Review of Gridded Climate Products and Their Use in Hydrological Analyses Reveals Overlaps, Gaps, and Need for More Objective Approach to Selecting Model Forcing Datasets

Kyle R. Mankin[1], Sushant Mehan[2], Timothy R. Green[1], David M. Barnard[1,3]

[1]Water Management & Systems Research Unit, USDA-Agricultural Research Service, Fort Collins, CO, USA
[2]Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Department, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD, USA
[3]Deparment of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

Correspondence to: Kyle R. Mankin (kyle.mankin@usda.gov)

Abstract. Climate forcing data accuracy drives performance of hydrologic models and analyses, yet each investigator needs to select from among the numerous gridded climate dataset options and justify their selection for use in a particular hydrologic model or analysis. This study aims to provide a comprehensive compilation and overview of gridded datasets (precipitation, air temperature, humidity, windspeed, solar radiation) and considerations for historical climate product selection criteria for hydrologic modelling and analyses based on a review and synthesis of previous studies conducting dataset intercomparisons. All datasets summarized here span at least the conterminous U.S. (CONUS), and many are continental or global in extent. Gridded datasets built on ground-based observations (G; $n=20$), satellite imagery (S; $n=20$), and/or reanalysis products (R; $n=23$) are compiled and described, with focus on the characteristics that hydrologic investigators may find useful in discerning acceptable datasets (variables, coverage, resolution, accessibility, latency). We provide best-available-science recommendations for dataset selection based on a thorough review, interpretation, and synthesis of 29 recent studies (past 10 years) that compared performance of various gridded climate datasets for hydrologic analyses. No single best source of gridded climate data exists, but we identified several common themes that may help guide dataset selection in future studies: 1) Gridded daily temperature datasets improved when derived over regions with greater station density. Similarly, 2) gridded daily precipitation data were more accurate when derived over regions with higher-density station data, when used in spatially less-complex terrain, and when corrected using ground-based data. 3) In mountainous regions as well as humid regions, R precipitation datasets generally performed better than G when underlying data had low station density, but for higher station densities, there was no difference. 4) G datasets generally were more accurate in representing precipitation and temperature data than S or R datasets, though this did not always translate into better streamflow modelling. We conclude that hydrologic analyses would benefit from guided dataset selection by investigators, including justification for selecting a specific dataset, and improved gridded datasets that retain dependencies among climate variables and better represent small-scale spatial variability of climate variables in complex topography. Based on this study, the authors' overall recommendations to hydrologic modelers are to select the gridded dataset (from Tables 1, 2, and 3) (a) having spatial and temporal resolutions that match modelling scales, (b) that are primarily (G) or secondarily (SG, RG) derived from ground-based observations, (c) with

sufficient spatial and temporal coverage for the analysis, (d) with adequate latency for analysis objectives, and (e) that includes all climate variables of interest, so as to better represent interdependencies.

1 Introduction

35 Hydrologists are faced with a dizzying variety of options when selecting climate data for water resource analyses. Climate drives hydrological processes, and accurate climate forcing data are essential for meaningful water resource investigations and modelling. However, it is arguable that no single source of climate data is universally appropriate, leading to a dearth of studies that make an effort to justify their dataset selection. Over recent decades, while ground-based observations from weather stations have decreased (Sun et al., 2018; Strangeways, 2006), gridded datasets built on ground-based observations, satellite
40 imagery, and reanalysis products have increased.

A well-maintained, long-term weather station, though not error-free (Gebremichael, 2010; Strangeways, 2006), provides direct, in-situ point measurements for a location. However, most hydrologic analyses address processes at locations and scales for which the point weather station data may not be representative. Gridded datasets offer several advantages over point station data (Essou et al., 2016a): gridded datasets are relatively easy to use, have uniform spatial coverage, provide consistent
45 coverage over time (avoids the problem of non-reporting stations), and rarely have missing data. Uniform grids with temporal consistency allow simple averaging across a domain. However, gridded datasets often are not available in real-time (i.e., data latency), which might pose limitations for some hydrologic analyses (e.g., snowmelt and runoff forecasting, operational water resource decision making).

Many studies (29 of which are reviewed in Section 4 of this article) have intercompared the accuracy of particular subsets of
50 these gridded climate datasets for various regions, settings, and time frames across the globe with various insights and conclusions. However, no cataloguing and synthesis of these studies has been completed to date, presenting an important knowledge gap that may hinder well-informed dataset selection. To address this need, we completed a search of "intercomparison" AND "gridded AND climate AND data", which yielded 202 documents using Scopus. Excluding "climate change" reduced this to 100 documents, and excluding "CMIP" produced 77 documents. Even with these filters, most studies
55 focus on a limited number of datasets, lack generalizable recommendations, and do not consider the functional implications of dataset limitations on end-users' hydrologic analysis. The present study aims to provide a comprehensive compilation, overview, and considerations for selection of gridded datasets with focus on selection for hydrologic modelling and analyses. Our focus is on historical datasets (not climate projections) at the conterminous U.S. (CONUS) to global extents.

