Supporting information for

A statistical-dynamical approach for probabilistic prediction

of sub-seasonal precipitation anomalies over 17 hydroclimatic regions in China

Yuan LI1, Zhiyong WU1*, Zhiwei ZHU2, Quan J. WANG3

¹ College of Hydrology and Water Resources, Hohai University, Nanjing 210098, China

² Key Laboratory of Meteorological Disaster, Ministry of Education (KLME)/ Collaborative Innovation Center on Forecast and Evaluation of Meteorological Disasters (CIC-FEMD)/Joint International Research Laboratory of Climate and Environment Change (ILCEC), Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing 210044, China

³ Department of Infrastructure Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Australia

Correspondence to: Zhiyong WU (wzyhhu@gmail.com)

Contents of this file

Figure S1 to S4 show the correlation maps between pentad mean 10-60 d signals of U850, H200, H500, H850 and precipitation over Region 1 (Inland rivers in Xinjiang).

Figure S5 to S8 show temporal correlation coefficient (TCC) of the ensemble mean of U850, H200, H500, H850 intraseasonal signals derived from the ECMWF model compared to the ERA5 reanalysis data in May.

Figure S9 to S13 show the CRPS skill score of calibration model, bridging models, and merged forecasts at different lead times in June, July, August, September, and October.



Figure S1. Correlation coefficient between pentad mean 10–60 d signals of U850 and precipitation over Region 1 (inland rivers in Xinjiang) in different months. Correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at the 5 % level are shaded.



Figure S2. Same as Figure S1, but for H200.



Figure S3. Same as Figure S1, but for H500.







Figure S5. Temporal correlation coefficient (TCC) of the ensemble mean of U850 intraseasonal signals derived from the ECMWF model compared to the ERA5 reanalysis data in May. Correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at the 5 % level are shaded.



Figure S6. Same as Figure S5, but for H200.







Figure S8. Same as Figure S5, but for H850.



Figure S9. CRPS skill score of calibration model, bridging models, and merged forecasts at different lead times in June.



Figure S10. Same as Figure S9, but in July.



-10 0 10 20 CRPS skill score (%) -20

Figure S11. Same as Figure S9, but in August.



Figure S12. Same as Figure S9, but in September.



Figure S13. Same as Figure S9, but in October.