Using a baseflow recession analysis, Wittenburg (2003) identified reduced baseflow resulting from abstraction for agricultural-summer irrigation in northern a catchment in Turkey but only saw limited effect of abstractions for agricultural irrigation on baseflow in a catchment in Germany. The latter was attributed to the location of the abstractions within the catchment (abstractions were primarily near the watershed) and that the abstracted groundwater was not entirely lost to the groundwater balance (with lowered evapotranspiration stress, relative to the Turkish case study, associated with the irrigation
- 75 <u>contributing to recharge</u>). <u>Similarly, uU</u>sing an empirical analysis of baseflow recession, Wang and Cai (2009) modelled the impact of abstraction and <u>effluent</u> returns on stream flow in a catchment in Illinois, USA. <u>They found that the WRM practices significantly altered recession process and low-flow hydrograph characteristics (compared with land-use change process that affected both the rising and falling limbs of the hydrograph and peak flows)</u> -and showed that they affected effluent returns caused a significant increase inflow recession processes and increased low-flow (Q5) magnitude but a decreased low flow
- 80 variability._-In a statistical analysis of trends in baseflow in a catchment in Florida, USA, Webber and Perry (2006) demonstrated-documented a long-term decline in baseflow and spring flows. They assessed the possible effects of changes in rainfall, LULC and groundwater abstraction but concluded that the primary cause of decline in baseflow and spring flow was due to over-abstraction of groundwater. Thomas et al. (2013) emphasised the importance of taking 'human interference' into account when estimating the baseflow recession constant after documenting higher baseflow recession constants associated
- 85 with groundwater withdrawals from catchments in New Jersey, USA. <u>They also noted that the location, size and degree of confinement of abstractions effected the degree to which streamflow was impacted. Large abstractions of groundwater close to streams resulted in larger impacts on streamflow than smaller abstractions from more distant locations, and abstractions from unconfined aquifers had larger impacts than from confined aquifers. A variety number of modelling studies have simulated the impact of abstraction and other WRM practices on baseflow (Kirk and Herbert, 2002; Parkin et al., 2007; Sanz</u>
- 90 et al., 2011; de Graff et al., 2014). For example, de Graffe et al., (2014) calibrated the PCR-GLOBWB model with a dynamic allocation scheme to simulate surface water and groundwater abstractions and corresponding feedbacks. They found impacts of WRM were experienced during periods of low flows when the contribution of groundwater through baseflow is the largest and that return flows changed the timing and duration of the low flow periods, causing baseflow to be maintained for longer. In summary, as with natural controls on baseflow (Gnann et al., 2019), there is as yet no general theory to explain the effects
- 95 of WRM practices on baseflow, and the effect of a given WRM practice on baseflow may be contingent on a range of factors including climate, (hydro)geological setting, location, and timing of the activity.

However<u>To date</u>, there have been no large-sample, data-led analyses of the impacts of WRM practices on baseflow. This is despite new opportunities being offered to investigate and quantify catchment processes through open access, largesample hydrology datasets (Addor et al., 2020). Such datasets have been used to provide insights into catchment processes and functioning across multiple climate and catchment settings (Beck et al., 2013; Ochoa-Tocachi et al., 2016; Fouad et al., 2018; Gnann et al. 2019; Dudley et al., 2020). CAMELS-GB, a recently published large-sample hydrology dataset for Great Britain (GB) (Coxon et al., 2020a; 2020b), is unusual in that it contains quantitative information on WRM practices including surface water and groundwater abstractions, discharges, and reservoir numbers and capacities at the catchment scale. The aim of the present study is to use the CAMELS-GB large-sample dataset to identify which, if any, of these WRM activities influence baseflow; to assess the importance of these activities in the context of other factors known to influence baseflow, such as meteorology, catchment hydrogeology, catchment physiography, and LUCLCU (Price, 2011); and, to investigate if WRM factors are important in any particular catchment or management settings. -More generally, this study also directly addresses 'Challenge 2' of Wagener et al., (2021) related to the need to improve understanding of the impact of human activities on the

water cycle in GB.

- As Price (2011) has noted, there are four broad approaches to quantify baseflow, as follows: low flow event time series; flow-duration statistics; baseflow recession analysis; and, metrics of the proportion of baseflow to total flow, also known as baseflow indices. This study focusses-takeson the lastter approach and specifically on-uses the two measures of Baseflow Index (BFI) reported in CAMELS-GB (Coxon et al., 2020a; 2020b). BFI is the ratio of baseflow volume to total flow volume expressed as a fraction (Nathan and McMahon, 1990) and can be estimated by hydrograph separation using a wide range of tracer-based and non-tracer methods (Eckhardt, 2008; Gonzales et al., 2009; Price et al., 2011). The two measures of BFI in CAMELS-GB both use non-tracer-based methods, specifically a digital filter (Lyne and Hollick, 1979) and a graphical / statistical method (Gustard et al., 1992; Piggot et al., 2005). The former, although it is not based on the physics of discharge processes, produces objective and reproducible estimates of BFI (Cheng et al., 2021), while the latter has been used previously to characterise BFI across the study area (Bloomfield, 2009).
- -Two statistical models (multiple linear regression, LR, and machine learning using random forests, RF) are used here to investigate the relationships between <u>the two estimates of BFI</u> and WRM and other catchment covariates in the CAMELS-GB dataset. <u>Although studies of BFI typically consider multiple baseflow filters to reduce uncertainty in estimates of BFI (Chen and Teegavarapu, 2020; Kissel and Schmalz, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Note that in the present study the modelling is not designed either to assess the relative efficacy of the filters used to estimate BFI, nor to compare the respective efficacy of the <u>chosen statistical</u> models in estimating baseflow: this is not a model inter-comparison study (Refsgaard and Knudsen, 1996). Instead, the <u>estimates of BFI and the modelling approaches</u> are designed to provide complementary evidence for the nature and importance (or not) of WRM practices on influencing BFI based on the published CAMELS-GB data.
 </u>

2 Study area and data

2.1 Study area

130 This study focuses on 429 catchments across GB (Fig. 1) covering a wide range of climate-landscape-water management features (Fig. 2). Catchments in north and north-west of the study area tend to have higher mean elevations than those in the

south and south-east (Coxon et al., 2020a). Meteorology tends to reflect the broad gradient in catchment physiography, with wet and cooler conditions typically prevalent in the north and west of the study area compared with relatively dry and warmer conditions in the south-east (Fig. 2a). The dominant land cover also reflects the prevailing physiographic and meteorological

135 conditions with grass cover predominating in the north and west and crop cover in the south and east, with urban land-cover dominant in London and the other large cities of central and northern England (Fig. 2b). High productivity aquifers are found in the south-east and east (Fig. 2c; Bloomfield et al., 2009; Marchant and Bloomfield, 2018), whereas less productive aquifers and non-aquifers are generally more extensive in the west and north-west. Catchments in which clay dominated soils overlie mudrock and clay bedrock formations and catchments with extensive glacial till deposits that are present in central and eastern areas (Fig. 2d) (Bloomfield et al., 2009; Bricker and Bloomfield, 2014).



Figure 1. Location of catchments in the study area

145

Groundwater is used throughout England and forms on average about 30% of the public supply, as well as being used extensively for agricultural irrigation and industrial supplies (Ascott et al., 2017). For 2017 (the last year of published abstraction data) estimated actual abstractions from all sources (except tidal) in England totalled 10,395 million cubic metres (Mm³), with 8,350 Mm³ from surface waters and 2,044 Mm³ from groundwater. Just over half of all these abstractions were used for public supply (5,332 Mm³) (UK Government, 2020). Regionally groundwater use is more important in southern and

150 eastern England where groundwater abstraction may consist of 100% of public supply (Ascott et al., 2020). Consequently, there is a tendency for more extensive surface water abstraction in the north and more groundwater abstraction in south-east (Fig. 2e and 2f) (Coxon et al., 2020b). <u>DEffluent d</u>ischarges are generally relatively high in catchments in and near major urban centres such as London, central England, and across parts of the north-west (Fig. 2b and 2g) while the highest reservoir capacity is generally associated with catchments in northern and western parts of the study region (Fig. 2h).

155



Figure 2. Selected catchment characteristics from CAMELS-GB.

2.2 Data

The data used in this study have been taken from the CAMELS-GB large-sample hydrology data set for Great Britain (GB) (Coxon et al., 2020a, 2020b), itself part of the wider CAMELS (Catchment Attributes and MEteorology for Large-sample Studies) initiative (Newman et al., 2015; Addor et al., 2017; 2020; Alvarez-Garreton et al., 2018; Chagas et al., 2020). CAMELS-GB is unique in that it contains human-influence attributes for some catchments, and it is that sub-set of catchments which are used here. These initially consisted of 442 catchments for which there are 'human influence attributes' (Coxon et al., 2020a, Table2). However, these were further reduced to 429 catchments (Fig. 3) following a consideration of the estimates of BFI that are available for those catchments and the availability of data for the covariates of interest, as described below.



[contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right 2021]

Figure 3. The distribution of a. BFI_CEH, b. BFI_LH, and c. relationship between the two measures of BFI with a 1:1 line for reference.

170

165

BFI is a hydrological signature (Price et al., 2011; McMillan, 2021) that can be estimated using a wide range of techniques. CAMELS-GB contains two estimates of baseflow. One index, 'baseflow_index_ceh' (BFI_CEH) (Fig3a.), is derived using a method developed by the UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology and has been used in previous studies of baseflow and flow regimes in Great Britain (Gustard et al., 1992; World Meteorological Organization, 2008). The other,
'baseflow_index' (BFI_LH) (Fig. 3b), was estimated by baseflow separation using the Lyne and Hollick digital filter (Lyne and Hollick, 1979) as implemented by Ladson et al., (2013). A comparison of the two CAMELS-GB baseflow indices (Fig. 3c) confirms the common observation that different techniques used for baseflow separation influence the estimated indices (Nathan and McMahon, 1990; Eckhardt, 2008; Beck et al., 2013, Addor et al., 2017). There are often large uncertainties in the underlying streamflow data used to estimate BFI (Coxon et al. 2015) but these are difficult to characterise across large samples of catchments and uncertainty estimates are not available for all the CAMELS-GB catchments (Coxon et al., 2020b). However, BFI typically has lower uncertainty compared with other hydrological signatures, as it is based on temporal averaging (Westerberg and McMillan, 2015), and that only typically small differences in the BFI estimates are observed in the present study based on the two methods of estimate (Fig. 3).

-Given that the true BFI for any given catchment is unknown, catchments for analysis in this study have been selected where there is a reasonable agreement between the two baseflow indices. Ten catchments were removed where there is an absolute difference between BFI_CEH and BFI _LH of greater than 0.14, equivalent to the largest 2.5% tile of the absolute differences of the population. A further three catchments were removed due to missing covariate data leaving the 429 catchments for analysis (Figs. 1 and 3). Coxon et al. (2020b) note that the CAMELS-GB baseflow indices have been estimated for flow time series available during water years from 1st Oct 1970 to 30th Sept 2015, but that individual time series lengths and completeness may vary between catchments. On average, flow records for the 429 catchments are 91% complete with only 48 catchments with <75% complete. No sites have been omitted from the analysis based on the length of their flow records. Figure 3c shows that that there is a generally good linear agreement between the two estimated BFI indices. However,

for BFIs below 0.7 BFI_CEH is systematically lower than BFI_LH, and for BFIs above 0.7 BFI_CEH is systematically higher
 than BFI_LH. but that for BFIs up to about 0.7 BFI_CEH is systematically lower than BFI_LH, and that at BFIs above about
 0.7 BFI_CEH is systematically higher than BFI_LH. In addition, for sites above a BFI of about 0.7 the correlation between the two indices is reduced.