2 Gridded Dataset Sources

60 Gridded historical climate datasets can be categorized as ground-based (G), satellite-based (S), or reanalysis-based (R) according to the sources of data and methods used in their derivation. Many datasets integrate multiple data sources and

methods in deriving the dataset; in this article, the primary data source/method in integrated datasets is listed first followed by secondary method(s) (e.g., SR, RG, RSG). We focus on gridded datasets available for five climatological variables that are essential to hydrological analyses: precipitation (P), air temperature (T), atmospheric moisture (relative humidity [rh], specific humidity [sh], dew-point T [Tdp], or vapor pressure [Vp]), windspeed (u), and solar radiation (Rs) or associated metrics (cloud cover [cc] or sky cover [sc]). Particular emphasis is on datasets that provide gridded P, a highly variable and critical driver in hydrological analyses. For more details, the reader is directed to an informative review of global P datasets, including a discussion of these dataset sources and estimation procedures (Sun et al., 2018).

Although the grid resolution of each data product is clear, the support scale is generally vague. That is, the grid centroid is often treated as a point, which is then interpolated or regionalized to obtain areal averaged values at the scale of hydrologic model resolution (e.g., a hydrologic response unit or HRU). However, if the gridded data represent grid-scale (e.g., 4 km by 4 km) areal averages, this should be considered during interpolation to the HRU scale. Scaling within and across grid cells has been explored for gridded soil moisture (Hoehn et al., 2017), but remains an issue for gridded climate products. In this study, we mention this as a precaution but do not offer scaling solutions.

2.1 Ground-based (G)

Ground-based gridded datasets (**Table 1**) are derived directly from observational data, typically from weather station networks. Various methods are used to interpolate data between stations and may account for orographic effects, lake effects, and other mesoscale meteorologic phenomena. These datasets benefit from direct application of data with relatively well-defined biases and uncertainty inherited from the instrumentation characteristics and errors. For example, P data collection has well-known errors at the station level from sources such as wind, evaporation, wetting, splashing, site location, instrument error, spatiotemporal variation in drop-size distribution, and frozen versus liquid P (Sun et al., 2018). Interpolating these data to a grid adds additional uncertainty to the extent that station density inadequately captures spatial variability of the climatic variable across the domain. Minimum recommended station densities vary by physiographic unit (mountains, plains, etc.) from 1 to 4 stations per 1000 km^2 (WMO, 2008). Essou et al. (2017) noted that most of the 316 watersheds in their comprehensive Canadian study had less than 1 station per 1000 km^2, indicating a wider global concern. Increased station density generally improves gridded dataset quality, but it may be impractical to adequately cover regions with complex topography, localized convective storms, heat islands, blowing snow, or other micrometeorological heterogeneity. For example, snow gauge undercatch due to high windspeeds is an especially pronounced phenomenon that challenges accurate characterization of water storage in snow dominated basins (Fassnacht, 2004; Panahi & Behrangi, 2020). Station density and coverage also change over time as old stations are deprecated or new stations added, complicating interpolation schemes and often disproportionately diminishing coverage in remote areas. Sun et al. (2018) noted that the number of global stations in the GPCC v7 dataset has changed from 10,900 stations in 1901, to a maximum of 49,470 in 1970, decreasing to 30,000 in 2005, and only 10,000 in 2012. This recent decline in station data not only impacts G datasets but also S and R datasets that rely on station data in their

dataset development. Uncertainty associated with these temporal changes in sampling density are further complicated by

95   nonstationarity of climate and accelerated climate change in recent decades.

Table 1. Summary of ground-based (G) gridded datasets.

Dataset Name	Data Source	Variables	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution	Spatial Coverage	Temporal Coverage	Latency	Data Format	Reference [Data Availability]
BEST	GR	T	0.25°, 1°	monthly	Land Global	1753-NP 1850-NP	months	NetCDF	Rohde & Hausfather (2020) [https://berkeleyearth.org/data/]
CPC	G	P	0.25°	24 h	Land	1948-NP	1 d	NetCDF	Chen et al. (2008), Xie et al. (2007) [https://ftp.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/precip/CPC_UNI_PRCP/GAUGE_CONUS/]
CPC-Unified	G	P	0.5°	24 h	Land	1979-NP	1 d	NetCDF	Chen et al. (2008) [https://ftp.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/precip/CPC_UNI_PRCP/GAUGE_GLB/RT]
CRU-TS v4.6	G	P, T	0.5°	monthly	Land	1901-2021	irreg.	NetCDF	Harris et al. (2020) [https://data.ceda.ac.uk/badc/cru/data/cru_ts/cru_ts_4.06/data]
Daymet	G	P, T, Vp, Rs	1 km	24 h	CONUS	1980-NP	CY	NetCDF	Thornton et al. (2021) [https://thredds.daac.ornl.gov/thredds/catalog/ornldaac/2129/catalog.html]
EMDNA	GR	P, T	11 km	24 h	N Amer	1979-2018	—	NetCDF	Tang et al. (2021) [https://gwfnet.net/Metadata/Record/T-2020-11-25-i1Fwxi32sBMU2GDhUZ6gAJEg]
GLDAS	GS	P, T, sh, u, Rs	0.125°	3 h	Global	2000-NP	2 mo	NetCDF	Rodell et al. (2004) [https://hydro1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/opendap/GLDAS/]
GPCC v7	G	P	0.25°, 0.5°, 1.0°, 2.5°	monthly	Land	1891-2020	—	NetCDF	Schneider et al. (2017, 2016) [https://opendata.dwd.de/climate_environment/GPCC/html/fulldata-monthly_v2022_doi_download.html]
GPCC-FDD	G	P	1.0°	24 h	Land	1982-2020	—	NetCDF	Schamm et al. (2014) [https://opendata.dwd.de/climate_environment/GPCC/html/fulldata-daily_v2022_doi_download.html]
gridMet	G	P, T, sh, u, Rs	4 km	24-h	CONUS	1979-NP	60 d	NetCDF	Abatzoglou (2013) [https://www.northwestknowledge.net/metdata/data/]
Livneh	G	P, T, u	0.0625°	24 h	CONUS	1915-2011	—	NetCDF	Livneh et al. (2013) [https://psl.noaa.gov/thredds/catalog/Datasets/livneh/metvars/catalog.html]
nClimGrid	G	P, T	48.3 km	24-h	CONUS	1951-NP	1 d	NetCDF	Durre et al. (2022) [https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/data/nclimgrid-daily/archive/]
NDFD 1-d[a] NDFD 7-d[a]	G	T, Tdp, u, sc	5 km[b]	3 h[b] 6 h	CONUS	2003-NP	NRT	GRIB2	Glahn & Ruth (2003) [https://vlab.noaa.gov/web/mdl/ndfd-grid-data]
NLDAS-2	GR	P, T, sh, u, Rs	0.125°	1 h	N Amer	1979-NP	4 d	GRIB, NetCDF	Xia et al. (2012a, b) [https://hydro1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/data/NLDAS/]

