



A re-examination of the dry gets drier and wet gets wetter paradigm over global land: insight from terrestrial water storage changes

3 Jinghua Xiong¹, Shenglian Guo¹, Abhishek², Jie Chen¹, and Jiabo Yin¹

4 ¹ State Key Laboratory of Water Resources and Hydropower Engineering Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430072,

5 China

6 ² School of Environment and Society, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Yokohama 226-8503, Japan

7 Correspondence to: S. Guo (slguo@whu.edu.cn)

8 Abstract. The "dry gets drier and wet gets wetter" (DDWW) paradigm has been widely used to summarise the expected 9 trends of the global hydrologic cycle under climate change. However, the paradigm is challenged over land due to the choice of different metrics and datasets used and is still unexplored from the perspective of terrestrial water storage anomaly 10 (TWSA). Considering the essential role of TWSA in wetting and drying of the land system, here we built upon a large 11 ensemble of TWSA datasets, including satellite-based products, global hydrological models, land surface models, and global 12 13 climate models to evaluate the DDWW hypothesis during the historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) periods under 14 various scenarios with a 0.05 significance level. We find that 28.1% of global land confirms the DDWW paradigm, while 15 23.3% of the area shows the opposite pattern during the historical period. In the future, the DDWW paradigm is still challenged with the percentage supporting the pattern lower than 20%, and both the DDWW-validated and DDWW-opposed 16 proportion increase along with the intensification of emission scenarios. The different choices of data sources and varying 17 18 significance levels (0.01-0.1) have subtle influences on the evaluation results of the DDWW paradigm. Our findings will 19 provide insights and implications for global wetting and drying trends from the perspective of TWSA under climate change.

20 1 Introduction

21 The hydrological conditions of the land surface have experienced considerable changes due to climate change and 22 anthropogenic interventions, exerting a tremendous impact on regional agriculture, ecological environment, and freshwater availability globally (Shugar et al., 2020; Gampe et al., 2021). Assessing the variations of terrestrial wetness and dryness is 23 24 crucial in understanding the hydrological response and dealing with water-related issues in the context of global change 25 (Moreno-Jimenez et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2021). Under these circumstances, the 'dry gets drier and wet gets wetter' 26 (DDWW) paradigm is one of the most widely used hypotheses to summarise the long-term trends in the global hydrological 27 cycle (Yang et al., 2019). Initially, it was developed based on the deficit between precipitation and evapotranspiration (P - P28 E), which is expected to increase due to the enhancement of atmospheric water vapour in humid regions (i.e., convergence 29 zones) under a warming climate, and decrease over arid regions (i.e., divergence zones) (Durack et al., 2012). The DDWW paradigm has been used to represent the historical and future trends in various constituent components of the hydrologic 30





31 cycle on regional (Chou et al., 2009; Allan et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2019; Zeng et al., 2019) and global scales (Held and Soden, 32 2006; Donat et al., 2016). However, the rationale and validity of the DDWW mechanism are recently questioned at different 33 levels through the growing accessibility of datasets, models, and indicators (Polson and Hegerl, 2017; Yang et al., 2019; Y. 34 Li et al., 2021). Byrne and Gorman (2015) used simulations from 10 climate models to reveal an ocean-land contrast pattern in the response of P - E to global warming in historical (1976-2005) and future (2071-2099) periods, highlighting the 35 36 DDWW mechanism as more suitable over ocean than over land. Given the fact that historical evaluation of the DDWW paradigm is mainly based on oceanic records, Greve et al. (2014) adopted 2142 possible combinations of P - E to assess the 37 38 trends in wetting and drying over global land and discovered merely 10.8% of the area following the DDWW pattern during 39 the period 1948-2005. Alternatively, Yang et al. (2019) integrated an ensemble of six hydro-climatic indicators for the global 40 assessment of the DDWW paradigm between 1982 and 2012, suggesting the catchphrase only occurred over 20% of the 41 global land. In short, there are great uncertainties still remaining in the assessments of global trends in dryness and wetness 42 under climate change (Dai, 2011; Trenberth et al., 2014).

43 The uncertainties within previous studies are mainly sourced from different choices of metrics adopted and datasets 44 used for evaluating the changes in dryness and wetness (Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010; Feng and Zhang, 2015; Huang et al., 2016). Specifically, the widely used metric P - E over the ocean has been proven overwhelmingly positive over land based 45 46 on both observations and simulations (Greve et al., 2014; Byrne and O'Gorman, 2015; Greve and Seneviratne, 2015). 47 Moreover, some meteorological indices derived from precipitation and evapotranspiration, such as the standardised precipitation evapotranspiration index (SPEI), aridity index (AI), and standardised precipitation/evapotranspiration index 48 49 (SPI/SETI), do not capture the integrated response of the land system due to the trade-off between the simplicity of 50 meteorological factors and computational requirements of process-based variables (Huntington, 2006; Dai, 2011; Slette et al., 2020; Barnard et al., 2021). A few indexes like the standardised soil moisture index (SSI), standardised groundwater index 51 52 (SGI), and standardised runoff index (SRI), however, focus on a single aspect of the water cycle and do not describe the 53 integrated status of the terrestrial water storage (TWS) (AghaKouchak, 2014; Wu et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2021). In the 54 coupled human-natural systems, where the synergistic impacts of natural and anthropogenic drivers are exceedingly difficult 55 to disentangle, an integrated representation of the land systems is of paramount importance for policymakers (Abhishek et al., 2021; Rodell et al., 2018). TWS, consisting of water storage in surface water, soil moisture, groundwater, snow and ice, and 56 canopies, can physically provide integrated information about the overall status of the land, whose changes are closely linked 57 58 to the terrestrial wetting and drying tendency (Tapley et al., 2019; Pokhrel et al., 2021). Apart from the societal and economic importance, TWS plays a vital role in Earth system processes, including climate, weather, and biogeochemical 59 60 cycles (Abhishek et al., 2021, Seyoum and Milewski, 2017). Therefore, understanding the past and future TWS trends dynamics is not only essential for human life but also crucial for assessing the water cycle, planning, policymaking, and 61 other management strategies for water resources in a changing climate and for a continuously increasing population 62 63 (Abhishek et al., 2021). There are several studies dealing with TWS or derived indicators to assess freshwater availability 64 (Rodell et al., 2018), water storage dynamics (Abhishek et al., 2021, Scanlon et al., 2018), droughts and floods monitoring





(Long et al., 2014), among others. Divergent patterns of TWS changes have been reported over arid and humid regions under 65 the combined effects of climate change (e.g., global warming), climatic variability (e.g., ENSO), and human activity (e.g., 66 67 groundwater pumping) (Chang et al., 2020; An et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2021). However, there is no study to examine the 68 global variability and validity of DDWW paradigm in the past and future in terms of TWS changes. Furthermore, divergent 69 data sets produce different trends in TWS due to distinctive internal variability and external forcing (from satellites and 70 meteorological stations), especially from precipitation and evapotranspiration (Chen et al., 2020). For example, Scanlon et al. 71 (2018) conducted comprehensive comparisons between decadal trends in TWS from seven global models and three Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) satellite solutions over major basins globally and showed a large 72 73 underestimation of the increasing and decreasing trends of models primarily due to human water use and forcing climate 74 variations.

Therefore, we conduct a systematic re-examination of the DDWW paradigm from the perspective of terrestrial water storage anomalies (TWSA) using a large ensemble of nine different TWS datasets from the GRACE reconstructions, global hydrological models, and land surface models to examine the DDWW paradigm over the global land between 1985 and 2014. Subsequently, an alternative ensemble of eight global climate models (GCMs) from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 6 (CMIP6) is used to further test the paradigm under various scenarios during the future (2071-2100) period.

80 2 Data and Methods

81 2.1 Data

82 We used an ensemble of nine data sets (hereinafter "DATASET") to evaluate the DDWW paradigm during the historical period 1985-2014, which includes three of GRACE reconstructions, global hydrological models (GHMs), and 83 84 global land surface models (LSMs) each (see Table 1). Since no dataset presents the absolutely 'true' value, the ensemble 85 mean was estimated using a simple average method to avoid the uncertainty implicit in any individual dataset. All of the 86 members and their mean have been resampled to $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ grid cell to compare the average value of three GRACE mass 87 concentrations (mascon) solutions between June 2002 and December 2014. The missing months of GRACE data have been filled using a linear interpolation method. Alternatively, an ensemble of eight simulations from CMIP6 was used to examine 88 the DDWW paradigm in the future period (2071-2100). All the ensemble members have been resampled to $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ scale 89 90 using a bilinear interpolation approach for consistency and better comparison in the spatial domain. Similarly, the ensemble 91 mean of CMIP6 models has been estimated using simple averaging. All the DATASET and CMIP6 members and their ensemble are represented as the long-term anomaly relative to the baseline between 1985 and 2014 to be consistent with 92 93 reconstructed GRACE data.