21 of the CAMELS-GB catchment attributes (Coxon et al., 2020a) related to catchment physiography, climate, hydrogeology, land cover and soils as well as WRM practices have been selected as covariates for analysis (Table A1). The spatial distribution of selected covariates are provided in Fig. 2 and fully-described in Coxon et al. (2020b). The 21 CAMELS-200 GB covariates used in this study have been selected to be representative of each of the major components in a new conceptual model of baseflow generation (Fig. 4) and are consistent with the recently proposed, broader perceptual hydrological model for GB (Wagener et al., 2021).- Five WRM covariates from the CAMELS-GB dataset have been selected for analysis: groundwater abstraction (groundwater abs), surface water abstraction (surfacewater abs), effluent discharges (discharges) to streams and the number and capacity of reservoirs within catchments (num reservoirs and reservoir cap). Note that the 205 discharge term only accounts for effluent from sewage treatment works and does not provide information on other water returns (Coxon et al., 2020b). Price (2011) presented a conceptual model that illustrated how components of the terrestrial water cycle and specific catchment processes are related to baseflow based on stores and flows of water in catchments. It did n²ot, however, incorporate WRM concepts and how these might influence or modify baseflow. In addition, it did n²ot include aspects of catchment physiography as it focussed on catchment inputs, storage and losses. Fig. 4 is a revised conceptual diagram (building 210 on Price et al, 2011) indicating conceptual relationships between baseflow, catchment compartments and processes that lead to baseflow generation, including aspects of WRM. It conceptualises WRM practices as simple high-level flows between

groundwater, streamflow and components of storage. Some flows that may be significant within a given catchment, such as mains leakage (conceptualised Fig. 4), however these are outside the current analysis as there is no information for these flows in CAMELS-GB.

215



Figure 4. Conceptual model of the relationships between the major compartments of the terrestrial water cycle that exert an influence on baseflow. Baseflow and storm flow components are highlighted in blue, driving climatology, catchment characteristics and compartments are shaded in green, and human influences within the conceptual model are shaded in orange and grey (the latter outside the scope of this study). The 21 CAMELS-GB covariates and the two BFI parameters used in this study are listed against their respective compartments within the conceptual framework.

3. Modelling methods

220

Modelling is used in this study not for predictive purposes but to explore model structures and performance to assess the evidence for the relative importance (or not) of WRM practices in influencing BFI. Two complementary modelling schemes, a multiple linear regression (LR) scheme and a random forest scheme (RF), have been applied to two estimates of BFI (BFI LH

- 225 a multiple linear regression (LR) scheme and a random forest scheme (RF), have been applied to two estimates of BFI (BFI_LH and BFI_CEH) using two sets of covariates (Set A and Set B). Set A consists of the 16 natural covariates and Set B consists of all 21 CAMELS-GB covariates, i.e. the combined natural and human influence covariates (Table A1). Consequently, eight models (Models 1 to 8) have been developed and evaluated. The LR and RF models are first calibrated for the Set A covariates (Models 1 to 4), then a second separate calibration is undertaken using Set B covariates (Models 5 to 8). The resulting model
- 230 structures are investigated and their performance in estimating observed BFI compared without and with WRM covariates to understand the influence of WRM covariates on BFI.

The accuracy of the model estimates has been assessed using RMSE and by calculating Lin's concordance coefficient (Lin, 1989) for the predicted and measured values. Lin's coefficient indicates the degree of similarity between two variables, where-

$$\rho_{c}(x,y) = \frac{2\rho(x,y)\sqrt{\operatorname{var}(x)}\sqrt{\operatorname{var}(y)}}{\operatorname{var}(x) + \operatorname{var}(y) + (\mu_{x} - \mu_{y})^{2}},$$
(1)

and where $\rho_c(x, y)$ is Lin's concordance coefficient for variables x and y, $\rho(x, y)$ is Pearson's coefficient for the same variables, var(x) is the variance of x, and μ_x in the mean of x. Lin's concordance coefficient can take values between -1 and 1. A value of 1 indicates an exact match between the two variables and the $(\mu_x - \mu_y)^2$ term means that variables with different mean values have a small coefficient value in contrast to standard correlation coefficients where perfectly correlated variables can have vastly different mean values. Lin's concordance coefficient This is in contrast to a more standard Pearson correlation coefficient that is an indication of the explanatory power of a linear relationship between the two variables. Lin's concordance coefficient is calculated both to assess the accuracy of a given model at replicating the training data and in a 10-fold crossvalidation procedure to explore the model accuracy at locations that were not used in calibration. If Lin's coefficient is substantially smaller upon cross-validation then this could be an indication that the model is overfitted.

3.1 Linear regression

Regression is commonly used to model the effect of a given set of covariates on a variable of primary interest (Fahrmier et al., 2013). Here generalised linear regression (Dobson, 2002) is used to investigate the relationship between BFI_LH and BFEI_CEH and the 21 catchment covariates. Logit transformation was applied to the BFI data, as $y_i = \log(z_i/(1 - z_i))$, where z_i is the BFI of catchment *i*. This is to ensure the fitted, back transformed BFI values are constrained between 0 and 1. The model considered in this paper is a linear mixed model with the following form,

$$Y = X_1\beta_1 + \dots + X_p\beta_p + \epsilon \qquad \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 R) \qquad (\underline{24})$$

where $Y = (y_1, ..., y_n)'$ denotes the column vector of BFI values from *n* catchments, $X_j = (x_{j1}, ..., x_{jn})'$, j = 1, ..., p, are the column vectors of the covariates (catchments attributes). The column vector ϵ represents the model residuals, which are assumed to follow a normal distribution, with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 R$, where *R* reflects the correlation between transformed BFI values. The linear sums of covariates in a linear mixed model are referred to as the fixed effects and the residual term as the random effects.

In this paper, the model parameters $\beta = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_p)'$ are estimated using the generalized least squares estimator (Dobson, 2002):

260

250

$$\beta = (X'R^{-1}X)^{-1}X'R^{-1}Y \qquad (\underline{32})$$

These parameter values maximise the likelihood or probability that the data would have arisen from the estimated model. Standard linear regression requires the assumption that the residuals are independent and identically distributed (iid) and that the correlation matrix is equal to the identity matrix, *I*. Such an assumption can be inappropriate for landscape measurements, as they are not selected according to a randomised design, and are often correlated in space as a result of the underlying

265 geology, climate, etc. In particular, the BFI measurements made from locations closer to each other are more likely to share some similarity than those a long distance apart. If this correlation is ignored then the significance of some model terms could be exaggerated.

A further issue is deciding which of the available covariates should be included. If too few covariates are included then some of the key drivers of BFI variation might be missed and the predictions that result might be imprecise. If too many 270 covariates are included then the model might be overfitted. Some of the terms in an overfitted model replicate the random variation of the BFI values within the calibration data rather than generally applicable relationships between BFI and the covariates. Such a model can accurately predict the BFI for the sites used in calibration but performs less well on other data. The addition of a covariate to a model generally increases the maximised likelihood even in the absence of a true relationship between that covariate and the property of interest. The addition cannot decrease this likelihood because the original model can be achieved if $\beta_{p+1} = 0$. A statistical criterion must be used to decide whether the increase in likelihood upon the addition 275 of a parameter is sufficient to justify the inclusion of that term.

The modelling procedure consists of three steps. In the first step, given the candidate covariates, variable selection is carried out using the stepwise selection routine based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1973). The AIC, which is twice the negative log-likelihood of the model minus 2 times the number of model parameters,

 $AIC = -2\log\{\mathcal{L}(\beta, \sigma^2; Y)\} - 2(p+1)$ (43)

- The model with the lowest AIC is considered to be the best compromise between accuracy and complexity. The forwards selection routine starts with a model containing no covariates. Each candidate covariate is considered in turn and the AIC that results from its addition to the model is recorded. The covariate which leads to the largest decrease in AIC is added to the model. The iterative procedure continues until none of the remaining covariates lead to a decrease in AIC. This procedure is 285 initially conducted assuming independent residuals (i.e., R = I) and is implemented using the "step" function from R package "stats". In the second step, spatial correlation is assessed by calculating empirical variograms (Cressie, 1993) of the model residuals using the "variogram" function from R package "gstat". The variogram indicates how the expected squared difference between a pair of residuals varies according to their distance apart. Finally, a model including spatial correlation in the residuals is estimated when inspection of the variogram indicates that this is necessary. Specifically, the spatial correlation is reflected 290 by the non-zero off-diagonal elements in the correlation matrix, R which correspond to the values from an exponential correlation function (i.e., $r(d_{ij}) = \exp(-d_{ij}/\varphi)$, where d_{ij} is the Euclidean distance between two catchments *i* and *j* and φ is an estimated model parameter). The model with spatial correlation can be estimated by residual maximum likelihood (REML; Lark et al., 2006) using the "gls" function from R package "nlme". The statistical significance of each covariate included in the model (i.e. whether the corresponding regression coefficient is significantly different to zero) is recorded for p
- 295 values of 0.1, 0.05 and 0.001.

3.2 Machine learning

degree of complexity is minimised.

LR models require assumptions about the nature of baseflow variation that can restrict the patterns of variation which the model can represent. In the past few decades, machine learning (ML) methodologies have become increasingly popular for representing complex environmental variation (e.g. Hengl et al., 2018; Lange and Sippel, 2020; Nearing et al 2020). Machine

300

<u>learningML</u> algorithms lead to considerably more flexible relationships between environmental variables. For example, regression trees recursively partition observation locations according to a series of binary tests on their covariate values. Each location enters the tree at the initial decision node and then follows one of two branches according to the result of the initial test. Each branch leads to a network of further decision nodes and tests until the location is allocated to a terminal node. The predicted value of the environmental variable at an unobserved location is equal to the average of the training data that are allocated to the same terminal node. The tests at each node are optimised so that the total squared errors for a tree of a specified

305

Regression trees can replicate complex nonlinear relationships that include interactions between different covariates but they are prone to overfitting. A regression tree can perfectly predict the variable of interest for some training data if the number of terminal nodes is equal to the number of training observations but it cannot be expected to perform exactly when predictions are made at other locations. Overfitting can be reduced by introducing stopping criteria to the trees (e.g. each terminal node must contain a specified proportion of the training data) or by using cross-validation to decide whether a particular decision node should be included in the tree. Overfitting might be further reduced by combining an ensemble of regression trees to form a random forest (Breiman, 2001). The trees within the ensemble differ because they are estimated for a different bootstrap sample of the available data and a different subset of the candidate covariates is considered at each decision node. The prediction of the variable of interest at a particular location is equal to the average prediction across all the trees. Addor et al. (2018) found that the inclusion of 500 trees in a random forest considerably stabilised predictions and smoothed relationships between their covariates and BFI measurements.