PRISM	G	P, T, rh	4 km	24 h	CONUS	1895-NP	1 yr	ASCII, NetCDF, GeoTIFF	Daly et al. (2008) [https://prism.oregonstate.edu/explorer/]
RTMA	G	P, T, Tdp, u, cc	2.5°	1 h	CONUS	2006-NP	NRT	GRIB2	DePondeca et al. (2011) [https://www.nco.ncep.noaa.gov/pmb/products/rtma/]
Santa-Clara	G	P, T	0.125°	24 h	CONUS	1949-2010	—	ASCII, NetCDF	Maurer et al. (2002) [https://www.engr.scu.edu/~emaurer/gridded_obs/index_gridded_obs.html]
TopoWx	GR	T	0.8 km	24 hr	CONUS	1948-2017	—	NetCDF	Oyler et al. (2015) [https://www.scrim.psu.edu/resources/topowx/]
UDEL	G	P, T	0.5°	monthly	Land	1900-2014	—	NetCDF	Matsuura et al. (2023) [https://psl.noaa.gov/data/gridded/data.UDel_AirT_Precip.html]

Data Source: G=ground-based observations (with interpolation), S=satellite, R=reanalysis. **Variables**: P=precipitation, T=air temperature, rh=relative humidity, sh=specific humidity, Tdp=dew-point T, Vp=vapor pressure, u=windspeed, Rs=solar radiation, sc=sky cover, cc=cloud cover. **Spatial Resolution**: 1.0° latitude=111 km, 1.0° longitude=111 km at 0° latitude and 85 km at 40° latitude. **Spatial Coverage**: Land=Global land surfaces only (not ocean surfaces), CONUS=contiguous U.S. **Temporal Coverage**: NP=near present. **Latency**: NRT = near-real-time, CY=Available each calendar year, —=Static dataset. **Data Format**: NetCDF=Network Common Data Form, ASCII=American Standard Code for Information Interchange, GRIB=Gridded Binary, GeoTIFF=Georeferenced Tagged Image File Format. [a]NDFD provides 1- to 7-d lead-time forecasts. [b]NDFD spatial resolution changes to 2.5 km and 1-d forecast temporal resolution changes to 1 h after 08/19/2014.

2.2 Satellite-based (S)

Satellite-based gridded datasets (**Table 2**) are derived from various sensors onboard geostationary satellites (visible/infrared [IR] sensors) with rapid sampling frequency (30 minutes or less) and low-Earth orbit satellites (visible/IR, passive microwave [MW], and active MW) with lower temporal sampling frequency (Sun et al., 2018). Compared to G datasets, S datasets provide spatially homogenous coverage (the entire area within the coverage field has similar data density) and temporally continuous records but are limited in temporal coverage to the satellite era, with the first Television and IR Observation Satellite (TIROS) launched in 1960. Visible/IR methods detect cloud-top surface conditions and correlate colder/brighter cloud tops to greater convection and more P. Passive MW methods detect precipitation-sized particles, which provides a more-direct measure of P. Active MW methods allow measurement of the instantaneous three-dimensional structure of rainfall. Methods have been developed to merge these datasets to capitalize on the higher accuracy of MW methods and greater temporal frequency of visible/IR methods and increase overall product accuracy (Sun et al., 2018).

A review by Maggioni et al. (2016) described satellite instruments and compared many of the algorithms used in current satellite P datasets. They found S datasets have larger overestimation bias in the warm season and lower positive bias in the cold season. Satellite datasets have high probability of capturing warm-season convective events; as a result, in the central

120 U.S., for example, S datasets have better agreement with ground-radar products than rain-gauge stations, which can miss localized convective storms. Satellite-based products tend to underestimate intense rainfall during extreme hurricane events; S also tends to underestimate light P at high elevations and overestimate P at low elevations in regions of complex topography in northwestern Mexico and the Appalachian Mountains, all of which may be attributed to IR sensors' lack of discrimination between raining and non-raining clouds.