2-2014 2-2014 2-2014 5-2014 5-2014 5-2014	2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014 2014	014 014 014 014 014 014	<u> </u>							
200 200 200 198 198 198	2002 2002- 1985- 1985- 1985- 1985- 1985-	2002-2 2002-2 2002-2 1985-2 1985-2 1985-2 1985-2	2002-20 2002-20 2002-20 1985-20 1985-20 1985-20 1985-20	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2010 1985-2100 1985-2100	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2010 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100	2002-2014 2002-2014 2002-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2014 1985-2010 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100 1985-2100
http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://globalhydrology.nl/research/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://gmd.copernicus.org/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://gnd.copernicus.org/ https://flas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/go/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://gobalhydrology.nl/research/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://gnd.copernicus.org/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://ndas.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/ https://ndas.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/ https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://globalhydrology.nl/research/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://globalhydrology.nl/research/ https://globalhydrology.nl/research/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://as.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/go/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/ https://gnd.copernicus.org/ https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/go/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/ http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/go/data/ https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/
PL RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa SFC RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://earth.g GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ddas. PCR-GLOBWB https://globall	L RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa FC RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://gr GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas. PCR-GLOBWB https://ldas GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas	L RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa C RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://as//gr GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas. PCR-GLOBWB https://globall GLDAS2.0-Noah https://globall GLDAS2.0-Noah https://das. CPC-v2 https://wwv	J RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa C RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://fdas. GLDAS2.0-VIC https://fdas. PCR-GLOBWB https://globall GLDAS2.0-Noah https://fdas. CPC-v2 https://das. GLDAS2.0-CLSM https://das	. RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa C RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://as GLDAS2.0-VIC https://das. PCR-GL0BWB https://das. GLDAS2.0-Noah https://das CPC-v2 https://das CPC-v2 https://das ACCESS-CM2 https://esgf-n	RL06 mascons-v02 http://podaa C RL06 mascons-v02 https://earth.g WGHM-v2.2d https://as.//das. GLDAS2.0-VIC https://das. PCR-GLOBWB https://globall GLDAS2.0-Noah https://globall GLDAS2.0-Noah https://globall ACCESS-OND https://das. ACCESS-ESM1-5 https://esgf-n	RL06 mascons-v02http://podaaC RL06 mascons-v02https://earth.gWGHM-v2.2dhttps://earth.gGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://idas.PCR-GLOBWBhttps://idas.PCR-GLOBWBhttps://idas.JLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://idas.CPC-v2https://idas.CPC-v2https://idas.ACCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-nCanESM-5https://esgf-n	RL06 mascons-v02http://podaaRL06 mascons-v02https://earth.gWGHM-v2.2dhttps://earth.grWGHM-v2.2dhttps://globallCR-GLOBWBhttps://globallCR-GLOBWBhttps://globallCPC-v2https://globallCPC-v2https://globallCPC-v2https://globallCPC-v2https://globallCPC-v2https://globallCCESS-ESM1-5https://globallCCESS-ESM1-5https://globallGFDL-ESM4https://esgf-nGFDL-ESM4https://esgf-n	Ulo6 mascons-v02http://podaaRL06 mascons-v02https://earth.gWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gas.UDAS2.0-VIChttps://das.CR-GLOBWBhttps://globallLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globallLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globallLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globallLDAS2.0-Storhttps://globallCPC-v2https://globallDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globallCCESS-CM2https://csgf-nVCCESS-CM2https://csgf-nCanESM-5https://csgf-nGFDL-ESM4https://csgf-nSL-CM6A-LRhttps://csgf-n	L06 mascons-v02http://podaaRL06 mascons-v02https://earth.gVGHM-v2.2dhttps://as.//guUDAS2.0-VIChttps://as.//das.CR-GLOBWBhttps://as.//das.DAS2.0-Noahhttps://as.//das.DAS2.0-VIChttps://as.//as.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://as.//as.CPC-v2https://as.//as.CESS-CM2https://as.//as.CESS-CM2https://segf-nCESS-ESM1-5https://segf-nGTL-ESM4https://segf-nSFDL-ESM4https://segf-nMIROC6https://segf-n	Lo6 mascons-v02http://podaaL06 mascons-v02https://earth.gGHM-v2.2dhttps://grDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.DAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.DAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.DAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://ldas.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://ldas.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://gr
WGHM-v2.2d https://gmd.copern GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nase PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrologr	WGHM-v2.2d https://gmd.copern WGHM-v2.2d https://gmd.copern GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nase PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrolog GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nase	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologCPC-v2https://www.psl.noa	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gud.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gud.copernGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://das.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologyGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.naseCPC-v2https://das.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nase	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://fdas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://fdas.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://fdas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://fdas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://fdas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.naseGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.naseACCESS-CM2https://esgf-node.llnl.g	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://das.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhygloba	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gnd.copernGLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologFLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologGLDAS2.0-SCM2https://globalhydrologGCCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gCCCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gCanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.g	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gmd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://gmd.copernSLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasePCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologyPCDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologyLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologyLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologyCPC-v2https://globalhydrologyLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologyCCESS-ESM1-5https://globalhylia.gsfc.naseACCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gCCESS-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gGFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.g	WGHM-v2.2dhttps://gudd.copernWGHM-v2.2dhttps://globalhydrolog:LDAS2.0-VIChttps://das.gsfc.naseCR-GLOBWBhttps://das.gsfc.naseLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.naseLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.naseDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.naseMCESS-CM2https://das.gsfc.naseMCCESS-CM2https://segf-node.llnl.gCanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gGFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gSL-CM6A-LRhttps://esgf-node.llnl.g	VGHM-v2.2dhttps://gudd.copernVGHM-v2.2dhttps://globalhydrologCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-VIChttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-Stathttps://globalhydrologCPC-v2https://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologCCESS-CM2https://globalhyglobalhiliCCESS-ESM1-5https://gsgf-node.llnl.gGanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gGTDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gSL-CM6A-LRhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.g	GHM-v2.2dhttps://gmd.copernGHM-v2.2dhttps://gmd.copernDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.naseDAS2.0-VIChttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrologDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgf-node.llnl_gDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl_gCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl_gFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl_gHDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl_gMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl_gMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl_gHESM1-2-HRhttps://esgf-node.llnl_g
GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc	GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/	GLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasPCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcGLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/SLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	GLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc GLDAS2.0-Noah https://globalhydrology.nl/researc GLDAS2.0-Noah https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas CPC-v2 https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas iLDAS2.0-CLSM https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas ACCESS-CM2 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project	GLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasPCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcJLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcCPC-v2https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasiLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://mas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectACCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project	GLDAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasPCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcJLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcJLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectCanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project	 JLDAS2.0-VIC https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/researc PCPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/gldas CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/ CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/gldas ACCESS-CM2 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project CCESS-ESM1-5 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project CCESS-ESM4 GFDL-ESM4 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project 	LDAS2.0-VIChttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-SNOahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researc.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researc.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researc.CFC-v2https://globalhydrology.nl/researc.CCESS-CM2https://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/glasVCCESS-CM2https://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/glasCanESM-5https://glas.gsfc.nasa.gov/projectGFDL-ESM4https://segf-node.llnl.gov/projectSL-CM6A-LRhttps://segf-node.llnl.gov/project	DAS2.0-VIChttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCFC-v2https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCFC-v2https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCFC-v2https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projectCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectGress-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectGress-LRM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project	DAS2.0-VIChttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-Noahhttps://globalhydrology.nl/researcDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projectCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectCanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projectMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/project
PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/research/	PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/research/ GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	PCR-GLOBWB https://globalhydrology.nl/research/ GLDAS2.0-Noah https://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/	PCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/GLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/5LDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas	PCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/GLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/iLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	PCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/3LDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/https://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-OLSMhttps://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://sgfc.nasa.gov/projects/ACCESS-ESM1-5https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	PCR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/jLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://nas.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/LDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://nas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/CCESS-ESM1-5https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/CanESM-5https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/	CR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/ iLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/ https://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasLDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasACCESS-CM2https://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasCCESS-ESM1-5https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CanESM-5https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/GFDL-ESM4https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	CR-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/LDAS2.0-Noahhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasJCESS-CM2https://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCCESS-CM2https://iesgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/GFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/SL-CM6A-LRhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	CR-GLOBWBhttps://globallydrology.nl/research/DAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgfc.nasa.gov/gldasCESS-CM2https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/CESS-SM1-5https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/GESS-ESM1-5https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/BFDL-ESM4https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://sgff-node.llnl.gov/projects/	R-GLOBWBhttps://globalhydrology.nl/research/DAS2.0-Noahhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/AS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CESS-CM2https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CESS-ESM1-5https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CanESM-5https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CL-CM6A-LRhttps://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://sgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/Https://ssgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/
	GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1	GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/	GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/ 1 5LDAS2.0-CLSM https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1	GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/ 1 iLDAS2.0-CLSM https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 ACCESS-CM2 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ 1	GLDAS2.0-Noah https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 CPC-v2 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/ 1 iLDAS2.0-CLSM https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas 1 ACCESS-CM2 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ 1 ACCESS-ESM1-5 https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/ 1	JLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas1CPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/1LDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas1ACCESS-CM2https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1CCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1CanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1	LLDAS2.0-Noahhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas1CPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/1LDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas1ACCESS-CM2https://idas.gsfc.nasa.gov/projects/1CCESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1CanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1GFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/1	LDAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://das.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.CESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.CESS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.CESS-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/.SL-CM6A-LRhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	DAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-Noahhttps://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/CPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CESS-CM2https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CBSS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/GESS-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/BFDL-ESM4https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/MIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/	DAS2.0-Noahhttps://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-Noahhttps://www.psl.noaa.gov/gldasCPC-v2https://www.psl.noaa.gov/gldasDAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/DAS2.0-CLSMhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/DASS-ESM1-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/CanESM-5https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/lhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/lhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/lMIROC6https://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/lhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/lhttps://esgf-node.llnl.gov/projects/l

4





96 2.1.1 GRACE and GRACE Reconstructions

97 A total of three GRACE reconstructions provided by Humphrey and Gudmundsson (2019) and Li et al. (2021) were selected in the DATASET for evaluation of the DDWW paradigm. The ensemble of GRACE reconstructions is generated 98 99 based on state-of-the-art machine learning models using historical and near-real-time meteorological forcing. It is informative to note that the GRACE reconstructions from Humphrey and Gudmundsson (2019) were calibrated with 100 101 GRACE mascon solutions from NASA JPL and NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), respectively, and that 102 supplied by Li et al. (2021) were trained by the GRACE mascon product from Center for Space Research (CSR). The GRACE reconstructions of JPL and GSFC mascon data (Humphrey and Gudmundsson, 2019) are forced with three different 103 104 climatic datasets, including the multisource weighted-ensemble precipitation (MSWEP), the Global Soil Wetness Project 105 Phase 3 (GSWP3), and the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts reanalysis (ERA5). We have implemented an ensemble of each reconstructed solution to reduce the uncertainties caused by different forcing datasets. The 106 107 CSR reconstruction is derived from four kinds of meteorological variables (e.g., precipitation and 2 m air temperature) and three kinds of hydrological variables (e.g., soil moisture and runoff) (Li et al., 2021a). The accuracy and applicability of 108 109 three GRACE reconstructions have been fully evaluated over global land in several previous studies (Xu et al., 2021; Yi et 110 al., 2021). Correspondingly, the three latest GRACE mascon solutions (RL06-v02) from JPL, GSFC, and CSR were 111 prepared for comparison purposes. Compared to other GRACE products (e.g., conventional spherical harmonic solutions), mascon solutions do not need spatial (e.g., smoothing) or spectral (e.g., de-striping) filtering or other empirical scaling and 112 113 therefore have higher signal-to-noise ratio, higher spatial resolutions, and eventually reduced errors (Save et al., 2016; 114 Watkins et al., 2015).