The random forest interprets the available data as if they were a random sample of the population of interest and does not account for spatial correlation amongst the observations. Also, the relationships implied by a random forest model cannot be stated in a simple parametric form such as Eq. (1) meaning that it can be a challenge to determine the drivers of variation. It is possible to assess the importance of each covariate by shuffling the values of that covariate amongst the observation locations and calculating the reduction in prediction accuracy. However, Schmidt et al. (2020) and Wadoux et al. (2020) advise caution when inferring causal relationships from random forest models. Wadoux et al. (2020) demonstrate that photographs of soil scientists projected across their study area can be utilised by a random forest to accurately map the soil carbon content.

325 They suggest that knowledge discovery from machine learningML models requires more than the recognition of patterns and successful prediction. Instead they recommend the pre-selection of relevant environmental covariates and the posterior interpretation and evaluation of the recognised patterns: this is the approach taken here with the selection of 21 covariates representative of the conceptual framework being analysed (Fig. 4).

Random forests are calibrated using the Matlab 'Treebagger' function with each forest containing 500 trees 330 (consistent with Addor et al., 2018), the with-replacement bootstrap sample for each tree being of the same size as the set of available data and one third of the covariates are considered at each decision node. The 'Treebagger' function defines the importance of a covariate in a random forest to be equal to the increase in the mean squared error of all predictions averaged over all trees in the ensemble upon shuffling of the covariate values divided by the standard deviation of the predictions taken over the trees.

335 4. Results

4.1 Linear regression model structures

Regression models were developed for both BFI_LH and BFI_CEH, with covariates from Set A (Models 1 and 2) and from Set B (Models 5 and 6). For all four models the variograms of the residuals indicated substantial spatial correlation. Therefore, the models were re-estimated by REML and included spatial correlation parameterised by an exponential function. Note that

although the inclusion of the residual correlation structure does not alter signs of the estimated coefficients, the significance 340 of the model covariates changed. Some covariates were no longer significant after accounting for the spatial correlations. This could imply that part of the variation in BFI that was previously explained by certain covariates in the iid model may have been a result of spatial correlation. The full LR models are listed in Table A2 and the distribution of residuals for the LR models are illustrated in Fig. A1.

345

Figure 5 shows the covariates identified as significant as well as the sign of the covariates. In this analysis, topography ("dpsbar"), climate ("aridity"), the spatial coverage of fractured aquifers ("frac high perc"), of crop coverage ("crop perc") and of clay soils ("clay perc") are highly significant in all four LR models, and the spatial coverage of areas with no active groundwater systems ("no gw perc") is also a significant covariate in all four models to different levels of significance (Fig. 5). In the LR models using Set B (Models 5 and 6), surface and groundwater abstractions and effluent discharges are all highly 350 significant in explaining the variations in the BFI LH and BFI CEH although the number ("num reservoirs") and capacity of reservoirs ("reservoir cap") are not significant covariates. Urban land cover ("urban perc"), previously noted as potentially influencing BFI in the Thames Basin in southern England (Bloomfield et al., 2009), is not a significant covariate in the LR models using covariate Set A once spatial correlation in the covariates has been accounted for, and is not significant at all when WRM covariates are include in the LR models.

355

In the LR models, the signs of the significant natural covariates in Fig. 5 (Models 1 and 2) are consistent with current process-based understanding of the generation of baseflow (Price et al., 2011; Gnann et al., 2019; Yao et al., 2021) as represented in the revised conceptual model (Fig. 4) and with previous regression models of BFI in the study area (Bloomfield et al., 2009). For example, there is a significant inverse relationship between BFI and the fraction of clay soils within catchments, the fraction of catchments underlain by rocks with essentially no groundwater, and the aridity of catchments.

360 Conversely, all LR models indicate a significant positive correlation between BFI and the fraction of catchments underlain by fractured aquifers.

In all four LR models, the Lin's concordance coefficients between the fixed effects predictions and the observed BFI are similar upon training and validation indicating that the models are not overfitted (Table 1). The coefficients for the models using Set A (Models 1 and 2) to predict BFI_LH and BFI_CEH are 0.75 and 0.81 respectively. There are moderate negative correlations between the residuals from these models and the surface water and groundwater abstractions and effluent discharges from Set B covariates (Table 2). There are negligible correlations between the residuals and the number and capacity of reservoirs covariates. When the WRM covariates are added to the model (Models 5 and 6) the Lin's concordance coefficients increase to 0.82 and 0.85 for BFI_LH and BFI_CEH respectively (Table 1).

365



370 Figure 5. Signs and significance levels of the covariates in the LR models and the relative importance of covariates in the RF models. The signs of the significant covariates in the LR models are indicated using colour (pink for positive, blue for negative) and the corresponding significance levels of the covariates are indicated on the x-axis with asterisks (* for significance level between 0.05 and 0.1, ** for significance level between 0.01 and 0.05, *** for significance level below 0.001). Some covariates were only significant prior to accounting for the spatial correlations. These are marked with asterisks only in the figure at their respective level of significance. Table A1 gives full details of the regression coefficients. Relative RF importance ranges from

zero to 2. Table 3 gives the scores for the relative importance of covariates in the four RF models.

Model	Model 1	Model 2	Model	Model 4 <u>6</u>	Model	Model <mark>64</mark>	Model 7	Model 8
			<u>5</u> 3		5 3			
Scheme	LR	LR	LR	LR	RF	RF	RF	RF
	Set A	Set A	Set B	Set B	Set A	Set A	Set B	Set B
BFI data	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH
Training	0.75	0.81	0.82	0.85	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.97
Validation	0.75	0.80	0.82	0.84	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.84

Table 1. Lin's concordance coefficients between LR model predictions and the data.

380

Table 2. Pearson correlation between Set A model residuals and Set B model covariates

Model Scheme	LR	LR	RF	RF
BFI data	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH
surfacewater_abs	-0.16	-0.17	-0.21	-0.19
groundwater_abs	-0.36	-0.31	-0.27	-0.27
discharges	-0.27	-0.23	-0.16	-0.13
num_reservoirs	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.02
reservoir_cap	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03

In summary, when spatial correlation effects are taken into account, the LR models do not appear to be overfitted, show a consistent though moderate improvement in explanatory power with the addition of the WRM covariates, and indicate that groundwater and surface water abstraction, groundwater abstraction, and effluent discharges are all significant in explaining the variations in both the estimates of BFI.

4.2 Machine learning model structures

The relative importance of the covariates with respect to estimates of BFI are listed in Table 3 and illustrated in Fig. 5 for the RF <u>Set A</u> models (Models 3 and 4) and <u>Set B models (Models 7 and 8)</u>. Lin's concordance coefficients on training data are larger for the RF predictions than for the LR models (Table 1). However, upon cross-validation the RF coefficients decrease and are comparable to the LR model values. This could be an indication of overfitted RFs, perhaps because the spatial correlation previously identified amongst the data (see LR results above) has not been accounted for in the RF models. The most important covariates in the RF models using Set A covariates (Models 3 and 4) are consistent for both BFI_LH and BFI_CEH and are in descending order of importance: the fraction of catchments underlain by fractured aquifers

395 ("frac_high_perc"), clay soils ("clay_perc"), extent of catchments underlain by rocks with essentially no groundwater ("no_gw_perc"), and crop and grass coverage ("crop_perc", "grass_perc") (Table 3 and Fig. 5).

The residuals from the RF models are moderately and negatively correlated for the surface water and groundwater abstraction covariates (Table 2). The groundwater abstraction covariate has high importance in both RF models of Set B covariates (Models 7 and 8, Table 3 and Fig. 5) and is in the top third of the covariates for both models. The discharges covariate has a moderate importance in the RF models, but the relative importance of the surface water abstraction covariate and the covariates for the number of reservoirs and for their total capacity is low (Table 3 and Fig. 5).

Covariate	Model <u>53</u>	Model <u>64</u>	Model 7	Model 8
area	0.36	0.43	0.28	0.18
dpsbar	0.59	0.58	0.54	0.62
aridity	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.57
frac_snow	0.20	0.28	0.21	0.22
inter_high_perc	0.43	0.52	0.39	0.44
frac_high_perc	1.81	1.82	1.59	1.62
no_gw_perc	1.14	1.3	1.09	1.16
dwood_perc	0.69	0.59	0.6	0.55
ewood_perc	0.39	0.30	0.34	0.31
grass_perc	0.76	0.67	0.70	0.64
shrub_perc	0.33	0.39	0.30	0.34
crop_perc	1.05	1.07	0.88	1.00
urban_perc	0.63	0.59	0.46	0.58
inwater_perc	0.34	0.27	0.27	0.26
cbares_perc	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.14
clay_perc	1.59	1.53	1.41	1.34
surfacewater_abs	0	0	0.24	0.28
groundwater_abs	0	0	0.96	0.96
discharges	0	0	0.55	0.45
num_reservoirs	0	0	0.15	0.10
reservoir_cap	0	0	0.19	0.21

Table 3. Score of the relative importance of covariates in RF model

400

405 In summary, RF models show that the majority of the power to explain variations in BFI is due to the natural covariates and when WRM covariates are included in the models, groundwater abstraction is the most important and <u>effluent</u> discharges of moderate importance in explaining both estimates of BFI.

4.3 Consistency between model structures

435

The results of the models are subject to standard caveats for such types of analysis. Inclusion of spatial correlation in the LR

- 410 models was necessary and led to some otherwise significant covariates being removed, and the LR models were unable to represent non-linear relationships between the covariates. The RF models did not take into account spatial correlation identified in the LR analysis and there was some evidence of overfitting of the RF models, but they are able to represent any non-linearities that are present between the covariates that could not be included in the LR models. Notwithstanding these observations, the two contrasting modelling approaches, one relatively simple and tractable (LR modelling) and the other
- 415 <u>considerably more flexible but potentially harder to interpret (RF modelling), have resulted in remarkably similar model</u> <u>structures with high levels of consistency between both natural and WRM covariates being identified as either significant (LR models) or important (RF models).</u>

The structures of the LR and RF models (Fig. 5) are broadly insensitive to the BFI being modelled. Although this is reasonable given the correlation between BFI_LH and BFI_CEH (Fig. 3), this observation supports the inference that the

420 models are robust. Importantly for the purposes of the present study, significant covariates in the LR models and covariates with relatively large importance in the RF models are consistent regardless of whether the models are developed using BFI_LH or BFI_CEH (Fig. 5).

There is a high level of agreement between the two modelling approaches regarding the significance or importance of the natural covariates in Set A. Both the LR and RF models indicate the primary importance of the presence of fractured aquifers in controlling BFI. This is consistent with the observation of Bloomfield et al (2009) where the percentage coverage of fractured aquifers in the Thames catchment in southern GB was found to be an important term in LR models of BFI. In the present study, in Models 1 to 4 the catchment fraction underlain by fractured aquifers is either a significant covariate or the covariate with the largest importance (Fig. 5), and catchment fraction of clay soils, those underlain by rocks with essentially no groundwater, and crop coverage are all significant in the LR models or have large importance in the RF models (Fig. 5). 430 The two other catchment covariates identified as significant in the LR models (topography and aridity) also have high or moderate importance in the RF models.