125 **Table 2. Summary of satellite-based (S) gridded datasets.**

Dataset Name	Data Source	Variables	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution	Spatial Coverage	Temporal Coverage	Latency	Data Format	Reference [Data Availability]
CHIRP v2	SR	P	0.05°	24 h	Land, <50°	1981-NP	2 d	GeoTIFF	Funk et al. (2015) [https://data.chc.ucsb.edu/products/CHIRP/]
CHIRPS v2	SRG	P	0.05°	24 h	Land, <50°	1981-NP	1 mo	GeoTIFF	Funk et al. (2015) [https://data.chc.ucsb.edu/products/CHIRPS-2.0/]
CMORPH v1	S	P	0.07°, 0.25°	0.5 h, 24 h	<60°	1998-NP	5-6 mo	NetCDF	Joyce et al. (2004), Xie et al. (2017) [https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/data/cmorph-high-resolution-global-precipitation-estimates/; https://noaa-cdr-precip-cmorph-pds.s3.amazonaws.com/index.html]
CMORPH-BLD v1	SG	P	0.25°	24 h	<60°	2003-NP	1 mo	GRIB, NetCDF	Sun et al. (2016) [https://ftp.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/precip/CMORPH_V1.0/BLD/]
CMORPH-CRT v1	SG	P	0.07°, 0.25°	0.5 h, 24 h	<60°	1998-2015	—	GRIB, NetCDF	Joyce et al. (2004), Xie et al. (2017) [https://ftp.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/precip/CMORPH_V1.0/CRT/]
GPCPDAY/MON	SG	P	0.5°	24 h	Global	2000-2021	—	NetCDF	Huffman et al. (2023) [https://measures.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/data/GPCP/]
GPCP-1DD v1.2	SG	P	1.0°	24 h	Global	1996-2015	—	NetCDF	Huffman et al. (2001) [https://rda.ucar.edu/datasets/ds728.3/dataaccess/]
GPM	SG	P	0.1°	0.5 h	<60°	2014-NP	24 h	HDF5, NetCDF	Hou et al. (2014) [https://gpm1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/data/]
GSMaP v5/6	S	P	0.1°	1 h	<60°	2000-NP	30 min	ASCII, GeoTIFF	Ushio et al. (2009), Kubota et al. (2020) [https://sharaku.eorc.jaxa.jp/GSMaP/]
IMERG-Early v6	S	P	0.1°	0.5 h	Global	2000-NP	4 h	HDF5, NetCDF	Tan et al. (2019), Huffman et al. (2020a,b) [https://gpm1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov/data/GPM_L3/GPM_3IMERGDE.06/]
IMERG-Late v6	S	P	0.1°	0.5 h	Global	2000-NP	14 h	HDF5, NetCDF	Tan et al. (2019), Huffman et al. (2020a,b) [https://gpm1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.g

									ov/data/GPM_L3/GPM_3IMERGDL.0 6/]
IMERG-Final v6	SG	P	0.1°	0.5 h	Global	2000-NP	3.5 mo	HDF5, NetCDF	Tan et al. (2019), Huffman et al. (2020a,b) [https://gpm1.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.g ov/data/GPM_L3/GPM_3IMERGDF.0 6/]
MSWEP v2.2	SRG	P	0.1°	3 h	Global	1979-NP	3 h	NetCDF	Beck et al. (2017a, 2019) [https://www.gloh2o.org/mswep/]
NSRDB	SG	P, T, rh, u, Rs	4 km	1 h	CONUS	1998-2021	—	HDF5	Sengupta et al. (2018), Buster et al. (2022) [https://nsrdb.nrel.gov/data-sets/how-to-access-data]
PERSIANN	SR	P	0.25°	1 h	<60°	2000-NP	1 h	NetCDF	Sorooshian et al. (2000) [https://persiann.eng.uci.edu/CHRSd ata/PERSIANN/]
PERSIANN-CCS	S	P	0.04°	1 h	<60°	2003-NP	1-2 d	NetCDF	Hong et al. (2004) [https://persiann.eng.uci.edu/CHRSd ata/PERSIANN-CCS/]
PERSIANN-CDR	SG	P	0.25°	24 h	<60°	1983-NP	1 mo	NetCDF	Ashouri et al. (2015) [https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/data/pr ecipitation-persiann/access/2023/]
SM2RAIN-ASCAT	S	P	0.1°	24 h	Land	2007-2021	—	NetCDF	Brocca et al. (2014) [https://zenodo.org/records/795010 3]
TMPA-3B42 v7	SG	P	0.25°	3 h	<60°	2000-2019	—	NetCDF	Huffman et al. (2007), Gebremichael et al. (2010) [https://disc2.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.go v/opendap/TRMM_L3/TRMM_3B42 _Daily.7/]
TMPA-3B42RT v7	S	P	0.25°	3 h	<60°	1998-2019	—	NetCDF	Huffman et al. (2007), Gebremichael et al. (2010) [https://disc2.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.go v/opendap/TRMM_RT/TRMM_3B42 RT.7/]