115 2.1.2 Global Hydrological Models

116 We used three global hydrological models, including the Variable Infiltration Capacity macroscale model (VIC-v4.1.2), 117 the WaterGAP hydrological model (WGHM-v2.2d), and PCRaster GLOBal Water Balance model (PCR-GLOBWB-v2.0) to 118 estimate TWS for evaluation of the DDWW paradigm. The physically-based, semi-distributed, and grid-based VIC model is 119 managed by the NASA Global Land Data Assimilation System Version 2.1 (GLDAS-v2.1) (Liang et al., 1994; Syed et al., 120 2008). Forced by the Global Data Assimilation System atmospheric analysis fields (Derber et al., 1991) and the Air Force 121 Weather Agency's AGRicultural METeorological modeling system radiation fields, the VIC model can effectively capture 122 the terrestrial water cycle by simulating the water stored in the canopies, snow, and soil moisture within the depth of 3 soil 123 layers (200 cm). The VIC model has been widely used to analyze terrestrial water storage changes at regional and global 124 scales (Hao and Singh, 2015; Hao et al., 2018). The WGHM is a grid-based global hydrological model quantifying the human water use and continental water fluxes for all land areas excluding Antarctica (Müller Schmied et al., 2021). Unlike 125 126 most global hydrological models, the WGHM forced by the ERA40 and ERA-Interim reanalysis is able to simulate groundwater storage by coupling with global water use models like the Groundwater-Surface Water Use, suggesting a 127





comparably better representation of TWS (Döll et al., 2014). Several frequently-used model outputs such as TWS, stream, and water use have been evaluated against global observations (Wan et al., 2021). The PCR-GLOBWB model is a gridbased global-scale hydrology and water resources model that fully integrates water use, such as water consumption, water withdrawal, and return flows (Sutanudjaja et al., 2018). Forced with the EC-Earth data, including atmospheric, oceanic, and land surface variables, the PCR-GLOBWB model can simulate the entire terrestrial system over global land at a daily time scale. The model performance has been fully evaluated using global discharge measurements and supported by many TWS studies globally (Scanlon et al., 2018; van der Wiel et al., 2019).

135 2.1.3 Land Surface Models

We used three land surface models consisting of the Noah (v3.6), Catchment (CLSM-vF2.5), and CPC (v2) models to 136 137 calculate TWS globally for assessment of the DDWW paradigm. The Noah and CLSM models are managed by GLDAS (v-138 2.1) from the NASA GSFC institute. GLDAS is a composite of global hydrological and land surface models that model 139 optimal fields of land surface by integrating multi-source observations such as in situ stations and satellites based on state-of-140 the-art data assimilation and land surface simulation techniques (Rodell et al., 2004). GLDAS has been widely used to compare with GRACE TWSA in data-sparse regions such as Africa and Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau (Ogou et al., 2021; Xing et 141 al., 2021). The Noah-modelled TWS is considered as the sum of canopy water storage, snow water equivalent, and soil 142 143 moisture of four layers with a total depth of 200 cm. Different from that, the CLSM simulates shallow groundwater and the vertical levels of soil moisture are not explicitly divided within the depth of 100 cm. Developed by the U.S. National 144 145 Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the CPC model provides global soil moisture conditions in 160 cm column soil forced with observations of different meteorological and hydrological fluxes (e.g., precipitation, temperature, 146 and humidity) from CPC (Fan, 2004). The reasonably good ability of CPC simulations to capture the TWS dynamics has 147 148 been examined over many areas of the globe in spite of its simplicity in the calculation of TWS (Jin et al., 2012; Agutu et al., 149 2020).

150 2.1.4 Global Climate Models

151 We used a suite of eight global climate models belonging to the ensemble "rlilp1fl" of CMIP6 to evaluate the DDWW 152 paradigm under climate change. The CMIP6 serves as a category of experiments of GCMs coupled to a dynamic ocean, a simple land surface, and thermodynamic sea ice (Evring et al., 2016). We chose these eight models out of the 34 CMIP6 153 154 models because, as we write, they are the only models for which TWSA results are available in both the historical and future 155 periods under multiple emission scenarios (see Table 1). The CMIP6 TWSA represents the sum of total soil moisture and snow equivalent water, which has been comprehensively validated, with embedded uncertainties, over global major river 156 basins compared with the GRACE data (Freedman et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2021). The CMIP6 comparisons have become a 157 158 diagnostic tool to better understand climate change in past, present, and future periods (Krishnan and Bhaskaran, 2020), which includes a total of five Shared Socio-economic Pathways (SSPs) representing global economic and demographic 159





160 changes under different greenhouse gas emissions. We selected three out of five SSP scenarios, including SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585, representing the green roads, middle of the road, and the highway road, respectively (Iqbal et al., 2021). In 161 162 specific, the monthly average TWS from CMIP6 is estimated as the sum of total soil moisture and snow water, which has 163 been proven reliable to assess the TWS changes (Wu et al., 2021). To avoid the considerable uncertainties in TWS of 164 different CMIP6 models, a trend-preserving method was employed to perform bias correction combined with historical 165 GRACE data. The trend-preserving method initially developed by Hempel et al. (2013) modifies the monthly means of the simulated data to match the observed data using a constant offset between the simulations and observations and has been 166 widely used in the Intersectoral Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). The detailed procedure of the bias correction for 167 168 CMIP6 TWSA has been described in detail in a recent study (Xiong et al., 2022).

169 **2.2 Detection of Wetting and Drying**

The non-dimensional TWS drought severity index (TWS-DSI) was adopted to reflect the long-term trends in terrestrial dryness and wetness at both $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ grid cell and regional scales over global land (see Figure S1 and Table S1). TWS-DSI has been widely used in hydrology and climate fields due to its simple structure and effective ability in capturing drying and wetting conditions (Pokhrel et al., 2021). Monthly TWS-DSI was calculated for all ensemble members and their mean from DATASET and CMIP6 as follows (Zhao et al., 2017):

$$TWS-DSI_{ij} = \frac{TWS_{i,j} - \mu_j}{\sigma_j} \tag{1}$$

where $TWS_{i,j}$ is the TWS value in year *i* and month *j*; μ_j and σ_j denote the mean and standard deviation of the annual TWS in month *j*, respectively. Long-term trends in TWS-DSI were estimated using the linear regression method and the significant trend values were evaluated using the t-test at a 5% significance level (Greve et al., 2014). The area having a significant trend of increasing/decreasing TWS-DSI is considered to be undergoing wetting/drying; otherwise, it is defined as an uncertain region. We calculated the regional/global mean trends of TWS-DSI using a spatially weighted method to account for the changing area of grid cells with latitudes.

182 2.3 Selected Regions

175

We performed the assessment of the DDWW paradigm over global land at both gridded $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ cell and regional scales excluding Greenland and Antarctica. A total of 43 regions are selected based on the Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Adaptation (SREX) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), which covers all the land area except for the Greenland and Antarctica (see Figure S1). Their basic information is summarised in Table S1.





188 3 Results and Discussion

189 3.1 Global Trends of Dryness and Wetness

190 Prior to the detection of the DDWW paradigm, we performed the evaluation of TWSA derived from the ensemble mean 191 of the DATASET and CMIP6 archive. Figure S2 presents the global distribution of the normalized root mean square error 192 (NRMSE) between GRACE TWSA and that from DATASET and CMIP6 data after bias correction during the period April 193 2002-December 2014, which is calculated as the ratio of RMSE to the change range of TWSA. The NRMSE between 194 GRACE and DATASET is generally lower than 0.3 (for 95.7% of the area), of which 12.9% of the land area shows NRMSE 195 below 0.1 and the percentage is 77.0% for the NRMSE lower than 0.2. Relatively larger NRMSE ranging from 0.3 to 0.4 196 occurs in east and central Asia, south Australia, north Africa, and north-eastern America, indicating the relatively poorer 197 performance of GHMs and LSMs. Results over central America, east Europe and west Asia are mostly below 0.1. However, 198 the NRMSE between GRACE and CMIP6 is generally lower than that of DATASET, most (98.7%) of which change from 199 0.1 to 0.3. Approximately 76.9% of the land area shows NRMSE<0.2 and 8.6% has NRMSE<0.1. Spatially, there are some 200 extreme values as high as 0.3 to 0.4 located in north and east Asia, south Africa, and central America, probably arising from 201 the uncertainties in the CMIP6 simulations even undergoing the bias correction. Figure S3 further presents the regional 202 results over the 43 selected SREX regions. Most of the mid-latitude regions like the WCE, EEU, WSB, ESB, and RFE present relatively lower NRMSE (0-0.1) between GRACE and DATASET, suggesting better performance than that in the 203 204 NZ, ECA, NEU, and NEN. For CMIP6 data, a similar pattern can be found with most mid-latitude regions having relatively lower NRMSE values from 0.1 and 0.2, while higher values (0.2-0.3) are located in NEN, ECA, SSA, and EAU. Although 205 the bias correction has been performed to the CMIP6 TWSA, a comparatively large bias still exists owing to the uncertainty 206 207 in parameters, hydrometeorological forcing, and internal variability of GCMs. Such biases can potentially influence the 208 assessment of the DDWW paradigm in the future period (2071-2100) climate change.

209 A temporal comparison of global average TWSA derived from DATASET/CMIP6 and GRACE during the period 2002-2014 is shown in Figure S4. The GRACE TWSA changing from -20 to 20 mm shows obvious seasonal characteristics 210 211 with relatively higher uncertainty in the dry season than that in the wet season. A similar change pattern is captured by the 212 DATASET, with the change range covering the variations of GRACE data. The NRMSE between the ensemble mean of DATASET and GRACE data is 0.11, equaling to that (0.11) between the ensemble mean of CMIP6 and GRACE results. 213 214 Moreover, the fluctuation range of DATASET data is generally greater than the CMIP6 before 2010 and slightly 215 underestimate that and GRACE measurements after the year with increasing range, highlighting the considerable uncertainty 216 sourced from different forcing variables and model parameterizations.