The same natural covariates that are identified as significant or of high importance in the LR and RF models in Set A (Models 1 to 4) are also significant or important in models using the Set B covariates (Models 5 to 8) (Fig. 5) and the majority of the variation in BFI is described by the natural covariates (Table A2). From these observations, it is taken that WRM practices, rather than being the principle explanatory factor of variance in BFI, act to modify BFI controlled primarily by natural catchment processes. There are also similarities in the significant or importance of WRM covariates between the Set B models (Models 5 to 8). In both cases groundwater abstraction is significant or important, effluent discharges are significant

or of moderate importance, and both reservoir numbers and capacities are either not significant or are of low importance. There is however a notable dissimilarity between the model structures with regard to surface water abstraction: it is a significant

440

covariate in the LR models (Fig. 5, see Models 5 and 6) but is not important in the RF model (Table 3 and Fig. 5, see Models

7 and 8).

4.4 Evidence for the impact of water resources management practices

The observations relating to the effect of WRM on BFI have been investigated further by considering the extent to which particular catchment context and management settings influence the respective model performance. Figure 6 shows that, particularly for a number of relatively high BFI catchments in central England and SE England to the north of London (Fig. 6a), the LR model of BFI_LH using only natural covariates appears to underestimate BFI. Similar observations can be made with respect to estimates of BFI_CEH (Fig. A2a), with the additional observation that there are a few catchments in eastern England where the model appears to overestimate BFI. Inclusion of WRM covariates leads to some improvements in LR model estimates of BFI, with the largest improvements being in the high BFI catchments (Fig. 7a and A3a). These improvements are particularly seen in the relatively high BFI catchments immediately to the north of London (Fig. 6b). Note, however, that addition of WRM covariates to the models does not appear to improve the estimates of BFI_CEH in the catchments in eastern

England, where the model still appears to overestimate BFI (Fig. A2b).



- **Figure 6.** Maps of difference between modelled and observed BFI_LH (a to d) and corresponding scatter plots of BFI_LH against fitted BFI (e to h) for covariate Sets A and B for LR and RF models (Models 1, 5, 3 and 7 respectivelye to h)
- To explore further which WRM covariates (groundwater abstraction, surface water abstraction, and <u>effluent</u> discharges) may be contributing to the improvement of the LR models, the distribution of differences between model estimates and observed BFI as a function of the magnitude of the three WRM covariates have been plotted for BFI_LH (Fig. 8) and for BFI_CEH (Fig. A4). Figure 8 shows that for LR models using <u>natural covariates</u> Set A (<u>Model 1</u>), underestimation of BFI is greater in catchments with higher levels of groundwater abstraction and, to a lesser extent, with higher <u>effluent</u> discharges. Whereas, there is no apparent systematic association between under- or overestimation of BFI_LH and levels of surface water abstraction. When the WRM covariates are included in the models (Set B, <u>Model 5</u>), estimates of BFI_LH are noticeably improved in catchments with high levels of groundwater abstraction and to a lesser extent moderate to high <u>effluent</u> discharges. Similar patterns are seen for models of BFI_CEH (Fig. A4). From this it is inferred that most of the improvement in the LR model performance when WRM covariates are included in the models is due to the groundwater abstraction covariate and, to a lesser extent, to the discharge covariate. Inclusion of the surface water abstraction covariate appears to have a negligible influence on estimates of BFI using LR models.
- 470 Compared with the LR models, differences between estimates of BFI from the RF models and observed values of BFI_LH and BFI_CEH using Set A covariates (Models 3 and 4) are small and there are no clear regional patterns in model performance across the study area (Fig. 6 and A2), and, unlike the LR models, there is no evidence of preferential improvement in models as a function of catchment BFI (Fig. 7 and A3). Figure 8 shows that RF models of BFI_LH using Set A (Model 3) covariates underestimate BFI in catchments with the highest levels of groundwater abstraction but there is no clear association
 475 between the performance of these models and levels of surface water abstraction or effluent discharges. Inclusion of WRM covariates in the RF models of BFI_LH ((Set B, Model 7) does not appear to improve the model (Fig. 7 and A3) or change these relationships: BFI is still underestimated in catchments with the highest levels of groundwater abstraction and there is still no clear association between model performance and levels of surface water abstraction or effluent discharges. Similar relationships also hold for the RF models of BFI_CEH (Fig. A4). There is no noticeable improvement in the performance of WRM covariates.



Figure 7. Scatter plots of improvement in modelled BFI as a function of observed BFI_LH for a) LR and b) RF models



Figure 8. Comparison of observed and modelled BFI_LH for covariate Sets A and B, for LR and RF models and as a function of different human management categories.

5. Discussion

490 Given that this is not a model inter comparison study, the following discussion focusses on insights to be gained from considering both the LR and RF model structures and the performance of the models with the inclusion of WRM covariates. The two contrasting modelling approaches, one relatively simple and tractable (LR modelling) and the other considerably more flexible but potentially harder to interpret (RF modelling), have resulted in remarkably similar model structures with high levels of consistency between both natural and WRM covariates being identified as either significant (LR models) or important (RF models). All results found are plausible in terms of the new conceptual model of baseflow generation (Fig. 4). In addition, analysis of the performance of the models appears to show that the LR models may offer some additional (model dependent) insights into which WRM covariates may be important in which eatchment settings.

The results of the models are, however, subject to standard caveats for such types of analysis. Inclusion of spatial correlation in the LR models was necessary and led to some otherwise significant covariates being removed, and the LR models were unable to represent non-linear relationships between the covariates. The RF models did not take into account spatial correlation identified in the LR analysis and there was some evidence of overfitting of the RF models, but they are able to represent any non-linearities that are present between the covariates that could not be included in the LR models. More generally, the CAMELS-GB data on which the models are based are measurements made in the landscape and are not the result of designed experiments (Coxon et al., 2020a; 2020b). Consequently, they have not been sampled at random and confounding variation cannot be controlled in the manner that can be achieved by a statistical experimental design. Therefore, the models must include some potentially additional sources of variation rather than those just found within the covariates of interest (e.g. natural and water management covariates) leading to potentially more complex model structures and potentially to some mismatches between model structure and reality.

5.1 Impacts of WRM practices on BFI

- 510 Both modelling approaches are broadly consistent in identifying the most influential WRM covariates, namely: the importance of groundwater abstraction; the modest effect of effluent discharges to streams; and, the unimportance of reservoirs in influencing BFI. While surface water abstraction was identified as significant in the LR model but unimportant in the RF model (Fig. 5). In addition, the LR models identified positive correlations between BFI and groundwater abstraction, surface water abstraction and effluent discharges (Fig. 5), and the influence of groundwater abstraction on BFI increases with increased
- 515 abstraction (Figs. 7 and 8). It is evident from previous studies (Wittenburg, 2003; Webber and Perry, 2006; Wang and Cai, 2009, Thomas et al. 2013) that there is no universal relationship between WRM practices and baseflow, and the influence of WRM practices on baseflow is sensitive to climate, the location of abstraction in a catchment and on the details of abstraction and that in the context of the present study, the relationship between WRM practices and BFI is only partly explained in terms of the conceptual model in Fig. 4.

- 520 Assuming the principal uses for abstracted groundwater in the UK are for public supply (UK Government, 2020) where losses to evaporation are limited, abstracted groundwater from up-catchment sites should have a broadly neutral effect on baseflow. In contrast, groundwater abstracted from down-catchment or in the immediate vicinity of streams may be expected to reduce baseflow. However, neither of these simple conceptualisations of groundwater abstraction explain the positive correlation between groundwater abstraction and increased baseflow in the CAMELS-GB data (Figs. 5, 7 and 8). Water resources in
- 525 England have been well-regulated within the context of the European Water Framework Directive and daughter Directives (European Commission, 2000), and a wide range of sophisticated schemes and measures are used to manage low flow and drought including: conjunctive use schemes, low flow alleviation schemes, and hands-off flow measures (Clayton et al., 2008; Shepley et al., 2009; Agnew et al., 2000; Hutchinson et al., 2012; Wendt et al., 2021). Conjunctive use schemes use combined management of groundwater and surface water abstractions to maintain ecological flows while low flow alleviation schemes
- 530 and hands-off flow measures are used in England to constrain the amount of water that is abstracted from groundwater and rivers, with abstractions being reduced or stopped at a given low flow trigger levels. Unfortunately, the CAMELS-GB data does not capture the details of any of these schemes or measures, and the conceptualisation of baseflow generation in Fig. 4 dose not capture the temporally and spatially linked changes in flows associated with these schemes and measures. In addition, although the analysis presented here uses BFI data for the period 1970 to 2015, the schemes and measures have evolved
- 535 significantly over this period and so are both temporally and spatially variable. Consequently, although the cumulative, spatiotemporally varying effects of these schemes and measures may influence the relationship between WRM terms in the models, because there is no information on the dynamic management of water resources in the CAMELS-GB data in response to hydrometeorological events (beyond the average terms used in the study, Table A1) the effects of the schemes and measures on BFI cannot be constrained by the present study. The positive correlation between effluent discharges and BFI is consistent with
- 540 the conceptualisation of baseflow generation in Fig. 4 while the lack of any significant or important correlation between the terms associated with reservoirs and BFI (Fig. 5) is consistent with the conceptualisation of these as stores of water that do not contribute to baseflow (Fig. 4).

5.2 Impacts of climate and landscape characteristics on BFI

545 Notwithstanding these caveats, bB oth modelling approaches point to the same natural covariates (Models 1 to 4) contributing to the majority of variation in BFI (Figure 5). These include a climate covariate (aridity), a number of catchment characteristics including topography (catchment mean drainage path slope, dpsbar), fractional area of highly productive fractured aquifer (frac high perc), non-aquifer (no gw), and the clay fraction in soils (clay perc), and a land cover characteristic (fractional area of crop cover, crop perc). , including hydrogeology attributes such as the role of highly productive aquifers and non aquifers influencing BFI. Qualitatively there is consistency between these covariates and similar covariates identified in previous studies. For example, Mazvimavi et al (2005) also found slope to be a significant term in a regression model of BFI for 52 basins in Zimbabwe, and Addor et al (2018) found slope to be an important covariate in an

analysis of the CAMELS data for the USA. Note the observation in Table A1 that when topographic relief appears to be more important with respect to mean residence and transit times, catchment area appears less important. This is consistent with the

- 555 results in both Fig. 5 and Addor et al., (2018). Beck et al (2013) demonstrated that PET (a climate covariate related to aridity) was a significant covariate in a regression model of BFI based on 3394 global catchments consistent with the results in Fig. 5. Bloomfield et al (2009) previously identified the importance of the fractional area of high productivity fractured aquifers and non-aquifers in controlling BFI in the Thames Basin, a basin within the current study area, again consistent with the results in Fig. 5. Similarly, Addor et al (2018) and Huang et al (2021) both found clay fraction in soils to be important in predicting BFI
- 560 when ML techniques were applied to the CAMELS data for the USA.