Data Source: G=ground-based observations (with interpolation), S=satellite, R=reanalysis. **Variables**: P=precipitation, T=air temperature, rh=relative humidity, u=windspeed, Rs=solar radiation. **Spatial Resolution**: 1.0° latitude=111 km, 1.0° longitude=111 km at 0° latitude and 85 km at 40° latitude. **Spatial Coverage**: Land=Global land surfaces only (not ocean surfaces). **Temporal Coverage**: NP=near present. **Latency**: —=Static dataset. **Data Format**: NetCDF=Network Common Data Form, HDF5=Hierarchical Data Format 5, ASCII=American Standard Code for Information Interchange, GRIB=Gridded Binary, GeoTIFF=Georeferenced Tagged Image File Format.

2.3 Reanalysis-based (R)

Reanalysis-based gridded datasets (**Table 3**) are synthesized from process-based climate models, often together with G and/or S observational data, with the goal of generating gridded datasets with spatially homogenous data density that are temporally continuous. A precipitation forecast is generated from complex interactions of *a priori* predictions from a physically based, dynamical process model (that can often account for orographic effects in topographically complex regions) and ingested observational data. Reanalysis systems use various models, observational datasets, and assimilation methods; can generate

many climate variables with inter-dependent variable consistency; and provide near-real-time datasets with latency periods from hours to months. Accuracy of R methods may be limited by the changing availability of observational data and biases in observations and models.

140 Reanalysis datasets have been found to better capture winter P resulting from large-scale systems than summer P with greater influence of localized convective storms (Massmann, 2020; Beck et al., 2019). Similarly, Beck et al. (2017b) confirmed the conclusions of several other studies (Barrett et al., 1994; Xie and Arkin, 1997; Adler et al., 2001; Ebert et al., 2007; Massari et al., 2017) that demonstrate reanalysis underperformed MW- and IR-based datasets in the tropics and outperformed them in colder regions (> 40° latitude). Reanalysis demonstrated reduced bias compared to S datasets, with greater ranges of bias

145 among all datasets in areas with complex topography (Rockies, Andes, and Hindu Kush) and arid regions (Sahara and the Arabian and Gobi deserts) (Beck et al., 2017b).

Table 3. Summary of reanalysis-based (R) gridded datasets.

Dataset Name	Data Source	Variables	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution	Spatial Coverage	Temporal Coverage	Latency	Data Format	Reference [Data Availability]
20CR	R	P, T, rh, u, Rs	1.0°	3 h, 24 h	Global	1836-2015	—	NetCDF	Compo et al. (2011) [https://psl.noaa.gov/thredds/catalog/Datasets/20thC_ReanV3/miscSI/catalog.html]
CERA-20C	R	P, T, rh, u	0.125°	24 h	Global	1901-2010	—	NetCDF	Laloyaux et al. (2018) [https://apps.ecmwf.int/archive-catalogue/?class=ep]
ERA-20C	R	P	125 km	3 h	Global	1900-2010	—	GRIB	Poli et al. (2016) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/aggregations/g/ds626.0/5/catalog.html]
ERA5	R	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.25°	1 h	Global	1979-NP	6 d	GRIB, NetCDF	Hersbach et al. (2018, 2020) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/files/g/ds633.0/catalog.html]
ERA-Interim	RS	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.75°	3 h	Global	1979-NP	months	GRIB	Dee et al. (2011) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/catalog_ds627.0.html]
EWEMBI v1.1	RG	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.5°	24 h	Global	1976-2013	—	NetCDF	Warszawski et al. (2014) [https://data.isimip.org/10.5880/pik.2019.004]
GFD-HYDRO	RSG	P	0.5°	3 h	Global	1979-NP	5 d	NetCDF	Berg et al. (2018, 2021) [https://zenodo.org/records/3871707]
GRASP	R	P, T	1.125°	24 h	Global	1961-2010	—	?	Iizumi et al. (2014) [Available upon request.]
GSMaP-RNL	RG	P	0.1°	24 h	<60°	2001-2013	—	NetCDF	Kubota et al. (2007), Iguchi et al. (2009) [https://thredds-x.ipsl.fr/thredds/catalog/FROGS/GSMAP-gauges-RNLv6.0/catalog.html; https://thredds-