To provide insights into the aspect of terrestrial water storage changes for the evaluation of the DDWW paradigm, TWS-DSI is estimated to determine the terrestrial wetness and dryness. Figure 1 shows the global distribution of long-term trends in TWS-DSI over the historical period 1985-2014 and the future period 2071-2100 under SPSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 scenarios. During the historical period, a clear spatial divergence is observed globally and the average TWS-DSI has





221 a significant decreasing slope of -0.07/a (p<0.05), similar to the results from SPI, SPEI, and AI (Wang et al., 2018; Yang et 222 al., 2019). Spatially, severe drying exists in the Gulf of Alaska coast and the Canadian archipelago with significant slopes of 223 TWS-DSI ranging from -0.08/a to -0.12/a, which is caused by rapid ice-sheet and glacier ablation under a warming climate 224 (Luthcke et al., 2013; Velicogna et al., 2014). Triggered by severe historical droughts over decades, the drying trends in 225 central Canada, southern California, and Texas can be clearly discovered, with decreasing trend of TWS-DSI ranging from 226 -0.04/a to -0.12/a (p<0.05) (Bouchard et al., 2013; Haacker et al., 2016), so as the eastern Brazil (Getirana, 2016). Moreover, overwhelming groundwater depletion due to unsustainable human water use such as irrigation is responsible for the 227 declining dryness at significant slopes ranging from -0.12/a to -0.16/a in southeast and north Africa, south Europe, North 228 229 China Plain, and northern India (Rodell et al., 2009; Feng et al., 2013; Ramillien et al., 2014). Naturally, a moderate drying 230 trend in southwestern Africa caused by precipitation decrease is detected by the reduction of TWS-DSI. On the contrary, 231 increasing precipitation dominates the wetting trend in mid-latitude regions, including southern Russia and Canadian, west 232 Africa, southeast Asia and Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau, with significant slopes ranging from 0.04/a to 0.12/a (Siebert et al., 2010; Ndehedehe et al., 2017). Alternatively, some regions, such as the Amazon River basin, south Africa and eastern 233 234 Australia, presenting wetting trends are considered to experience progression from wet to dry period (Chen et al., 2010; 235 Gaughan and Waylen, 2012).

236 In the future, most of the mid-latitude regions such as north China, south Mongolia, and central Europe are projected to 237 be wet because of the growth in precipitation under SSP126 scenario (Milly et al., 2005; Seneviratne et al., 2006). Similar trends can be found in North China Plain and Caspian regions that underwent drying during the historical period, mainly due 238 239 to groundwater abstraction and sporadic droughts. Some areas, including northern India and southwestern America are 240 expected to continue drying under SSP126 scenario in the future owing to the increasing evapotranspiration in a warming climate (Allen et al., 2010; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010). Alternatively, the obvious drying trend around Canada's subarctic 241 lakes are attributed to the high vulnerability to droughts when snow cover declines under increasing temperature (Bouchard 242 243 et al., 2013). Many regions around the Aral Sea and north Russia are prone to experience wet-to-dry transition under climate 244 change. It is worth noting that a higher emission scenario can be translated to a more intensive trend of either drying or 245 wetting, the pattern is also revealed by a recent study (Pokhrel et al., 2021).

We further demonstrate the global distribution of the long-term trends in TWS-DSI over 43 selected SREX regions in 246 Figure 2. During the historical period, 53.5% and 46.5% of land area present drying and wetting trend, respectively, of which 247 248 59.4% and 48.4% is significant (p < 0.05). NAU has the highest percentage (73.7%) of land area with a significant increasing 249 trend of TWS-DSI, which is mainly caused by precipitation increase (Rajah et al., 2014). While the ARP has the greatest percentage of 81.9% of pixels showing a significant drying trend jointly affected by the groundwater depletion and droughts 250 over the Arabian Peninsula (Lelieveld et al., 2012). During the future period under climate change, the proportion of drying 251 252 areas with a significant slope increases from SSP126 (23.6%) to SSP585 (30.1%) scenario. Similar growth is detected in the percentage with significant wetting trends, which reaches 15.7%, 17.4%, and 23.5% under SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 253 scenarios, respectively. Some mid-latitude regions including WCE, EEU, WSB, WNA, and ECA present wetting trends that 254





benefit from precipitation increase and become wetter when a high emission scenario is expected to occur. SAS also illustrates a dry-to-wet transformation and a higher radiative forcing from SSP126 to SSP585. Alternatively, all the regions in North America and Russia except for WNA are expected to become dry, and so do some regions over south-eastern Africa, central Asia, and south of Australia. Generally, the percentage of the land area showing significant trends of both wetting and drying stably increase from the SSP126 to SSP585 scenarios, and the drying is always ~10% higher than the wetting.



260

Figure 1: Global distribution of the long-term trends (left panel) and classification (right panel) in TWS-DSI during (a, b) the historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) period under (c, d) SSP126, (e, f) SSP245, and (g, h) SSP585 scenarios. Note: The stippling marks regions with a significant trend (p<0.05). "D" and "W" indicate regions with drying and wetting trends, respectively.

265







266

Figure 2: Global distribution of the long-term trends in TWS-DSI in 43 selected IPCC SREX regions during the (a) historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) periods under (b) SSP126, (c) SSP245, and (d) SSP585 scenarios. Note: The fan shape represents the regional proportion of area with different trends and the bar plot means the global percentage. "D" and "W" indicate regions with drying and wetting trends, respectively. Please refer to Figure S1 for abbreviations of the IPCC SREX regions.

272 3.2 Assessment of the DDWW Paradigm

273 To evaluate the DDWW paradigm over global land, the effective Aridity index (AI) is used to classify a grid cell as arid, 274 humid, and transitional region, following Yang et al. (2019). The AI is calculated as the ratio of annual precipitation to 275 potential evapotranspiration provided by the Climatic Research Unit Time series (CRU TS-v4.05) during the same period as 276 TWS-DSI (i.e., 1985-2014). The global distribution of multi-year average AI and the classifications during the period 1985-2014 is presented in Figure S5. It can be seen that most of the arid regions are located in southwestern America, north and 277 278 south Africa, central Asia, Arabian regions, and Australia, accounting for 33.6% of the land. The percentage of humid areas 279 that are mainly located in east America, the Amazon region, central Africa, south China, west Europe, and Russia reaches 280 58.1% of the land. An approximate 8.3% of the land area is defined as the transitional region. We compare AI and TWSA derived from DATASET and CMIP6 between 1985 and 2014 in Figure S6, with the latter presenting a similar spatial 281 282 distribution to AI. Moreover, the CMIP6 data has a relatively higher amplitude than that of the DATASET, in line with the 283 temporal results (see Figure S4).

Figure 3 illustrates the test results of DDWW paradigm at a 5% significance level (p=0.05) during the historical and future periods. Limited proportions (<10%) of area illustrating the "transition gets drier" (TD) and "transition gets wetter" (TW) patterns are reported in both past and future periods. Much of the land area over north Africa, Arabian regions, east Asia, and southwest America show the "dry gets drier" (DD) phenomenon. In contrast to that, a substantial portion of area over the arid regions of the north and south of Africa, Australia, and central Asia shows the "dry gets wetter" (DW) hypothesis. Moreover, the "wet gets wetter" (WW) paradigm is confirmed mainly in east Russia and north Amazon, with the "wet gets drier" (WD) pattern happening in central Africa, north-eastern Amazon, and north Asia. Under climate change, a





291 similar pattern under the SSP126 scenario is revealed in the historical results. Nevertheless, the SSP245 scenario presents a 292 slightly different distribution from historical results, with many regions in north Asia and central Europe showing DW and 293 WW situations instead of DD and WD. In addition to that, the south and northeast of China, together with the majority of 294 Russia show the WD situation, and the DD paradigm is gradually dominating Australia. This difference is further confirmed 295 based on the results under the SSP585 scenario. We further conducted the regional analysis as shown in Figure 4. Among 296 54.9% of land showing significant trends in drying and wetting, 50.5% confirms the DDWW paradigm, of which 30.1% and 297 20.5% are drying and wetting, respectively, during the historical period (1985-2014). ARP has the highest percentage of 96.3% of the area with significant trends showing the DD hypothesis, while RFE achieves the highest proportion of 92.1% 298 presenting the WW theory. During the future period under climate change, multiple SSP scenarios highlight a generally 299 300 consistent distribution with some minor differences. Some regions such as WCA, WNA, and MED show a DD paradigm while others such as WCE, SES, MDC, and NC have a WW paradigm. Apart from that, a lot of regions located in Russia, 301 Mongolia, and Canada present WD conditions, with few areas like NEAF and ARP showing DW situation. It can be clearly 302 303 observed that the proportion of regions showing WD pattern increases from SSP126 to SSP585 scenario, indicating the 304 comprehensive trend of drying at region scale.

305 Global statistics of the regions with various patterns during the historical (1985-2014) and future periods (2071-2100) are shown in Figure 5. During the period 1985-2014, a percentage as high as 54.9% of area shows significant trends in 306 307 wetting or drying (p < 0.05). Further, 28.1% of the area shows the DDWW paradigm, in which 16.7% and 11.4% of area is 308 drying and wetting, respectively. 23.3% of the area, however, shows the opposite pattern of DW (8.4%) and WD (14.9%), 309 respectively. The confirmed percentage for the DDWW paradigm (27.1%) for the land mass (represented by TWSA) in our study is more than twice as high as that for the land surface (represented by precipitation, evaporation, and aridity) in a 310 previous study (10.8%) (Greve et al., 2014). Feng and Zhang (2015) used soil moisture to conclude a proportion of 15.12% 311 followed the DDWW pattern while a percentage of 7.7% of the land showed an opposite pattern between 1979 and 2013, 312 313 relatively lower than our study. Yang et al. (2019) applied a combined measure employing six different drought indices to 314 evaluate the DDWW paradigm and discovered the percentage following and opposing the DDWW paradigm is 29% and 20%, respectively, during the period 1982-2012, typically consistent with our study. Cheng et al. (2020) utilized the GRACE 315 data during 2002-2017 and reported the area having the DDWW pattern reached 11.2% except for the 4.7% of cold regions 316 over global land, which is comparatively lower than our study. Observed differences among various studies are attributed to 317 318 the differences in datasets used, metrics employed for assessment, and the study period.