However, there are challenges in making direct comparisons between different models of BFI. Firstly, there is no commonly accepted approach to defining covariates used in such models. Although many of the climate and topographic catchment characteristics may have common definitions, other important or significant catchment factors, such soil and aquifer characteristics may be quantified quite differently between studies. The CAMELS family of hydrological large-sample datasets
565 seek to address the issue of consistency between hydrological datasets by attempting to published hydrological data in standardised formats (Addor et al., 2020). However, even between the different national CAMELS datasets there are differences in how (hydro)geological attributes are characterised (Addor et al., 2017; 2020; Alvarez-Garreton et al., 2018; Chagas et al., 2020; Coxon et al., 2020a, 2020b). A second challenge when attempting to compare between studies of the natural controls on BFI is that studies typically investigate different combinations of covariates. Regardless of the modelling approach used, for example step-wise multiple LR (e.g. Mazvimavi et al., 2005; Bloomfield et al., 2021), the resulting significant or important covariates reflect the composition of the original pool of covariates under consideration.

Given the importance of these covariates for BFI estimates, also previously reported by Bloomfield et al. (2009), it is interesting to note that the hydrogeology attributes in CAMELS GB are "heuristic, based on hydrogeological inference that is

- 575 based on mapped lithologies rather than on statistical analysis of borehole yields" (Coxon et al., 2020) (similar heuristic hydrogeological attributes are found in other CAMELS datasets, Addor et al., 2017). As a consequence, although uncertainties in hydrogeology attributes are particularly difficult to constrain they may be particularly influential in the overall performance of the models described here.
- Both modelling approaches are largely consistent in identifying the most influential WRM covariates, namely: the importance of groundwater abstraction, the modest effect of discharges to streams, and the unimportance of reservoirs in influencing BFI. What is less clear is why surface water abstraction was significant in the LR model but unimportant in the RF model even though conceptually it is expected to be important in effecting BFI (Fig. 4). Differences between the two modelling approaches may amplify the effects of linear and non linear relationships between groundwater and surface water abstraction and other covariates, including other WRM covariates. Water resources in England are currently well regulated within the context of the European Water Framework Directive and daughter Directives (European Commission, 2000), however, a wide range of WRM practices are used to manage low flow and drought in England including: low flow alleviation

schemes, 'hands-off' flow measures, and conjunctive use schemes (Wendt et al., 2020; 2021). Low flow alleviation schemes and 'hands off' flow measures constrain the amount of water that is abstracted from rivers with abstractions being reduced or stopped at a given low flow trigger level. Conjunctive use schemes, such as the Shropshire Groundwater Scheme (Shepley et

590 al., 2009), use combined management of groundwater and surface water abstractions to maintain ecological flows in catchments where there is an important groundwater resource in the catchment. These different WRM schemes have operated in different catchments in GB in response to perceived local regulatory and management needs, and in any given catchment WRM practices have evolved over the period which the CAMELS GB baseflow indices have been estimated. All of these factors will affect the relationships between surface water abstraction and the other covariates and hence the respective sensitivities of the models to surface water abstraction effects.

5.3 Implications for future research

There are a couple of implications that arise from this study. Although the dominant controls on baseflow across the study area are climate and catchment covariates, there is evidence that WRM practices, particularly groundwater abstraction, influence baseflow but the manner in which they effect baseflow is inferred to be a function of the specific climate and

- 600 catchment settings and WRM practices. Consequently, as this analysis and the CAMELS-GB data reflects the dominant WRM practices for GB_a only. Consequently, once systematic WRM practice information becomes available for other regions it is recommended that the present study should be extended to test additional WRM attributes and the applicability of the findings in other settings and WRM regimes. For example, CAMELS-GB does not explicitly include information about WRM practices associated with hydropower schemes or seasonal changes in abstraction (e.g. for irrigation), so the effect of such schemes
 605 WRM practices on BFI has not been assessed. In addition, CAMELS-GB does not include any information on within and between catchment water transfers (note the absence of these WRM terms from the conceptual model, Fig. 4). In addition, the approach to assessing the effect of WRM practices on BFI could also be applied and tested for relevance in other climate settings such semi-arid environments (Mwakalila et al., 2002), or where snowmelt is an important component of baseflow generation (Miller et al., 2014; Barnhart et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2021) once systematic information on WRM practices is
- 610 available in those settings.

-More broadly, it is important to make data related to WRM practices much more widely available and for that data to be included in future large-catchment datasets (Addor et al., 2020). It is already challenging to develop common approaches to characterise some important catchment covariates related to soils and (hydro)geology for inclusion in large-catchment datasets. It is likely to be even more difficult to provide a consistent approach to capturing WRM practice data. However, a

615 <u>starting point would be to systematically conceptualise the major WRM practices across a wide range of regulatory</u> (unregulated to highly regulated), catchment, and climatic settings that may influence baseflow and other hydrological signatures (McMillan, 2021) in order to establish broad classes of WRM practices against which data can be reported.

Finally, there is an active debate on the comparative merits of process-based hydrological modelling and machine learningML in hydrological forecasting. Specifically, questions have been asked related to the extent to which hydrological 620 processes and our understanding of the uniqueness of place, as encapsulated in our conceptual models of the terrestrial water cycle (Wagener et al., 2021-in review), has a role in hydrological prediction in the 'age of machine learning' (ML) (Bevan 2020; Nearing et al 2020). For example, in a recent comparative study of the predictive accuracy of ML and LR models of flooding events in Germany, Schmidt et al., (2020) demonstrated that although ML methods had higher predictive accuracy than the LR models they were still shown to be susceptible to the problem of equifinality and that this severely restricted their 625 potential for inference.- Schmidt et al., (2020) concluded with the observation that multiple algorithms and multiple methods should ideally be employed within a framework of model cross-validation when using ML for inference. Although the purpose of the present modelling was not to develop models capable of predicting BFI. or of undertaking a model intercomparison between two different stochastic modelling approaches, it is interesting to note that there have been clear benefits in applying both simple statistical models (LR models) and more flexible machine learningML approaches (RF models) to the same 630 parameter space to identify explore common model structures and covariates of interest,... Typically ML might have previously been applied to a much larger parameter space over 100 catchment parameters and variables are available in CAMELS GB -however limiting the analysis to 21 covariates has enabled direct comparison of LR and RF model structures. Even though the models described here are not process based and have not been developed to predict BFI in ungauged catchments, and the results have provided evidence to extend our-current process understanding of baseflow based beyond individual LR 635 (Bloomfield at al., 2009; Carlier et al., 2018; Zhang et al 2020) and RF (Mazvimavi et al., 2005; Addor, et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2021) studies. Now that the correlations between WRM covariates and BFI have been identified, future predictive models of BFI that take account of WRM practices could be developed using a refinement of the conceptual model (Fig. 4) to constrain a combination of multiple targeted statistical (LR) and multiple knowledge-guided ML models (Shen et al., 2021) deployed with appropriate cross-validation schemes.

640 <u>6.</u>6. Conclusions

By exploring model structures from complementary statistical modelling schemes applied to BFI data for GB, the aim of the present study was to identify which, if any, WRM activities influence baseflow; to assess the influence of these activities relative to other natural factors known to effect BFI; and, to investigate if WRM factors are important in any particular catchment settings or management context. The following concluding observations can be made:

645 Modelling shows that <u>V</u>-variation in BFI is predominantly <u>controlled explained</u> by natural (<u>meteorological climatic</u> and catchment) characteristics, <u>with the most important being</u> the preeminent of which is the extent of high productivity fractured aquifers within a-catchments. <u>This latter observation being consistent with previous analyses of BFI within the study area</u>. Although not the major control on variation in BFI, there is evidence that WRM practices systematically modify BFI in <u>GBthe</u> <u>study area</u>. 650 -Groundwater abstraction appears is to be the most influential of these practices with a positive correlation between abstraction and baseflow . Reservoir storage appears to be unimportant in modifying BFI, at least in the current study area and for the specific reservoir attributes provided in CAMELS GBand is consistent with the observation that -

The the effect of groundwater abstraction on s of WRM practices on BFI is are most evident in groundwater-dominated catchments where there are the highest levels of groundwater abstraction.

655 <u>However, a variety of schemes and measures are used to manage water resources in the UK and systematic information on such schemes is currently lacking in the CAMELS-GB large sample dataset so their specific effects on BFI cannot be constrained by the current study. Information regarding WRM practices, their temporally and spatially linked associations and changes in flows associated with these schemes and measures, can (Fig. 4) and should where appropriate be incorporated in future conceptual models of BFI and baseflow generation be incorporated in future conceptual models of BFI, and consequently data and information about WRM practices should be included in future large sample catchment datasets and in future investigations of baseflow.</u>

Large-sample datasets are increasingly being used to understand and predict the functioning of hydrological systems at scales above the individual catchment (Addor et al., 2020). Given the importance of understanding the effects of WRM practices on baseflow and a range of other hydrological signatures there is need to incorporate information about such practices in large-sample datasets. If such datasets are to be comparable, there is also the need to systematise how WRM practices, in

all their diversity, are described and recorded.

7. Data availability

665

670

The CAMELS-GB dataset used in this study is available from the Environmental Information Data Centre (EIDC) at https://doi.org/10.5285/8344e4f3-d2ea-44f5-8afa-86d2987543a9 and the supporting paper describing the data (Coxon et al., 2020b) is available from Earth System Science Data at https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/12/2459/2020/

8. Author contributions

JPB designed the study and undertook the literature review. MG and BPM performed the modelling and all authors contributed to the analysis of the results. JPB prepared the manuscript and GC prepared the figures (except Fig. 4 and 5 which were produced by JPB). <u>GC</u>, MG, BPM and NA reviewed and edited the manuscript.

675 9. Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

10. Acknowledgements

JPB and BPM publish with the permission of the Director, British Geological Survey (Natural Environment Research Council, UKRI).

680 11. References

Aboelnour, M., Engle, B.A., Frisbee, M.D., Gitau, M.W., and Flanagan, D.C.: Impacts of watershed physical properties and land use on baseflow at regional scales, J. Hydrol: Reg. Studies, 3, 100810, 2021.

Addor, N., Newman, A. J., Mizukami, N., and Clark, M.P.: The CAMELS data set: catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21, 5293-5313, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-5293-2017</u>, 2017.

- Addor, N., Nearing, G., Prieto, C., Newman, A. J., Le Vine, N. and Clark, M. P.: A ranking of hydrological signatures based on their predictability in space, Water Resour. Res., 54(11), 8792–8812, doi:10.1029/2018WR022606, 2018.
 Addor, N., Do, H. X., Alvarez-Garreton, C., Coxon, G., Fowler, K., and Mendoza, P. A.: Large-sample hydrology: recent progress, guidelines for new datasets and grand challenges, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 65, 712-725, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2019.1683182, 2020
- Agnew, C.T., Clifford, N.J., and Haylett, S.: Identifying and alleviating low flows in regulated rivers: the case of the rivers Bulbourne and Gade, Hertfordshire, UK, Regul., Rivers: Res. Mgmt, 16, 245-266, https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1646(200005/06)16:3<245::AID-RRR583>3.0.CO;2-F, 2000.
 Ahiablame, L., Sheshukov, A>Y., Rahmani, V., and Moriasi, D.: Annual baseflow variations as influenced by climate variability and agricultural land use change in the Missouri River Basin, J. Hydrol., 551, 188-202,
- 695 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.05.055, 2017
 - Akaike, H.: Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In: Second International Symposium on Information Theory (eds. BN Petrov and F Csaki), pp 267-81, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1973.
- Alvarez-Garreton, C., Mendoza, P. A., Boisier, J.P., Addor, N., Galleguillos, M., Zambrano-Bigiarini, M., Lara, A., Puelma, C., Cortes, G., Garreaud, R., McPhee, J., and Ayala, A.: The CAMELS-CL dataset: catchment attributes and meteorology for
 large sample studies Chile dataset. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 22, 5817-5846, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-5817-2018</u>, 2018.
 - Asano, Y., and Uchida. T.: Flow path depth is the main controller of mean baseflow transit times in a mountainous catchment, Water Resour. Res., 48, W03512, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR010906</u>, 2012.