Name	Type	Variables	Resolution	Time step	Coverage	Years	Latency	Format	Reference/URL
									x.ipsl.fr/thredds/catalog/FROGs/GSMAP-nogauges-RNLv6.0/catalog.html]
GSMaP-std v6	RG	P	0.1°	24 h	<60°	2001-2013	—	NetCDF, GeoTIFF	Ushio et al. (2019), Kubota et al. (2020) [https://sharaku.eorc.jaxa.jp/GSMaP/]
JRA-55	R	P	0.56°	3 h	Global	1958-NP	days	GRIB	Kobayashi et al. (2015), Harada et al. (2016) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/catalog_ds628.0.html]
MERRA	R	P, T, sh, u; Rs	0.67°x0.5°; 1.0°x1.25°	1 h (6 h?); 3 h	Global	1979-2016	—	HDF	Rienecker et al. (2011) [https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets?page=1&project=MERRA]
MERRA-2	RSG	P, T, sh, u	0.625°x0.5°	1 h	Global	1980-NP	2 mo	NetCDF	Gelaro et al. (2017), Reichle et al. (2017) [https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets?keywords=MERRA-2%20Products&page=1]
NASA-POWER	RS	Rs, P, T	0.625°x0.5°, 1.0°	24 h	Global	1980-NP	14 h - 3 mo	ASCII, CSV, NetCDF, GeoTIFF	Zhang et al. (2009) [https://power.larc.nasa.gov/data-access-viewer/]
NCEP-CFSR	RS	P, T, sh, u, Rs	0.3°, 0.5°, 1.0°, 1.9°, 2.5°	6 h	Global	1979-2011	—	GRIB	Saha et al. (2010), Decker et al. (2012) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/files/g/ds093.0/catalog.html]
NCEP-CFS v2	RS	P, T, sh, u, Rs	0.2°, 0.5°, 1.0°, 2.5°	6 h	Global	2011-NP	NRT - days	GRIB	Saha et al. (2014) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/files/g/ds094.0/catalog.html]
NCEP-NARR	RG	P, T, rh, u, Rs	32 km	3 h	N Amer <50°	1979-NP	months	GRIB	Mesinger et al. (2006) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/files/g/ds608.0/catalog.html]
PGMFD v2.1	RG	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.5°	24 h	Global	1901-2012	—	NetCDF	Sheffield et al. (2006) [https://data.isimip.org/search/simulation_round/ISIMIP2a/product/InputData/climate_forcing/princeton/]
PGF v3	RG	P, T	0.25°	3 h	Global	1948-2012	—	NetCDF	Sheffield et al. (2006) [https://hydrology.soton.ac.uk/data/pgf/]
S14FD	R	P, T	0.5°	24 h	Global	1958-2013	—	NetCDF	Iizumi et al. (2017) [https://search.diasjp.net/en/dataset/S14FD]
WFDEI	R	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.5°	3 h	Global	1979-2016	—	NetCDF	Weedon et al. (2014) [https://thredds.rda.ucar.edu/thredds/catalog/files/g/ds314.2/catalog.html]
WFD-20C	R	P, T, rh, u, Rs	0.5°	6 h	Global	1901-2016	—	NetCDF	Weedon et al. (2011) [https://data.isimip.org/search/simu

									lation_round/ISIMIP2a/product/InputData/climate_forcing/watch-wfdei/; https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/a83eef6d-30d3-479d-90b3-40c09c26d42c/watch-forcing-data-wfd-20th-century-tair-air-temperature-1901-2001]
WRFCONUS404	R	P, T, rh, u, Rs	4 km	1 h	CONUS	1980-2021	—	NetCDF	Liu et al. (2017) Rasmussen et al. (2023) [https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/6372cd09d34ed907bf6c6ab1; https://app.globus.org/file-manager?origin_id=39161d64-419d-4cc4-853f-f6e737644eb4&origin_path=%2F]

Data Source: G=ground-based observations (with interpolation), S=satellite, R=reanalysis. **Variables**: P=precipitation, T=air temperature, rh=relative humidity, sh=specific humidity, u=windspeed, Rs=solar radiation. **Spatial Resolution**: 1.0° latitude=111 km, 1.0° longitude=111 km at 0° latitude and 85 km at 40° latitude. **Spatial Coverage**: Land=Global land surfaces only (not ocean surfaces). **Temporal Coverage**: NP=near present. **Latency**: —=Static dataset. **Data Format**: NetCDF=Network Common Data Form, HDF5=Hierarchical Data Format 5, ASCII=American Standard Code for Information Interchange, GRIB=Gridded Binary, GeoTIFF=Georeferenced Tagged Image File Format, CSV=comma separated variable, ?=unknown.

2.4 Integrated Products

Inherent limitations of individual data sources (G, S, or R) can be reduced by merging other data sources with complimentary advantages to reduce errors or biases. Some reanalysis datasets are used independently or merge multiple reanalysis products (denoted by R in **Table 3**). Reanalysis datasets commonly ingest ground-based observational data (RG), satellite data (RS), or both (RSG). Some S datasets also integrate G data (denoted by SG in **Table 2**), reanalysis data (SR), or both (SRG) to enhance accuracy and reduce bias. Several data sources, CHIRP, CMORPH, IMERG, PERSIANN, and TMPA, offer multiple products with increasing data source complexity, often with increased latency and different spatial and temporal resolutions. Each dataset follows a different workflow in developing the integrated product; in general, the primary method (in this article, the first abbreviation letter) is enhanced somewhat sequentially with various interpolation or bias-correction schemes using the secondary dataset(s).