Under climate change, the proportion of areas supporting the DDWW paradigm is 18.2%, 17.4%, and 20.7% under SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 scenarios, respectively. Alternatively, the area having the opposite DDWW pattern achieves 17.9%, 22.4%, and 28.5%, respectively. The percentage of areas with significant wetting and drying trends slightly increases over the enhancement of emission scenarios, consistent with the increase of DDWW-validated areas from SSP126 to SSP585 scenarios. It is worth noting that the internal variability of climate models might affect the potential agreement with the DDWW pattern (Kumar et al., 2015). Greve and Senevirtne (2015) used climate projections from CMIP5 to establish the





measure P - E for assessment of the DDWW paradigm and discovered the hypothesis was validated over 19.5% of land area between 2080 and 2100 under the RCP8.5 scenario, which is close to our result (20.7%). Moreover, Li et al. (2021) further applied the P-E index to test the DDWW theory based on GCMs from the third phase of Paleoclimate Modelling Intercom-parison Project (PMIP3) simulations, concluding a similar proportion of 22.8% of the global land to our study that held the DDWW paradigm. This similarity reveales the similar atmospheric and terrestrial responses under future warming for both the studies.



- 331
- 332 Figure 3: Global assessment of the DDWW paradigm during the (a) historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) period under (b)
- SSP126, (c) SSP245, and (d) SSP585 scenarios. Note: DD indicates the dry gets drier; DW indicates the dry gets wetter; WW indicates the wet gets wetter; WD indicates the wet gets drier; TD indicates the transition gets drier; TW indicates the transition
- 334 indicates th335 gets wetter.



336

Figure 4: Global assessment of the DDWW paradigm in 43 selected IPCC SREX regions during the (a) historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) period under (b) SSP126, (c) SSP245, and (d) SSP585 scenarios. Note: The fan shape represents the regional proportion of area with different patterns to the total area with significant (p<0.05) patterns and the bar plot means the global





340 percentage. "D" and "W" indicate regions with drying and wetting trends, respectively. DD indicates the dry gets drier; DW 341 indicates the dry gets wetter; WW indicates the wet gets wetter; WD indicates the wet gets drier; TD indicates the transition gets 342 drier; TW indicates the transition gets wetter. Please refer to Figure S1 for abbreviations of the IPCC SREX regions.



343

Figure 5: Global statistics of the regions with different patterns during the historical (1985-2014) and future (2071-2100) period under SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 scenarios. Note: DD indicates the dry gets drier; DW indicates the dry gets wetter; WW indicates the wet gets wetter; WD indicates the wet gets drier; TD indicates the transition gets drier; TW indicates the transition gets wetter; Uncertain indicates the regions showing insignificant (p>0.05) trends in TWS-DSI.

348 **3.3 Uncertainties and Implications**

349 Each ensemble member of the DATASET has embedded uncertainties inherently originating from one or more forcing 350 variables, simplified assumptions of complex processes in the models and their physical structure, retrieval algorithms, and 351 systematic biases, which might have inevitably propagated to the results presented herein. For example, the original GRACE 352 mascon observations contain the measurement error and signal leakage at the gridded scale, which persists in the 353 reconstruction of TWSA when training via the statistical methods (Humphrey and Gudmundsson, 2019; Li et al., 2021a). 354 Unlike observed GRACE and reconstructed GRACE-like data, simulations from the models (GHMs, LSMs, and GCMs) are inherently featured by incomplete TWSA representation (Table S2). They are generally based on simplified hydrological 355 356 processes, resulting in the lack of certain TWSA components. For example, the widely used Noah and VIC models lack surface water and groundwater storage in TWSA (Scanlon et al., 2018). Similarly, GCMs can only simulate the snow water 357 358 and soil moisture within a limited depth from 2 to 10 m below the land surface (Xiong et al., 2022). This inadequate 359 representation of the land mass (and hence TWSA) in these global models can lead to regional bias in some aquifers with 360 overexploitation of the particular TWSA components (e.g., groundwater depletion in North China Plain). Despite the noted





inevitable uncertainties, a satisfactory accuracy in simulating TWS over large basins worldwide provides confidence in our
 results (Freedman et al., 2014; Pokhrel et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021).

363 Moreover, the eight CMIP6 GCMs are forced with the future projections of many meteorological variables such as 364 precipitation and air temperature, which have been reported to show underestimation or overestimation over the global land (Eyring et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2020). Despite employing bias correction with GRACE data, uncertainty from the forcing 365 366 and models can influence the accuracy of TWSA simulations (Xiong et al., 2022). Although it is challenging to explicitly attribute and quantify these uncertainties in the absence of a 'true' reference observation dataset, the ensemble averaging 367 method has been used to integrate the multi-source TWSA data. The global distributions of NRMSE between GRACE 368 369 observations and each ensemble member and their mean during April 2002-December 2014 show improved performance of 370 the latter (Figure S7). Three GRACE reconstructions present relatively lower error than the GHMs and LSMs, especially in 371 the high-latitude northern hemisphere, where snow, ice, and glaciers contribute more to TWS than other regions, which is 372 not considered in most of the global models. The ensemble-mean solution illustrates reasonably good accuracy with the NRMSE generally below 0.2, highlighting the reduced uncertainty compared with the individual solution. The GRACE 373 374 reconstructions compare better than other data because they are directly calibrated with the GRACE measurements during 375 2002-2017, while their performances need more validation beyond the GRACE era (i.e., prior to April 2002 and during July 2017-June 2018). Similar patterns are also evident from the probability density functions of NRMSE, of which there is an 376 377 overall negative deviation in the ensemble-mean relative to other solutions except for the CSR reconstruction (see Figure S8). This outperformance of the ensemble dataset is ascertained by the increased correlation and decreased standard deviation as 378 379 shown by the Taylor diagram (Figure S8). In addition, the comparison between GCM-modelled and GRACE-derived TWSA before and after bias correction in the past (April 2002-December 2014) is conducted (see Figure S9 and S10). The spatial 380 distributions clearly show that the ensemble mean of eight GCMs outperforms each member globally, particularly in 381 Australia, southern Africa, and North America. The outperformance become more obvious after bias coeection. An overall 382 383 decrease in NRMSE is also observed according to the probability density functions after performing bias correction, which is 384 also detected from the Taylor diagram results (see Figure S11). The largely reduced bias after bias correction and ensemble averaging give us condifence for the future projection of TWSA. 385

To investigate the influence of different models and datasets on the robustness of the re-examination for the DDWW 386 paradigm, we carried out an independent analysis at the individual member level (see Figure S12). For the historical period 387 388 (1985-2014), a clear overestimation of the CSR reconstructions is detected, with 42.4% of the area agreeing with the 389 DDWW pattern and 36.6% showing the opposite situation. Moreover, the modeled results from VIC and WGHM illustrate 390 the underestimation of the area validating the DDWW paradigm, reaching 15.6% (WGHM) and 12.2% (VIC), respectively. 391 Their proportion with the opposite DDWW paradigm is 10.2% (WGHM) and 17.8% (VIC), respectively. Therefore, it can be 392 concluded that the differences among different members of DATASET limitedly affect the evaluation of the DDWW during the historical period. In the future (2071-2100), the GFDL-ESM4 model presents overestimation but the IPSL-CM6A and 393 394 CanESM5 models have underestimation for different percentages compared with the ensemble mean. Specifically, the area





395 dominated by the DDWW paradigm changes from 8.9% (CanESM5) to 21.9% (GFDL-ESM4), while that showing the 396 opposite pattern ranges from 7.8% (CanESM5) to 14.8% (GFDL-ESM4) under the SSP126 scenario. For the SSP245 397 scenario, the DDWW-validated regions account for 7.4% (CanESM5) to 21.5% (GFDL-ESM4), the opposite pattern occurs 398 over a range from 9.7% (CanESM5) to 16.0% (GFDL-ESM4) of land. The proportion supporting the DDWW paradigm 399 varies from 10.4% (CanESM5) to 24.0% (GFDL-ESM4), while that presenting the opposite pattern ranges from 8.4% 400 (CanESM5) to 22.3% (GFDL-ESM4) under the SSP585 scenario. Overall, the comparatively large difference among various models might source from unforced internal climate variability of distinctive CMIP6 members and different emission 401 scenarios (Kumar et al., 2015). 402

403 Our choice of the significance level (i.e., 0.05) may also affect the rationale of the DDWW examination results, thus 404 different significance levels are alternatively tested (see Figure S13). At a significance level of 0.01, 22.2% of land area agrees well with the DDWW theory, while the 17.1% of area illustrates the opposite pattern during the period 1985-2014. As 405 for the 0.1 significance level, the DDWW-validated regions account for 30.6% of the total area, with 25.4% of land agreeing 406 407 with the opposite hypothesis. In the future period, a similar pattern is discovered that both DDWW-confirmed and DDWW-408 opposed regions are increasing on account of the enhancement of projected strength of radiative forcing, with the reduction 409 of the area showing insignificant trends in wetting and drying. However, the magnitudes of results at the 0.01 significance level are generally lower than that at the 0.1 significance level due to the different thresholds of detected trends in drying and 410 411 wetting. Considering the similar tendency with marginal effects of the varying choices of the p-value (e.g., 8.4% change in DDWW area from 0.01 to 0.1 level), our adopted significance level (i.e., 0.05) can reasonably explain the global trends of 412 413 dryness/wetness.