Ascott, M. J.: Groundwater resources in the UK, <u>http://www.bgs.ac.uk/research/groundwater/waterResources/GroundwaterInUK/home.html</u> (last access: 8 December 2020), 705 2017.

Ascott, M. J., Bloomfield, J. P., Karapanos, I., Jackson, C., Ward, R., McBride, A., Dobson, B., Kieboom, N., Holman, I., and Van Loon, A.: Managing public groundwater supplies during drought: Managing groundwater supplies subject to drought:

perspectives on current status and future priorities from England (UK), Hydrogeology Journal, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-020-02249-0</u>, 2020.

Barnhart, T.B., Molotch, N. P., Livneh, B., Harpold, A. A., Knowles, J.F., and Schneider, D.: Snowmelt rate dictates streamflow, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 8006-8016, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069690</u>, 2016.
Bayliss, A.: Catchment descriptors. In Flood estimation handbook (Vol. 5). Wallingford, England: Institute of Hydrology, 1999.

Beck, H. E., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., Miralles, D.G., de Jeu, R. A. M., Bruijnzeel, L. A. S., McVicar, T. R., and Schellekens, J.:

- 715 Global patterns in base flow index and recession based on streamflow observations from 3394 catchments. Water Resources Res., 49, 7843-7863, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR013918</u>, 2013.
 - Bloomfield, J. P., Allen, D. J., and Griffiths, K. J.: Examining geological controls on baseflow index (BFI) using regression analysis: An illustration from the Thames Basin, UK. J. Hydrol., 373, 164-176, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.04.025,2009.
- Bloomfield, J. P., Bricker, S. H., and Newell, A. J.: Some relationships between lithology, basin form and hydrology: a case study from the Thames Basin, UK, Hydrol. Process., 25, 2518-2530, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.8024</u>, 2011.
 <u>Boulton. A.J.: Parallels and contrasts in the effects of drought on stream macroinvertebrate assemblages, Freshwater Biology, 48, 1173-1185, https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2003.01084.x, 2003.</u>

Breiman, L.: Random forests. Machine Learning, 45, 5-32, https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324, 2001.

725 Bricker, S. H., and Bloomfield, J. P.: Controls on the basin-scale distribution of hydraulic conductivity of superficial deposits: a case study from the Thames Basin, UK. Q. J. Eng. Geol. and Hydrogeol., 47, 223-236, <u>https://doi.org/10.1144/qjegh2013-072</u>, 2014.

British Geological Survey.: BGS hydrogeology 625k mapping, <u>https://www.bgs.ac.uk/products/hydrogeology/maps.html</u> (last access: 8 April 2021), 2019.

730 Carlier, C., Wirth, S. B., Cochand, F., Hunkeler, D., and Brunner, P.: Geology controls streamflow dynamics, J. Hydrol., 566, 756-769, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.08.069</u>, 2018.

Chagas, V. B. P., Chaffe, P. L. B., Addor, N., Fan, F. M., Fleischmann, A. S., Paiva, R. C. D., and Siqueira, V. A.: CAMELS-BR: Hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 897 catchments in Brazil. Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 2075-2096, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2075-2020</u>, 2020.

- 735 Chang, H.: Comparative streamflow characteristics in urbanizing basins in the Portland Metropolitan Area, Oregon, USA, Hydrol. Process., 21, 211-222, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6233, 2007. Chen. H., and Teegavarapu, S.V.: Comparative analysis of four baseflow separation methods in the South Atlantic-Gulf region of the U.S., Water, 12, 120; doi:10.3390/w12010120, 2020. Cheng, Q., Zhong., and Wang, P.: Baseflow dynamics and multivariate analysis using bivariate and multiple wavelet coherence 740 in an alpine endorheic river basin (Northwest China), Sci. Tot. Env.. 777. 145013,
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145013, 2021

Clayton, H. J., Morris, S. E., McIntyre, N. R., and Greaves, M.: The hydrological impact of low-flow alleviation measures, Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng. Water Man., 161, 171-180, <u>https://doi.org/10.1680/wama.2008.161.4.171</u>, 2008.

<u>Coxon, G., Freer, J., Westerberg, I. K., Wagener, T., Woods, R. and Smith, P. J.: A novel framework for discharge uncertainty</u>
 quantification applied to 500 UK gauging stations, Water Resour. Res., 51, 5531–5546, doi:10.1002/2014WR016532, 2015.

- Coxon, G., Addor, N., Bloomfield, J. P., Freer, J., Fry, M., Hannaford, J., Howden, N. J. K., Lane, R., Lewis, M., Robinson, E. L., Wagener, T., Woods, R.: Catchment attributes and hydro-meteorological timeseries for 671 catchments across Great Britain (CAMELS-GB). NERC Environmental Information Data Centre, [data set], available at: https://doi.org/10.5285/8344e4f3-d2ea-44f5-8afa-86d2987543a9 (last access: 8 April 2021), 2020a.
- Coxon, G., Addor, N., Bloomfield, J. P., Freer, J., Fry, M., Hannaford, J., Howden, N. J. K., Lane, R., Lewis, M., Robinson, E. L., Wagener, T., and Woods, R.: CAMELS-GB: Hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 671 catchments in Great Britain, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 2459-2483, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2459-2020</u>, 2020b. Cressie, N.: Statistics for Spatial Data Revised Edition. Wiley, 1993.

de Graaf, I. E. M., van Beek, L. P. H., Wada, Y., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Dynamic attribution of global water demand to surface 755 water and groundwater resources: Effects of abstractions and return flows on river discharges, Advances Wat. Res., 64, 21-33,

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.12.002, 2104

Dobson, A. J.: An introduction to generalized linear models. Chapman & Hall/CRC Boca Raton, 2002.

Dow, C. L.: Assessing regional land-use/cover influences on New Jersey Pinelands streamflow through hydrograph analysis, Hydrol. Process., 21, 185-197, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6232</u>, 2007.

- Dudley, R. W., Hirsch, R. M., Archfield, S. A., Blum, A.G., and Renard, B.: Low streamflow trends at human-impacted and reference basins in the United States, J. Hydrol., 580, 124254, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124254</u>, 2020.
 Durant, M. J., and Counsell, C. J.: Inventory of reservoirs amounting to 90% of total UK storage. NERC Environmental Information Data Centre, [data set], available at: <u>https://doi.org/10.5285/f5a7d56c-cea0-4f00-b159-c3788a3b2b38</u> (last access: 8 April 2021), 2018.
- Eckhardt, K.: A comparison of baseflow indices, which were calculated with seven different baseflow separation methods, J. Hydrol., 352, 168-173, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.01.005</u>, 2008.

European Commission.: Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy. <u>https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html</u> (last access: 9 April 2021), 2002.

Fahrmier, L., Kneib, T., Lang, S., and Marx, B.: Regression Models, Methods and Applications. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.

Ficklin, D. L., Robeson, S. M., and Knouft, J. H.: Impacts of recent climate change on trends in baseflow and stormflow in United States watersheds, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 5079-508, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069121</u>, 2016.

Fouad, G., Skupin, A., and Tague, C. L.: Regional regression models of percentile flows for the contiguous United States:

775 Expert versus data-driven independent variable selection, J. Hydrol.: Reg. Studies, 17, 64-82, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2018.04.002, 2018.

Gnann, S. J., Woods, R. A., and Howden, N. J. K.: Is there a baseflow Budyko curve? Water Resources Res., 55, 2838-2855, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR024464, 2019.

Gomez-Velez, J. D., Harvey, J. W., Cardenas, M. B., and Kiel, B: Denitrification in the Mississippi River network controlled

by flow through river bedforms, Nat. Geosci., 8, 941–945, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2567, 2015.
 Gonzales, A.L., Nonner, J., Heijkers, J., and Uhlenbrook. S.: Comparison of different base flow separation methods in a lowland catchment. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 2055–2068, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-13-2055-2009, 2009.
 Gustard, A., Bullock, A. and Dixon, J. M.: Low flow estimation in the United Kingdom, [online] Available from: http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/id/eprint/6050/ (last access: 8 April 2021), 1992.

- Hare, D.K., Helton, A.M., Johnson, Z.C., Lane, J.W. and Briggs, M.A.: Continental-scale analysis of shallow and deep groundwater contributions to streams, Nat. Commun., 12, 1459, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21651-0, 2021
 Hengl, T., Nussbaum, M., Wright, M.N., Heuvelink, G. B. M., and Gräler, B.: Random forest as a generic framework for predictive modeling of spatial and spatio-temporal variables, PeerJ, 6, Article e5518, https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5518, 2018.
 Hiederer, R.: Mapping soil typologies: spatial decision support applied to the European Soil Database., Publications Office,
- Luxembourg. [online] Available from: <u>http://dx.publications.europa.eu/10.2788/87286</u> (Accessed August 2020), 2013.
 Joint Research Centre. 2019. World Atlas of Desertification. <u>https://wad.jrc.ec.europa.eu/patternsaridity</u>, last downloaded August, 2020

 Huang, S., Dong, Q., Zhang, X., and Deng, W.: Catchment natural driving factors and prediction of baseflow index for <u>Continental United States based on Random Forest technique, Stoch., Environ., Res., Risk Assess.,</u>
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-021-02057-2, 2021

Hutchinson, M.J., Ingram, R.G.S., Grout, M.W., and Hayes, P.J.: A successful model: 30 years of the Lincolnshire Chalk model, In: Groundwater Resources Modelling: A case study from the UK (Eds. Shepley, M.G., Whiteman, M.I., Hulme, P.J., and Grout, M.W.), Geol. Soc. Spec., Pub., 364, 173-191, https://doi.org/10.1144/SP364.12, 2012.

Jordan, T. E., Correll, D. L., & Weller, D. E.: Relating nutrient discharges from watersheds to land use and streamflow variability, Water Resour., Res., 33, 2579–2590, https://doi.org/10.1029/97WR02005, 1997.

- Juckem, P. F., Hunt, R. J., Anderson, M. P., and Robertson, D. M.: Effects of climate and land management change on streamflow in the driftless area of Wisconsin, J. Hydrol., 355, 123-130, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.03.010</u>, 2008. Kirk, S., and Herbert, A. W.: Assessing the impact of groundwater abstractions on river flows, Geol. Soc. Spec. Pub., 193, 211-233, <u>https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.2002.193.01.16</u>, 2002.
- 805 <u>Kissel. M., and Schmalz., Britta.: Comparison of baseflow separation methods in the german low mountain range, Water, 12, 1740, https://doi.org/10.3390/w12061740, 2020.</u>

Kuentz, A., Arheimer, B., Hundecha, Y., and Wagener, T.: Understanding hydrologic variability across Europe through catchment classification, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21, 2863-2879, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-2863-2017</u>, 2017.