3 Considerations for Use of Gridded Dataset for Hydrologic Analyses

Gridded datasets summarized in **Tables 1, 2, and 3** span 0.8 to 278 km spatial resolutions, 0.5 to 720 h (monthly) temporal resolutions, 0.02 (30 min) to 365 d latencies, CONUS to global spatial coverage, and 10 to 271 year periods of record, starting as early as 1753 (**Figure 1**). Differences have emerged in the representation of G, S, and R datasets across many of these categories. G datasets have the finest spatial resolutions (1 km) and longest periods of record (> 240 years) and tend to have

the longest latency (average for G = 86 d, compared to S = 29 d and R = 36 d). A greater proportion of G datasets have less-extensive spatial coverage (CONUS to North American continental in this study) whereas S and R datasets typically were global in extent. S datasets start no earlier than 1979 and no greater than 45-year period of record (through 2023). More R and S datasets have finer temporal resolution than G datasets, with average resolutions of 10 h for R and 9 h for S compared to 158 h for G.

No single best source of gridded climate data exists. Many characteristics of gridded datasets influence the best product for a given application or research question. We highlight several of the most important considerations in differentiating among the many possible gridded datasets. Most of these characteristics are detailed for each gridded dataset in **Tables 1, 2, and 3**.

Figure 1. Distribution of (a) spatial resolution, (b) temporal resolution, (c) latency, (d) period start date, (e) period of record, and (f) spatial coverage for assessed ground-based (G), satellite-based (S), and reanalysis-based (R) gridded precipitation data sources. X axis labels are the upper limits of each categorical bin, exclusive of other bins. [CONUS = conterminous U.S., N AMER = North America, LAND = global land surfaces only (not ocean surfaces), GLOBAL = global land + ocean surfaces]

3.1 Variables and Interdependencies

185   Hydrological investigations typically begin with selecting datasets for each important climate variable. **Tables 1, 2, and 3** summarize the variables included in each gridded dataset. Datasets that include all climate variables of interest may inherently represent appropriate interdependencies or cross-correlations among the variables. For example, periods of time with P are associated with cloud cover and decreased Rs and often higher humidity. Other types of dependency-related dilemmas may also occur in gridded datasets. Cold air drainage can invert the minimum T (Tmin)-elevation relationship in montane foothills,

190   and daily Tmin may not equal daily average Tdp in semi-arid regions (Tmin decoupled from 100% rh), thus invalidating an assumption of commonly used schemes to spatially interpolate gridded Tdp data (McEvoy et al., 2014). Often these interdependencies are important to represent accurately in hydrologic analyses.

3.2 Coverage

   Gridded datasets have a range of spatial and temporal extents. All datasets summarized in this article span at least the CONUS,

195   and many are continental or global in extent. General guidelines by the World Meteorological Organization require a 30-year minimum period of record to reasonably represent climate variability. Non-stationarity of climate makes it even more important to consider whether longer periods representing climatic trends or periods more heavily weighted toward recent data are preferable for a given hydrologic study. Periods of record may be dictated by investigations focused on specific events or periods, such as studies of the hydrologic effects of wildfire or other disturbance events, calculations of the recurrence interval

200   of a flood of a given severity, or studies assessing hydrologic responses over specific periods.

3.3 Resolution

   Spatial and temporal resolution of the dataset should be adequate to represent the variability of the climate variable given the representational scale of the hydrologic model. The simulated spatial and temporal resolution of evapotranspiration (ET), runoff, and other hydrological elements in hydrologic models can be relatively fine (<1 km, subdaily), and model resolution

205   is increasing in ways that capitalize on increasing computational power, process understanding, and data availability (Melsen et al., 2016). Hydrologic model output resolution and uncertainty are often limited by the spatial and temporal resolution of climate datasets. As such, the resolution of gridded climate datasets should be an important criterion to consider, especially in mountainous areas within complex terrain driving spatial heterogeneity in climate variables. Some gridded datasets sacrifice representation of extremes, both wet and dry, to better represent mean climatic conditions. Alternatively, increased temporal

210   resolution may come at the cost of reduced spatial resolution. Creation of spatially continuous and consistent gridded response surfaces can result in point data extremes being smoothed during interpolation. Gridded data interpolation schemes can also influence representation of meteorologic variability; for example, Daymet uses a strict T-elevation relationship that limits its ability to represent T inversions relative to PRISM, which includes "climatologically aided interpolation" (McEvoy et al.,

2014). Methods that create ensembles of multiple gridded datasets often better represent mean conditions across a domain at
215 the expense of representing the full range of possible conditions within the domain.

3.4 Format and Accessibility

Data format and accessibility dictate how easily and effectively a dataset can be accessed, processed, and analysed for a specific
hydrologic application. Several common data formats are described in **Table A1**. The data format must be compatible with
software and tools used in the hydrologic analysis. Formats such as NetCDF and HDF5 are widely used in climate research
220 because they are consistent with various processing tools and can efficiently store large multidimensional datasets. Adequate
metadata are essential for understanding the dataset, including its origin, methodology, and any processing it has undergone.
Investigators may consider the importance of datasets that can be compressed without significant data loss, are interoperable
with the other datasets, and are freely available and easily accessible online. Some datasets have application programming
interfaces (APIs) for automated data retrieval that can be useful.

225 3.5 Site and Event Characteristics

Preference may be given to datasets that reflect characteristic spatial and temporal dimensions of climatic processes in the
domain, such as cool-air drainage patterns, orographic or convective P events, lake effects, and effects of altitude. Priority may
be given to datasets that capture the most important aspects of climate variable magnitude and variability at appropriate scales,
including daily/seasonal/annual averages, extreme event (high or low) magnitudes, or event sequences (continuous dry days
230 [CDDs], continuous wet days [CWDs], etc.). For example, datasets with fine temporal resolution (~1 h) may be required to
capture hydrological functioning when P is dominated by high intensity but short duration convective events. In hydrologic
models, space-time scales are interdependent, and source data should be considered in watershed delineation.