Despite the multisource uncertainties, our study provides important implications for the long-term trends in 414 dryness/wetness over global land in the past and future from the perspective of TWSA. Compared with other widely used 415 indexes that are purely derived from the hydrometeorological variables (e.g., SPI, SPEI, and PDSI) or incorporate a single 416 component of the TWSA (e.g., SSI, SGI, and SRI), our developed TWS-DSI describes the overall status of the land system, 417 418 which is jointly influenced by different components including soil moisture, river runoff, and groundwater that play different roles in the hydrological cycle (Tapley et al., 2019). Furthermore, the projected changes in global TWSA and associated 419 420 TWS-DSI improve our understanding of the large-scale hydrological response to climate change, particularly in regions with 421 strong human interventions, such as the south and east of Asia. Despite the magnitude bias from satellite products, 422 simulations of LSMs and GHMs, and GCMs projections, the ensemble averaging method has presented an effective and 423 efficient ability to alleviate the multi-source uncertainty, which can be further applied over data-sparse areas globally with limited in-situ observations like Africa and central Asia. In addition, the regional aggregation of the analysis based on the 424 425 IPCC AR6 SREX references regions provides an improved understanding of the TWSA dynamics in the past and valuable 426 inferences for policymakers and stakeholders for better water resources management in a changing environment (Iturbide et 427 al., 2020).





428 4 Conclusion

429 In this study, the historical TWSA series over global land during 1985-2014 was calculated from the ensemble mean of 430 nine model outputs, including three each from GHMs (VIC, WGHM, PCR-GLOBWB), LSMs (Noah, CLSM, CPC), and GRACE reconstructions (CSR, JPL, GSFC). Future TWSA projections from 2070 to 2100 under SSP126, SSP245, and 431 432 SSP585 scenarios were derived from the average of eight selected CMIP6 GCMs after bias-correction using GRACE observations. Subsequently, TWS-DSI was estimated to detect the long-term trends in dryness/wetness in the past and future 433 434 periods. Further, the DDWW paradigm has been re-examined with a significance level of 0.05 from the perspective of 435 terrestrial water storage change. The uncertainty sourced from different choices of models, methods, and confidence levels has been discussed systematically. The new findings are summarised as follows. 436

437 (1) During the historical period, 32.9% and 22.1% of land area present significant (p<0.05) drying and wetting trends, 438 respectively. During the future period under climate change, the proportion of drying areas (always ~10% higher than 439 wetting) with a significant slope increases from SSP126 (23.6%) to SSP585 (30.1%) scenario. A similar change is detected 440 in the percentage with significant wetting trends, which reaches 15.7%, 17.4%, and 23.4% under SSP126, SSP245, and 441 SSP585 scenarios, respectively.

(2) A total of 28.1% of the global land area shows the DDWW paradigm valid, in which 16.7% and 11.4% of the area is drying and wetting, respectively during the period 1985-2014. 23.3% of the area, however, shows the opposite pattern like "dry gets wetter" (DW, 8.4%) or "wet gets drier" (WD, 14.9%), respectively. The proportion of areas supporting the DDWW paradigm is 18.2%, 17.4%, and 20.7% under SSP126, SSP245, and SSP585 scenarios, respectively. Alternatively, the area opposing the DDWW paradigm achieves 17.9%, 22.4%, and 28.5%, respectively.

(3) The ensemble mean of TWSA generally compares better with GRACE observations during 2002-2014 than the individual solution, especially for the eight bias-corrected CMIP6 GCMs. Independent experiments based on the individual TWSA dataset suggest that the divergent choices of data source might lead to reasonable overestimations (CSR mascon) and underestimations (WGHM and VIC) for both the DDWW-agreed and DDWW-opposed patterns. Moreover, the use of distinctive GCMs suggests slightly overrated (GFDL-ESM4) and underrated (CanESM5) percentages of DDWW-pro and DDWW-con area in the future under multiple emission scenarios.

(4) Sensitivity analysis on different choices of significance levels from 0.01 to 0.1 indicate similar patterns, in which
22.2% (17.1%) of the land area supports (opposes) the DDWW theory historically under the 0.01 level, and the DDWWvalidated regions account for the 30.6% of total area with 25.4% of land agreeing with the opposite hypothesis under the 0.1
level. Such consistency is also evidenced by the projected TWS-DSI in the future under various scenarios.

457 New insights from the TWSA perspective highlight that the widely-used DDWW paradigm is still challenging in both 458 historical and future periods under climate change. In addition, our developed ensemble-mean method can effectively and 459 efficiently alleviate the uncertainty sourced from different data sources, implying an alternative way to assess the TWSA 460 variations over major basins globally. The regional aggregation of our study based on IPCC SREX reference regions can





461 provide important inferences for decision-makers and stakeholders for the sustainable management and efficient utilization 462 of water resources under global change.

463 Data Availability

464 The data used in this study are open access and available at: GRACE (CSR, http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace/; JPL, 465 http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov/grace; GSFC, https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/grace-mascons), GRACE reconstructions (CSR, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093492; JPL and GSFC, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-1153-2019), GHMs (WGHM, 466 https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/14/1037/2021/; VIC, https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas; PCR-GLOBWB, 467 https://globalhydrology.nl/research/models/pcr-globwb-2-0/), LSMs (Noah, https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas; 468 CPC. 469 https://www.psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.cpcsoil.html; CLSM, https://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas), GCMs (https://esgfnode.llnl.gov/projects/cmip6/). 470

471 Supplement

472 The supplement related to this article is available online

473 Author contributions

- 474 Jinghua Xiong conceived and designed the experiments. Jinghua Xiong performed the experiments. Jinghua Xiong and
- 475 Abhishek analyzed the data. Jinghua Xiong, Shenglian Guo, Abhishek, Jie Chen, and Jiabo Yin wrote and edited the paper.

476 Competing interests

477 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

478 Acknowledgments

This study was financially supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2021YFC3200303), the National Natural Science Foundation of China [U20A20317]. The numerical calculations in this paper have been done on the supercomputing system in the Supercomputing Center of Wuhan University.





482 **References**

- 483 Abhishek, Kinouchi, T., and Sayama, T.: A comprehensive assessment of water storage dynamics and hydroclimatic 484 extremes in the Chao Phraya River Basin during 2002 - 2020,J. Hydrol., 603, 485 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126868, 2021.
- AghaKouchak, A., 2014. A baseline probabilistic drought forecasting framework using standardized soil moisture index:
 application to the 2012 United States drought. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 18, 2485–2492. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-182485-2014
- Agutu, N.O., Awange, J.L., Ndehedehe, C., Mwaniki, M., 2020. Consistency of agricultural drought characterization over
 Upper Greater Horn of Africa (1982–2013): Topographical, gauge density, and model forcing influence. Sci. Total
- 491 Environ. 709, 135149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135149
- Allan, R.P., Soden, B.J., John, V.O., Ingram, W., Good, P., 2010. Current changes in tropical precipitation. Environ. Res.
 Lett. 5, 025205. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/5/2/025205
- Allen, C.D., Macalady, A.K., Chenchouni, H., Bachelet, D., McDowell, N., Vennetier, M., Kitzberger, T., Rigling, A.,
 Breshears, D.D., Hogg, E.H., Gonzalez, P., Fensham, R., Zhang, Z., Castro, J., Demidova, N., Lim, J.-H., Allard, G.,
 Running, S.W., Semerci, A., Cobb, N., 2010. A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals
- 497 emerging climate change risks for forests. For. Ecol. Manag. 259, 660–684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.09.001
- An, L., Wang, J., Huang, J., Pokhrel, Y., Hugonnet, R., Wada, Y., et al. (2021). Divergent Causes of Terrestrial Water
 Storage Decline Between Drylands and Humid Regions Globally. Geophysical Research Letters, 48(23).
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL095035
- 501 Barnard, D.M., Germino, M.J., Bradford, J.B., Connor, R.C., Andrews, C.M., Shriver, R.K. 2021. Are drought indices and 502 climate data good indicators of ecologically relevant soil moisture dynamics in drylands? Ecol. indic. 133, 108379.
- 503 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.108379
- Bouchard, F., Turner, K.W., MacDonald, L.A., Deakin, C., White, H., Farquharson, N., Medeiros, A.S., Wolfe, B.B., Hall,
 R.I., Pienitz, R., Edwards, T.W.D., 2013. Vulnerability of shallow subarctic lakes to evaporate and desiccate when
 snowmelt runoff is low. Geophys. Res. Lett. 40, 6112–6117. https://doi.org/10.1002/2013GL058635
- Byrne, M.P., O'Gorman, P.A., 2015. The Response of Precipitation Minus Evapotranspiration to Climate Warming: Why the
 "Wet-Get-Wetter, Dry-Get-Drier" Scaling Does Not Hold over Land. J. Clim. 28, 8078–8092.
 https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0369.1
- 510 Chen, J.L., Tapley, B., Rodell, M., Seo, K.W., Wilson, C., Scanlon, B.R., Pokhrel, Y., 2020. Basin-Scale River Runoff
- 511 Estimation From GRACE Gravity Satellites, Climate Models, and In Situ Observations: A Case Study in the Amazon
- 512 Basin. Water Resour. Res. 56, e2020WR028032. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028032