Ladson, A. R., Brown, R., Neal, B., and Nathan, R.: A Standard Approach to Baseflow Separation Using The Lyne and Hollick 810 Filter, Australas. J. Water Resour., 17, 25-34, 2013.

Lange, H., and Sippel, S.: Machine Learning Applications in Hydrology. In: Levia, D. F., Carlyle-Moses, D. E., Iida, S., Michalzik, B., Nanko, K., and Tischer, A. (eds.) Forest-Water Interactions, Ecological Studies (Analysis and Synthesis), vol. 240. Springer, Cham. 2020.

Lark, R. M., Cullis, B. R., and Welham, S. J. On spatial prediction of soil properties in the presence of a spatial trend: the

815 empirical best linear unbiased predictor (E-BLUP) with REML, European J. Soil Science 57, 787–799, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2005.00768.x, 2006.

Lin, L. I-K.: A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility. Biometrics, 45, 255-268, https://doi.org/10.2307/2532051, 1989.

Longobardi, A., and Van Loon, A. F.: Assessing baseflow index vulnerability to variation in dry spell length for a range of

- catchment and climate properties, Hydrological Process., 32, 2496–2509, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13147, 2018. Longobardi, A., and Villani, P.: 2008. Base flow index regionalization analysis in a Mediterranean area and data scarcity context: role of the catchment permeability index, J. Hydrol., 355, 63-75, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.03.011, 2008. Lyne, V., and Hollick, M.: Stochastic time-variable rainfall-runoff modelling. Institute of Engineers Australia National Conference, pp. 89–93, 1979.
- 825 Marchant, B. P., and Bloomfield, J. P.: Spatio-temporal modelling of the status of groundwater droughts. J. Hydrol., 564, 397-413, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.07.009</u>, 2018.

Mazvimavi, D., Meijerink, A.M.J., Savenije, H.H.G., Stein, A.: Prediction of flow characteristics using multiple regression and neural networks: a case study in Zimbabwe. Phys. Chem. Earth, Parts A/B/C, 30, 639–647, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2005.08.003, 2005

830 McMillan, H.K.: 2021, A review of hydrologic signatures and their applications, WIREs Water, 2021;8:e1499, https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1499, 2020

McGlynn, B., McDonnell, J., Stewart, M., and Seibert, J.: On the relationships between catchment scale and streamwater mean residence time, Hydrol. Process., 17, 175-181, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.5085</u>, 2003.

McGrane, S. J.: Impacts of urbanisation on hydrological and water quality dynamics, and urban water management: a review, Hydrol. Sciences Journal, 61, 2295-2311, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2015.1128084, 2016.

Miller, M. P., Susong, D. D., Shope, C.L., Heilweil, V. M., and Stolp, B.J.: Continuous estimation of baseflow in snow meltdominated streams and rivers in the Upper Colorado River Basin: A chemical hydrograph separation approach, Water Resour. Res., 50, 6986-6999, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR014939</u>, 2014.

Miller, M.P., Buto, S.G., Susong, D.D., Rumsey, C.A.: The importance of base flow in sustaining surface water flow in the

840 Upper Colorado River Basin. Water Resour. Res., 52, 3547–3562. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015WR017963, 2016.

835

Mo, C., Ruan, Y., Xiao, X., Lan, H., and Jin.: Impact of climate change and human activities on baseflow in a typical karst basin, Southwest China, Ecological Indicators, 126, 107628, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107628, 2021

Morris, D. G., and Flavin, R. W.: A digital terrain model for hydrology, In: Proc. 4th International Symposium on Spatial Data Handling, vol. 1, pp. 250-262, Zürich, 1990.

Muñoz-Villers, L. E., Geissert, D. R., Holwerda, F., and McDonnell, J. J.: Factors influencing stream baseflow transit times in tropical montane watersheds, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20, 1621-1635, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-1621-2016</u>, 2016. Mwakalila, S., Feyen, J., and Wyesure, G.: 2002. The influence of physical catchment properties on baseflow in semi-arid environments, Journal of Arid Environments, 52, 245-258, <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/jare.2001.0947</u>, 2002.
 <u>Nathan, R.J., and McMahon, T.A.: Evaluation of automated techniques for base-flow and recession analyses. Water Resour.</u>

850 Res. 26, 1465–1473, https://doi.org/10.1029/WR026i007p01465, 1990

- Newman, A. J., Clark, M.P., Sampson, K., Wood, A., Hay, L. E., Bock, A., Viger, R. J., Blogett, D., Brekke, L., Arnold, J. R., Hopson, T., and Duan, Q.: Development of a large-sample watershed-scale hydrometeorological dataset for the contiguous USA: dataset characteristics and assessment of regional variability in hydrologic model performance, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 209-223, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-209-2015</u>, 2015.
- 855 Ochoa-Tocachi, B. F., Buytaert, W., and De Bievre, B.: Regionalization of land-use impacts on streamflow using a network of paired catchments, Water Resour. Res., 52, 6710-6729, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016WR018596, 2016. Parkin, G., Birkinshaw, S. J., Younger, P.L., Rao, Z., and Kirk, S.: A numerical modelling and neural network approach to the impact of groundwater abstractions river flows. J. Hydrol., 339, 15-28, estimate on https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.01.041, 2007.
- Piggott, A.R., Moin, S., and Southam, C.: A revised approach to the UKIH method for the calculation of baseflow. Hydrol. Sci. J., 50, 910-920, doi:https://doi.org/10.1623/hysj.2005.50.5.911, 2005.
 Poff, N. L., Allan, J. D., Bain, M. B., Karr, J. R., Prestegaard, K. L., Richter, B. D., Sparks, R.E., and Stromberg, J.C.: The natural flow regime. BioScience, 47, 769–784. https://doi.org/10.2307/1313099, 1997.

- Price, K., Jackson, C. R., Parker, A. J., Reitan, T., Dowd, J., and Cyterski, M.: Effects of watershed land use and geomorphology on stream low flows during severe drought conditions in the southern Blue Ridge Mountains, Georgia and North Carolina, United States, Water Resour. Res., 47, W02516, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009340</u>, 2011.
- Refsgaard, J. C., and Knudsen, J.: Operational validation and intercomparison of different types of hydrological models, Water
 Resources Res., 32, 2189-2202, <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/96WR00896</u>, 1996.
- Rowland, C. S., Morton, R. D., Carrasco, L., McShane, G., O'Neil, A. W., and Wood, C. M.: Land Cover Map 2015 (1km percentage target class, GB). NERC Environmental Information Data Centre, [data set], available at: https://doi.org/10.5285/505d1e0c-ab60-4a60-b448-68c5bbae403e (last access: 8 April 2021), 2017.

Price, K.: Effects of watershed topography, soils, land use, and climate on baseflow hydrology in humid regions: A review, Prog. Phys. Geog., 35, 465-492, https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133311402714, 2011.

Shen, C., Chen, Z., and Laloy, E.: Broadening the use of machine learning in hydrology, Front. Water, 3:681023,

875 <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2021.681023, 2021.</u> Smakhtin, V.U.: Low flow hydrology: A review. J. Hydrol., 240, 147–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00340-1, 2001.

Sankarasubramanian, A., Wang, D., Archfield, S., Reitz, M., Vogel, R. M., Mazrooei, A., and Mukhopadhyay, S.: Beyond the long-term water balance: evolving Budyko's supply-demand framework for the Anthropocene towards a global synthesis of

- land-surface fluxes under natural and human-altered watersheds. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 24, 1975-1984, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-1975-2020, 2020.
 Santhi, C., Allen, P.M., Muttiah, R.S., Arnold, J.G., and Tuppad, P.: Regional estimation of base flow for the conterminous United States by hydrologic landscape regions. J. Hydrol., 351, 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.12.018, 2008.
- Sanz, D., Castano, S., Cassiraga, E., Sahuquillo, A., Gómez-Alday, J. J., Peña, S., and Calera, A.: Modeling aquifer-river interactions under the influence of groundwater abstraction in the Mancha Oriental System (SE Spain). Hydrogeol. J., 19, 475-

487, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-010-0694-x, 2011.

905

Schmidt, L., Hesse, F., Attinger, S., and Kumar, R.: Challenges in applying machine learning models for hydrological inference: a case study of flooding events across Germany, Water Resources Res., 56, e2019WR025924, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019WR025924, 2020.

Shepley, M. G., Streetley, M., Voyce, K., and Bamford, F.: Management of stream compensation for a large conjunctive use scheme, Shropshire, UK, Water and Environment Journal, 23, 263-271, <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-6593.2008.00158.x</u>, 2009.

Simmons, D. L., and Reynolds, R. J.: Effects of urbanization on base-flow of selected south-shore streams, Long Island, New York, Water Resources Bulletin, 18, 797–805, <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1982.tb00075.x</u>, 1982.

Singh, S., Pahlowb, M., Bookera, D. J., Shankara, U., and Chamorroc, A.: Towards baseflow index characterisation at national scale in New Zealand, J. Hydrol., 568, 646-657, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.11.025, 2019.
 Singh, S. K., Pahlow, M., Booker, D. J., Shankar, U., and Chamorro. A.: Towards baseflow index characterisation at national scale in New Zealand. J. Hydrol., 568, 646-657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.11.025, 2019.

Tallaksen, L. M.: A review of baseflow recession analysis, J. Hydrol. 165, 349-370, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-</u> 900 <u>1694(94)02540-R</u>, 1995

UK Government.: Estimated licensed and actual abstractions from all surface and groundwater sources by purpose: 2000 to 2017, [data set], available at: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/env15-water-abstraction-tables last</u> downloaded Oct 2020 (last access 9 April 2021), 2020

Van Loon, A. F., and Laaha, G.: Hydrological drought severity explained by climate and catchment characteristics, J. Hydrol., 526, 3-14, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.10.059</u>, 2015.

Thomas, B. F., Vogel, R. M., Kroll, C. N., and Famiglietti, J. S.: Estimation of the base flow recession constant under human interference, Water Resources Res., 49, 7366-7379, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/wrcr.20532</u>, 2013

Van Loon, A. F., Gleeson, T., Clark, J., Van Dijk, A. I. J. M., Stahl, K., Hannaford, J., Di Baldassarre, G., Teuling, A. J., Tallaksen, L. M., Uijlenhoet, R., Hannah, D. M., Sheffield, J., Svoboda, M., Verbeiren, B., Wagener, T., Rangecroft, S.,

910 Wanders, N., and Van Lanen, H. A. J.: Drought in the Anthropocene, Nature Geoscience, 9, 89-91, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2646, 2016.

Vivoni, E. R., Entekhabi, D., Bras, R. L., and Ivanov, V.Y.: Controls on runoff generation and scale-dependence in a distributed hydrologic model, Hydrol. and Earth Syst. Sci., 11, 1683-1701, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-11-1683-2007</u>, 2007.