- Chang, L.-L., Yuan, R., Gupta, H. V., Winter, C. L., Niu, G.-Y. 2020. Why is the terrestrial water storage in dryland regions
 declining? A perspective based on Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment satellite observations and Noah land surface
- 515 model with multiparameterization schemes model simulations. Water Resources Research, 56, e2020WR027102.
- Chen, J.L., Wilson, C.R., Tapley, B.D., 2010. The 2009 exceptional Amazon flood and interannual terrestrial water storage
 change observed by GRACE. Water Resour. Res. 46, W12526. https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009383
- Chou, C., Neelin, J.D., Chen, C.-A., Tu, J.-Y., 2009. Evaluating the "Rich-Get-Richer" Mechanism in Tropical Precipitation
 Change under Global Warming. J. Clim. 22, 1982–2005. https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2471.1
- 520 Dai, A., 2011. Drought under global warming: a review. Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.-Clim. Change 2, 45–65. 521 https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.81
- 522 Derber, J., Parrish, D., Lord, S., 1991. The New Global Operational Analysis System at the National-Meteorological-Center.
- 523 Weather Forecast. 6, 538–547. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(1991)006<0538:TNGOAS>2.0.CO;2
- Döll, P., Müller Schmied, H., Schuh, C., Portmann, F.T., Eicker, A., 2014. Global-scale assessment of groundwater
 depletion and related groundwater abstractions: Combining hydrological modeling with information from well
 observations and GRACE satellites. Water Resour. Res. 50, 5698–5720. https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015595
- 527 Donat, M.G., Lowry, A.L., Alexander, L.V., O'Gorman, P.A., Maher, N., 2016. More extreme precipitation in the world's 528 dry and wet regions. Nat. Clim. Change 6, 508-+. https://doi.org/10.1038/NCLIMATE2941
- Durack, P.J., Wijffels, S.E., Matear, R.J., 2012. Ocean Salinities Reveal Strong Global Water Cycle Intensification During
 1950 to 2000. Science 336, 455–458. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1212222
- 531 Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G.A., Senior, C.A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R.J., Taylor, K.E., 2016. Overview of the Coupled
- Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. Geosci. Model Dev. 9, 1937–
 1958. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016
- Fan, Y., 2004. Climate Prediction Center global monthly soil moisture data set at 0.5° resolution for 1948 to present. J.
 Geophys. Res. 109, D10102. https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JD004345
- Feng, H., Zhang, M., 2015. Global land moisture trends: drier in dry and wetter in wet over land. Sci. Rep. 5, 18018.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep18018
- 538 Feng, W., Zhong, M., Lemoine, J.-M., Biancale, R., Hsu, H.-T., Xia, J., 2013. Evaluation of groundwater depletion in North
- China using the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) data and ground-based measurements: Groundwater
 Depletion In North China. Water Resour. Res. 49, 2110–2118. https://doi.org/10.1002/wrcr.20192
- 541 Freedman, F.R., Pitts, K.L., Bridger, A.F.C., 2014. Evaluation of CMIP climate model hydrological output for the
- 542 Mississippi River basin using GRACE satellite observations. J. Hydrol. 519, 3566–3577.
 543 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.10.036.
- 544 Gampe, D., Zscheischler, J., Reichstein, M., O'Sullivan, M., Smith, W.K., Sitch, S., Buermann, W., 2021. Increasing impact
- of warm droughts on northern ecosystem productivity over recent decades. Nat. Clim. Change 11, 772-+.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01112-8





- Gaughan, A.E., Waylen, P.R., 2012. Spatial and temporal precipitation variability in the Okavango-Kwando-Zambezi
 catchment, southern Africa. J. Arid Environ. 82, 19–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2012.02.007
- 549 Getirana, A., 2016. Extreme Water Deficit in Brazil Detected from Space. J. Hydrometeorol. 17, 591-599.
- 550 https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0096.1
- Greve, P., Orlowsky, B., Mueller, B., Sheffield, J., Reichstein, M., Seneviratne, S.I., 2014. Global assessment of trends in
 wetting and drying over land. Nat. Geosci. 7, 716–721. https://doi.org/10.1038/NGEO2247
- Greve, P., Seneviratne, S.I., 2015. Assessment of future changes in water availability and aridity. Geophys. Res. Lett. 42,
 5493–5499. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064127
- Guo, M., Yue, W., Wang, T., Zheng, N., Wu, L., 2021. Assessing the use of standardized groundwater index for quantifying
 groundwater drought over the conterminous US. J. Hydrol. 598, 126227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126227
- Haacker, E.M.K., Kendall, A.D., Hyndman, D.W., 2016. Water Level Declines in the High Plains Aquifer: Predevelopment
 to Resource Senescence. Groundwater 54, 231–242. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.12350
- Hao, Z., Singh, V.P., 2015. Drought characterization from a multivariate perspective: A review. J. Hydrol. 527, 668–678.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.05.031
- Hao, Z., Singh, V.P., Xia, Y., 2018. Seasonal Drought Prediction: Advances, Challenges, and Future Prospects. Rev.
 Geophys. 56, 108–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/2016RG000549
- Held, I.M., Soden, B.J., 2006. Robust responses of the hydrological cycle to global warming. J. Clim. 19, 5686–5699.
 https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3990.1
- Hempel, S., Frieler, K., Warszawski, L., Schewe, J., Piontek, F., 2013. A trend-preserving bias correction: the ISI-MIP
 approach. Earth Syst. Dyn. 4, 219–236. https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-4-219-2013
- Hu, B., Wang, L., Li, X., Zhou, J., & Pan, Y. (2021). Divergent Changes in Terrestrial Water Storage Across Global Arid
 and Humid Basins. Geophysical Research Letters. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091069
- Hu, Z., Chen, X., Chen, D., Li, J., Wang, S., Zhou, Q., Yin, G., Guo, N., 2019. "Dry gets drier, wet gets wetter": A case
 study over the arid regions of central Asia. Int. J. Climatol. 39, 1072–1091. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5863
- Huang, J., Ji, M., Xie, Y., Wang, S., He, Y., Ran, J., 2016. Global semi-arid climate change over last 60 years. Clim. Dyn. 46,
 1131–1150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2636-8
- 573 Humphrey, V., Gudmundsson, L., 2019. GRACE-REC: a reconstruction of climate-driven water storage changes over the
- 574 last century. Earth Syst. Sci. Data 11, 1153–1170. https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-1153-2019
- Huntington, T.G., 2006. Evidence for intensification of the global water cycle: Review and synthesis. J. Hydrol. 319, 83–95.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.07.003
- Iqbal, Z., Shahid, S., Ahmed, K., Ismail, T., Ziarh, G.F., Chung, E.-S., Wang, X., 2021. Evaluation of CMIP6 GCM rainfall
 in mainland Southeast Asia. Atmospheric Res. 254, 105525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2021.105525
- 579 Iturbide, M., Gutiérrez, J.M., Alves, L.M., Bedia, J., Cerezo-Mota, R., Cimadevilla, E., Cofiño, A.S., Di Luca, A., Faria,
- 580 S.H., Gorodetskaya, I.V., Hauser, M., Herrera, S., Hennessy, K., Hewitt, H.T., Jones, R.G., Krakovska, S., Manzanas, R.,





- Martínez-Castro, D., Narisma, G.T., Nurhati, I.S., Pinto, I., Seneviratne, S.I., van den Hurk, B., Vera, C.S. 2020. An
 update of IPCC climate reference regions for subcontinental analysis of climate model data: definition and aggregated
 datasets. Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12(4), 2959–2970. https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2959-2020
- Jin, S.G., Hassan, A.A., Feng, G.P., 2012. Assessment of terrestrial water contributions to polar motion from GRACE and hydrological models. J. Geodyn. 62, 40–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jog.2012.01.009
- Kim, Y.H., Min, S.K., Zhang, X., Sillmann, J., Sandstad, M. 2020. Evaluation of the CMIP6 multi-model ensemble for
 climate extreme indices. Weather Clim. Extremes, 29, p. 100269, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace:2020.100269
- 588 Krishnan, A., Bhaskaran, P.K., 2020. Skill assessment of global climate model wind speed from CMIP5 and CMIP6 and
- evaluation of projections for the Bay of Bengal. Clim. Dyn. 55, 2667–2687. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05406-z
 Kumar, S., Allan, R.P., Zwiers, F., Lawrence, D.M., Dirmeyer, P.A., 2015. Revisiting trends in wetness and dryness in the
- 591 presence of internal climate variability and water limitations over land. Geophys. Res. Lett. 42, 10867–10875.
 592 https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066858
- Lelieveld, J., Hadjinicolaou, P., Kostopoulou, E., Chenoweth, J., El Maayar, M., Giannakopoulos, C., Hannides, C., Lange,
 M.A., Tanarhte, M., Tyrlis, E., Xoplaki, E., 2012. Climate change and impacts in the Eastern Mediterranean and the
 Middle East. Clim. Change 114, 667–687. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-012-0418-4
- Li, F., Kusche, J., Chao, N., Wang, Z., Loecher, A., 2021. Long-Term (1979-Present) Total Water Storage Anomalies Over
 the Global Land Derived by Reconstructing GRACE Data. Geophys. Res. Lett. 48, e2021GL093492.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093492
- Li, Y., Zhang, Y., Ye, W., Zhang, X., 2021. Global Wet/Dry Patterns and Mechanisms Since the Last Glacial Maximum: A
 Key to Future Projection. Earths Future 9, e2020EF001907. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001907
- Liang, X., Lettenmaier, D., Wood, E., Burges, S., 1994. A Simple Hydrologically Based Model of Land-Surface Water and
 Energy Fluxes for General-Circulation Models. J. Geophys. Res.-Atmospheres 99, 14415–14428.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD00483
- Long, D., Shen, Y., Sun, A., Hong, Y., Longuevergne, L., Yang, Y., Li, B., Chen, L., 2014. Drought and flood monitoring
 for a large karst plateau in Southwest China using extended GRACE data. Remote Sens. Environ. 155, 145–160.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.08.006
- Luthcke, S.B., Sabaka, T.J., Loomis, B.D., Arendt, A.A., McCarthy, J.J., Camp, J., 2013. Antarctica, Greenland and Gulf of
 Alaska land-ice evolution from an iterated GRACE global mascon solution. J. Glaciol. 59, 613–631.
 https://doi.org/10.3189/2013JoG12J147
- 610 Milly, P.C.D., Dunne, K.A., Vecchia, A.V., 2005. Global pattern of trends in streamflow and water availability in a changing
- 611 climate. Nature 438, 347–350. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04312
- 612 Moreno-Jimenez, E., Plaza, C., Saiz, H., Manzano, R., Flagmeier, M., Maestre, F.T., 2019. Aridity and reduced soil
- 613 micronutrient availability in global drylands. Nat. Sustain. 2, 371–377. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0262-x