- Wadoux, A. M. J-C., Samuel-Rosa, A., Poggio, L., Mulder, V. L.: A note on knowledge discovery and machine learning in
 digital soil mapping, European J. Soil Sci., 71, 133-136, <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.12909</u>, 2020.
- Wagener, T., Dadson, S.J., Hannah, D.M., Coxon, G., Beven, K., Bloomfield, J.P., Buytaert, W., Cloke, H., Bates, P., Holdern, J., Parry, L., Lamb, R., Chappell N.A., Fry, M., and Old, G.: Knowledgegaps in our perceptual model of Great Britain's hydrology, Hydrol. Proc., https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.14288, 2021.

Wang, D., and Cai, X.: Detecting human interferences to low flows through base flow recession analysis, Water Resources
Research, 45, W07426, https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR007819, 2009.

- Wang, R., Kalin, L., Kuang, W., and Tian, H.: Individual and combined effects of land use/cover and climate change on Wolf Bay watershed streamflow in southern Alabama, Hydrol. Process. 28, 5530-5546, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10057</u>, 2014.
 Weber, K. A., and Perry, R. G.: Groundwater abstraction impacts on spring flow and base flow in the Hillsborough River Basin, Florida, USA, Hyrdogeol. J., 14, 1253-1264, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-006-0040-5</u>, 2006.
- Wendt, D. E., Van Loon, A. F., Bloomfield, J. P., and Hannah, D. M.: Asymmetric impact of groundwater use on groundwater droughts, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 24, 4853-4868, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-4853-2020</u>, 2020.
 Wendt, D. E., Bloomfield, J. P., Van Loon, A. F., Garcia, M., Heudo<u>r</u>frer, B., Larson, J., and Hannah, D. M.: Demonstrating the impact of integrated drought policies on hydrological droughts, Nat. Haz. Earth Syst. Sci., <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-129</u>, 2021
- 930 Westerberg, I. K., and McMillan, H. K.: Uncertainty in hydrological signatures. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 3951–3968, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-3951-2015, 2015.

Wittenberg, H.: 2003. Effects of season and man-made changes on baseflow and flow recession: case studies, Hydrol. Proc., 17, 2113-2123, <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.1324</u>, 2003.

WorldMeteorologicalOrganization.:Manualonlow-flowestimationandprediction,WMO,Geneva.935http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/hwrp/publications/low-flow_estimation_prediction/WMO%201029%20en.pdf (last access 9

April 2021), 2008.

Yao, L., Sankarasubramanian. A., and Wang, D.: Climatic and landscape controls on long-term baseflow. Water Resour. Research, 57, e2020WR029284. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR029284, 2021

Zhang, Y-K., and Schilling, K. E.: Increasing streamflow and baseflow in Mississippi River since the 1940 s: Effect of land use change, J. Hydrol., 324, 412-422, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.09.033, 2006. Zhang, Y., Ahiablame, L., Engel, B., and Liu, J.: Regression modelling of baseflow and baseflow index for Michigan, USA, Water, 5, 1797-1815, https://doi.org/10.3390/w5041797, 2013.

Zhang, M., Liu, N., Harper, R., Li, Q., Liu, K., Wei, X., Ning, D., Hou, Y., and Liu, S.: A global review on hydrological responses to forest change across multiple spatial scales: Importance of scale, climate, forest type and hydrological regime, J.

- 945 Hydrol., 546, 44-59, <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.12.040</u>, 2017.
 Zhang, L., Nan, Z., Wang, W., Dong, R., and Zhao, Y.: Separating climate change and human contributions to variations in streamflow and its components using eight time-trend methods, Hydrol. Proc., 33, 383–394, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13331, 2019.
 Zhang, J., Zhang, Y., Song, J., Cheng, L, Paul PK., Gan, R., Shi, X., Luo, Z., and Zhao.: Large-scale baseflow index prediction
- 950 <u>using hydrological modelling, linear and multilevel regression approaches, J. Hydrol., 585, 124780, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124780, 2020.</u>

12. Appendix

Table A	\1.]	Descri	ption	of the	e CAMESL	-GB	covariates	used i	n the	modelling	and ana	lysis.
											/	~

Covariate	CAMELS-GB	Details of CAMELS-GB covariate	Context
class	covariate		
Catchment	area	Catchment area (km ²) based on date	Catchment area is commonly identified
physiography		from UKCEH's Integrated Hydrological	as an important factor in explaining
		DTM (Morris and	variability in low flows (Price et al.,
		Flavin, 1990).	2011). However, it less important with
			respect to mean residence and transit
			times where topographic relief appears
			to be more important (McGlynn et al,
			2003; Asano and Uchida, 2012; Munoz-
			Villiers et al., 2016).
	dpsbar	Catchment mean drainage slope path (m	Mean drainage path slope (Bayliss,
		km ⁻¹).	1999) is an index of catchment
			steepness and is estimated as the mean
			of all inter-nodal slopes from UKCEH's
			Integrated Hydrological DTM for a
			given catchment (Morris and Flavin,
			1990).
Climate	aridity	Aridity (-). Aridity in CAMELS-GB, as	The primary input to the catchment
indices		with the other CAMELS data sets, is	water balance and hence to baseflow
		calculated as the ratio of mean daily	

		potential evapotranspiration to mean	generation is precipitation minus
		daily precipitation (Addor et al., 2017,	evapotranspiration (Price 2011, Fig.1).
		Coxon et al., 2020b). In the present study	
		it has been reformulated as usually	
		estimated (Joint Research Centre, 2019).	
	frac_snow	Fraction of precipitation falling as snow	Barnhart et al (2016) demonstrated a
		(for days colder than 0° C) was estimated	strong correlation between snowmelt
		by Coxon et al., (2020b).	rate and baseflow efficiency for
			catchments from western USA.
Hydrogeology	inter_high_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	As Price (2011) notes, catchment
classes		being underlain by rock with	geology is a primary control on
		intergranular flow & high productivity	baseflow-generating process. Three of
		(%) (Hydrogeological attributes for each	the nine CAMELS-GB hydrogeological
		catchment were derived from the UK	attributes have been selected as
		bedrock hydrogeological maps, British	covariates, these include the two high
		Geological Survey, 2019).	groundwater productivity attributes and
	fract_high_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	the attribute that denotes essentially no
		being underlain by rock with flow	groundwater. Bloomfield et al., (2009)
		through fractures & high productivity	had previously explained 97% of the
		(%).	variance in BFI for 44 catchments in the
	no_gw_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	Thames Basin, UK, using a model that
		being underlain by rocks with essentially	regressed four hydrogeological classes
		no groundwater (%).	including two high productivity and two
			low productivity classes on BFI.
Land cover	dwood_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	Processes associated with the
		deciduous woodland coverage (%)	transformation of the hydrological
		(Attributes for each catchment were	inputs, in forests and shrubby
		derived from the UK Land Cover Map	vegetation, such as interception,
		2015 produced by UKCEH, Rowland et	throughflow and stem flow, at the
		al., 2017).	ground surface, such as ponding and
	ewood_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	infiltration, and in the soil, such as deep
		evergreen woodland coverage (%).	drainage and recharge (Price, 2011)
	grass_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	depend on the nature of land use and
		grass and pasture coverage (%).	land cover.
	shrub_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	
		medium scale vegetation (shrubs)	
		coverage (%).	

	crop_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	
		crops coverage (%).	
	urban_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	
		suburban and urban coverage (%).	
	interwater_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	
		inland water coverage (%).	
	bares_perc	Percentage of catchment designated as	
		bare soil and rocks coverage (%).	
Soil	clay_perc	Percentage clay content of soil (%). Soil	Using data from over 600 catchments in
		attributes for each catchment were based	the CAMELS-US dataset, Addor et al.,
		on the European Soil Database Derived	(2018) used ML to compare the
		Data product (Hiederer, 2013).	influence of catchment attributes on a
			variety of hydraulic signatures
			including BFI_LH. Soil clay fraction
			was the most negatively correlated
			attribute with BFI_LH (Addor et al.,
			2012, Fig. 4).
Water	surfacewater_abs	Mean surface water abstraction (mm	Wittenburg (2003), Wang and Cai
resource		day ⁻¹). Mean surface water and	(2009), Webber and Perry (2006) and
management		groundwater abstraction and discharge	Tomas et al. (2013) have all previously
Ū		data were estimated by Coxon et al.,	identified changes in features of
		(2020) based on monthly actual	baseflow in catchments subject to
		abstractions and returns for the period	groundwater abstraction or due to
		January 1999 – December 2014.	returns flows.
	groundwater_abs	Mean groundwater abstraction (mm day-	
		¹).	
	discharges	Mean discharges (mm day-1). Discharge	
		data consists of daily discharges into	
		water courses from water companies and	
		other discharge permit holders reported	
		to the Environment Agency from 1	
		January 2005 to 31 December 2015.	
	num_reservoirs	Number of reservoirs in the Catchment	
		(-). Reservoir attributes were taken from	
		(-). Reservoir attributes were taken from an open source UK reservoir inventory	

955

Table A2. Coefficients of the four LR models, and associated spatial structural parameters and summary statistics for the models

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4			
	Set A	Set B	Set A	Set B			
	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH	BFI_LH	BFI_CEH			
intercept	1.3652	1.4068	1.1372	1.2137			
dpsbar	0.0029**	0.0056***	0.0034***	0.0063***			
aridity	-0.2182***	-0.3220***	0.238***	-0.4002			
inter_high_perc				(-0.0031***)			
frac_high_perc	0.0107***	0.0194***	0.0105***	0.0031***			
no_gw_perc	-0.0028**	-0.0035*	-0.0018*	-0.0021***			
crop_perc	0.0096***	0.0157***	0.0089***	0.0149***			
urban_perc	(0.0027***)	(0.0032***)					
inwater_perc	(0.0850***)						
clay_perc	-0.0412***	-0.0538***	-0.0350***	-0.0476***			
surfacewater_abs			0.3278***	0.5239***			
groundwater_abs			1.3861***	1.8737***			
discharges			0.7099***	0.7285***			
	Spati	ial structure paramet	ters				
Range	0.504	0.446	0.473	0.426			
Nugget	0.408	0.383	0.496	0.387			
	Summary of models						
MSPE	0.117	0.360	0.138	0.289			
Residual std.	0.435	0.642	0.388	0.581			
R^2 (iid model)	0.627	0.669	0.703	0.732			



Figure A1. Distribution of residuals for LR models (Models 1 to 4)



965 Figure A2. Maps of difference between modelled and observed BFI_CEH (a to d) and corresponding scatter plots of BFI_CEH against modelled BFI (e to h) for covariate Sets A and B for LR and RF models (Models 2, 4, 6 and 8e to h) [Note this is the same as Fig. 6, but for BFI_CEH].



970 **Figure A3.** Scatter plots of improvement in modelled BFI as a function of observed BFI_CEH for a) LR and b) RF models. [Note this is the same as Fig. 7, but for BFI_CEH].



Figure A4. Comparison of observed and modelled BFI_CEH for covariate Sets A and B, for LR and RF models and as a function of different human management categories. [Note this is the same as Fig. 8, but for BFI_CEH].