- 614 Müller Schmied, H., Cáceres, D., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Herbert, C., Niemann, C., Peiris, T.A., Popat, E., Portmann, F.T.,
- 615 Reinecke, R., Schumacher, M., Shadkam, S., Telteu, C.-E., Trautmann, T., Döll, P., 2021. The global water resources and
- 616 use model WaterGAP v2.2d: model description and evaluation. Geosci. Model Dev. 14, 1037–1079.
- 617 https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-1037-2021
- Ndehedehe, C.E., Awange, J.L., Kuhn, M., Agutu, N.O., Fukuda, Y., 2017. Climate teleconnections influence on West
 Africa's terrestrial water storage. Hydrol. Process. 31, 3206–3224. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.11237
- Ogou, F.K., Ojeh, V.N., Naabil, E., Mbah, C.I., 2021. Hydro-climatic and Water Availability Changes and its Relationship
 with NDVI in Northern Sub-Saharan Africa. Earth Syst. Environ. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-021-00260-3
- 622 Pokhrel, Y., Felfelani, F., Satoh, Y., Boulange, J., Burek, P., Gädeke, A., Gerten, D., Gosling, S.N., Grillakis, M.,
- 623 Gudmundsson, L., Hanasaki, N., Kim, H., Koutroulis, A., Liu, J., Papadimitriou, L., Schewe, J., Müller Schmied, H., 624 Stacke, T., Telteu, C.-E., Thiery, W., Veldkamp, T., Zhao, F., Wada, Y., 2021. Global terrestrial water storage and
- drought severity under climate change. Nat. Clim. Change 11, 226–233. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00972-w
- Polson, D., Hegerl, G.C., 2017. Strengthening contrast between precipitation in tropical wet and dry regions. Geophys. Res.
 Lett. 44, 365–373. https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071194
- Rajah, K., O'Leary, T., Turner, A., Petrakis, G., Leonard, M., Westra, S., 2014. Changes to the temporal distribution of daily
 precipitation. Geophys. Res. Lett. 41, 8887–8894. https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL062156
- Ramillien, G., Frappart, F., Seoane, L., 2014. Application of the Regional Water Mass Variations from GRACE Satellite
 Gravimetry to Large-Scale Water Management in Africa. Remote Sens. 6, 7379–7405. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs6087379
- 632 Rodell, M., Houser, P.R., Jambor, U., Gottschalck, J., Mitchell, K., Meng, C.J., Arsenault, K., Cosgrove, B., Radakovich, J.,
- Bosilovich, M., Entin, J.K., Walker, J.P., Lohmann, D., Toll, D., 2004. The global land data assimilation system. Bull. Am.
 Meteorol. Soc. 85, 381-+. https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-85-3-381
- Rodell, M., Velicogna, I., Famiglietti, J.S., 2009. Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion in India. Nature 460,
 999–1002. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08238
- Rodell, M., Famiglietti, J.S., Wiese, D.N., Reager, J.T., Beaudoing, H.K., Landerer, F.W., Lo, M.H. 2018. Emerging trends
 in global freshwater availability. Nature. 557(7707): 651–659. 10.1038/s41586-018-0123-1
- 639 Scanlon, B.R., Zhang, Z., Save, H., Sun, A.Y., Müller Schmied, H., van Beek, L.P.H., Wiese, D.N., Wada, Y., Long, D.,
- Reedy, R.C., 2018. Global models underestimate large decadal declining and rising water storage trends relative to
 GRACE satellite data. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 201704665.
- 642 Seneviratne, S.I., Luethi, D., Litschi, M., Schaer, C., 2006. Land-atmosphere coupling and climate change in Europe. Nature
 643 443, 205–209. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05095
- 644 Shugar, D.H., Burr, A., Haritashya, U.K., Kargel, J.S., Watson, C.S., Kennedy, M.C., Bevington, A.R., Betts, R.A., Harrison,
- 645 S., Strattman, K., 2020. Rapid worldwide growth of glacial lakes since 1990. Nat. Clim. Change 10, 939-+.
- 646 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0855-4





- Siebert, S., Burke, J., Faures, J.M., Frenken, K., Hoogeveen, J., Doell, P., Portmann, F.T., 2010. Groundwater use for
 irrigation a global inventory. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 14, 1863–1880. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-14-1863-2010
- Slette, I.J., Smith, M.D., Knapp, A.K., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., Camarero, J.J., Beguería, S., 2020. Standardized metrics are
 key for assessing drought severity. Glob. Change Biol. 26, e1–e3.
- key for assessing arought severity. Glob, change Blob, 20, er es.
- 51 Sutanudjaja, E.H., van Beek, R., Wanders, N., Wada, Y., Bosmans, J.H.C., Drost, N., van der Ent, R.J., de Graaf, I.E.M.,
- 652 Hoch, J.M., de Jong, K., Karssenberg, D., López López, P., Peßenteiner, S., Schmitz, O., Straatsma, M.W., Vannametee,
- E., Wisser, D., Bierkens, M.F.P., 2018. PCR-GLOBWB 2: a 5 arcmin global hydrological and water resources
 model. Geosci. Model Dev. 11, 2429–2453. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2429-2018
- Syed, T.H., Famiglietti, J.S., Rodell, M., Chen, J., Wilson, C.R., 2008. Analysis of terrestrial water storage changes from
 GRACE and GLDAS. Water Resour. Res. 44, W02433. https://doi.org/10.1029/2006WR005779
- 657 Tapley, B.D., Watkins, M.M., Flechtner, F., Reigber, C., Bettadpur, S., Rodell, M., Sasgen, I., Famiglietti, J.S., Landerer,
- 658 F.W., Chambers, D.P., Reager, J.T., Gardner, A.S., Save, H., Ivins, E.R., Swenson, S.C., Boening, C., Dahle, C., Wiese,
- D.N., Dobslaw, H., Tamisiea, M.E., Velicogna, I., 2019. Contributions of GRACE to understanding climate change. Nat.
- 660 Clim. Change 9, 358–369. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0456-2
- Trenberth, K.E., Dai, A., van der Schrier, G., Jones, P.D., Barichivich, J., Briffa, K.R., Sheffield, J., 2014. Global warming
 and changes in drought. Nat. Clim. Change 4, 17–22. https://doi.org/10.1038/NCLIMATE2067
- van der Wiel, K., Wanders, N., Selten, F.M., Bierkens, M.F.P., 2019. Added Value of Large Ensemble Simulations for
 Assessing Extreme River Discharge in a 2 °C Warmer World. Geophys. Res. Lett. 46, 2093–2102.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL081967
- Velicogna, I., Sutterley, T.C., van den Broeke, M.R., 2014. Regional acceleration in ice mass loss from Greenland and 666 667 Antarctica GRACE time-variable Res. 41, 8130-8137. using gravity data. Geophys. Lett. 668 https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL061052
- 669 Vicente-Serrano, S.M., Beguería, S., López-Moreno, J.I., 2010. A Multiscalar Drought Index Sensitive to Global Warming:
- 670TheStandardizedPrecipitationEvapotranspirationIndex.J.Clim.23,1696–1718.671https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI2909.1
- Wan, W., Zhao, J., Popat, E., Herbert, C., Döll, P., 2021. Analyzing the Impact of Streamflow Drought on Hydroelectricity
- 673 Production: A Global-Scale Study. Water Resour. Res. 57, e2020WR028087. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028087
- Wang, Z., Li, J., Lai, C., Wang, R.Y., Chen, X., Lian, Y., 2018. Drying tendency dominating the global grain production
 area. Glob. Food Secur.-Agric. Policy Econ. Environ. 16, 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.02.001
- 676 Wu, J., Miao, C., Tang, X., Duan, Q., He, X., 2018. A nonparametric standardized runoff index for characterizing
- hydrological drought on the Loess Plateau, China. Glob. Planet. Change 161, 53–65.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.12.006
- 679 Wu, R.-J., Lo, M.-H., Scanlon, B.R., 2021. The Annual Cycle of Terrestrial Water Storage Anomalies in CMIP6 Models
- 680 Evaluated against GRACE Data. J. Clim. 34, 8205–8217. https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0021.1





- Xing, Z., Fan, L., Zhao, L., De Lannoy, G., Frappart, F., Peng, J., Li, X., Zeng, J., Al-Yaari, A., Yang, K., Zhao, T., Shi,
 Jiancheng, Wang, M., Liu, X., Hu, G., Xiao, Y., Du, E., Li, R., Qiao, Y., Shi, Jianzong, Wen, J., Ma, M., Wigneron, J.-P.,
- 683 2021. A first assessment of satellite and reanalysis estimates of surface and root-zone soil moisture over the permafrost
- region of Qinghai-Tibet Plateau. Remote Sens. Environ. 265, 112666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112666
- 685 Xiong, J., Guo, S., Yin, J., Ning, Z., Zeng, Z., Wang, R. 2022. Projected changes in terrestrial water storage and associated 686 flood potential across the Yangtze River basin. Sci. Total Environ. 817, 152998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.152998 687
- 688 Xu, Z., Cheng, L., Liu, P., Makarieva, O., Chen, M., 2021. Detecting and quantifying the impact of long-term terrestrial
- water storage changes on the runoff ratio in the head regions of the two largest rivers in China. J. Hydrol. 601, 126668.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126668
- Yang, T., Ding, J., Liu, D., Wang, X., Wang, T., 2019. Combined Use of Multiple Drought Indices for Global Assessment of
 Dry Gets Drier and Wet Gets Wetter Paradigm. J. Clim. 32, 737–748. https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0261.1
- Yi, W., Feng, Y., Liang, S., Kuang, X., Yan, D., Wan, L., 2021. Increasing annual streamflow and groundwater storage in
 response to climate warming in the Yangtze River source region. Environ. Res. Lett. 16, 084011.
 https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac0f27
- Zeng, H., Wu, B., Zhang, N., Tian, F., Phiri, E., Musakwa, W., Zhang, M., Zhu, L., Mashonjowa, E., 2019. Spatiotemporal
 Analysis of Precipitation in the Sparsely Gauged Zambezi River Basin Using Remote Sensing and Google Earth Engine.
 Remote Sens. 11(24), 2977. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11242977
- Zhao, M., Geruo, A., Velicogna, I., Kimball, J.S., 2017. Satellite Observations of Regional Drought Severity in the
 Continental United States Using GRACE-Based Terrestrial Water Storage Changes. J. Clim. 30, 6297–6308.
 https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0458.1
- 702 Zhao, M., Geruo, A., Zhang, J., Velicogna, I., Liang, C., Li, Z., 2021. Ecological restoration impact on total terrestrial water
- 703 storage. Nat. Sustain. 4, 56-U85. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00600-7