3.6 Process and Model Sensitivity, and Latency

Hydrologic processes are differentially sensitive to climatic variables and characteristics. For example, a snowmelt runoff
235 modelling study may prioritize a dataset with accurate, fine-spatial-resolution T and accurate Rs whereas a small-basin study
of soil moisture or erosion dynamics may prioritize a fine-scale P dataset that maintains a full range of extreme events. A study
focused on ET dynamics may prioritize a dataset that includes T, rh, u, and Rs and maintains appropriate inter-variable
dependencies. Flood simulation may prioritize fine-temporal-resolution P data at a resolution matching the domain
heterogeneity. Long-term water balance studies or large-scale river basin studies may prefer daily or monthly datasets with
240 coarse spatial resolution. Often the selected model formulation will constrain the required variables, their characteristics, and
the preferred data format.

Latency, or the time lag in dataset availability, also may be an important consideration. Some modelling applications may
require real-time or near-real-time results. Other applications designed to analyse historical trends or prior conditions can

tolerate long data latency periods. Gridded datasets may implement additional processing steps intended to increase accuracy

245 or resolution but that increase the latency before data become available for use. In the gridded datasets summarized in Tables 1-3, S datasets averaged the shortest latency periods (29 d) followed by R (36 d) and G (86 d).

3.7 Time Zone Considerations

When using climate and other hydrologic data from different sources, data time-period consistency is critical and too often overlooked. Particularly for data in a "daily" format, users must be cognizant of the zonal time period for each dataset. Station

250 data varies on the reporting period for G data (e.g., daily periods beginning at midnight, 07:00 or 08:00 standard time or local time [i.e., with spring and fall daylight savings time shifts]). Gridded datasets may provide data for a standard time period (e.g., 24-hour period from 0:00 GMT) or adjusted for user-defined time zone. Hydrologic comparison datasets (e.g., streamflow) may be reported for 24 hours starting midnight standard or local time or for some other 24-hour period. Mismatched datasets may lead to systematic analysis errors.

255 4 Review of Gridded Dataset Performance

Appropriate selection from among the many available gridded meteorological datasets requires an understanding of how these datasets impact hydrologic modelling. To assist with the selection process, we conducted a thorough review and synthesis of the recent (past 10 years) literature comparing gridded meteorological datasets, with specific consideration of their influence on hydrologic modelling (**Table 4**). Studies were selected that (a) compared multiple gridded datasets, preferably including

260 comparisons with different resolutions, scales, spatial contexts (topography, climate), goals, or hydrologic models; (b) compared the accuracy of those datasets to observed meteorological data; and (c) compared the performance of those datasets as forcing data for hydrologic model(s) or analyses. Most studies assessed and compared P datasets, some also assessed T datasets, and very few assessed rh, u, or Rs datasets. This relates, in equal measures, to the relative importance of P data in hydrologic analysis, the relative complexity of representing P in gridded datasets, and the relative availability of P, T, and

265 other data across G, S, and R datasets (**Tables 1, 2, 3**).

Table 4. Summary of recent (10 years, 2014-2023) literature on gridded dataset comparisons for hydrologic modelling.

Reference [Location]	Dataset Name	Data Source	Spatial Extent	Temporal Extent	Analysis Goals	Hydrologic Model	Hydrologic Outcomes
Ang et al. (2022) [SE Asia]	APHRODITE NCEP-CFS v2 TMPA-3B42 v7 IMERG-Final v6 ERA5 SA-OBS CPC	G RS SG SG R G G	83,107 km^2, 100-1,700 m asl, 1,354 mm/y P	1985-2011	Compare P, T datasets to gauge stations and evaluate Q, ET performance	SWAT, daily, 0.25° grid	Good P (APHRODITE, ERA5, TMPA, IMERG), Good T (CPC, SA-OBS). TMPA and IMERG P with SA-OBS T provide reliable Q, ET.

Beck et al. (2017b) [Global]	CHIRP v2 CMORPH v1 ERA-Interim GSMaP v5/6 GridSat v1 JRA-55 MSWEP-ng v1.2 MSWEP-ng v2 NCEP-CFSR PERSIANN PERSIANN-CCS SM2RAIN-ASCAT TMPA-3B42RT v7 CHIRPS v2 CMORPH-CRT v1 CPC-Unified GPCP-IDD v1.2 MSWEP v1.2 MSWEP v2 PERSIANN-CDR v1r1 TMPA-3B42 v7 WFDEI-CRU	SR S R S S R SR SR RS S S S S SRG SG G SG SRG SRG SG SG RG	76,086 P stations; 9,035 basins (<50,000 km^2)	P: 2000-2016, Q: 2000-2012	Compare P datasets to daily gauge stations and evaluate daily Q performance (via 3-day NSE)	HBV, daily, conceptual	G best (CPC), but not transferable to low gauge density areas. Next best was SRG, with direct G correction (MSWEP). Among non-G corrected, SR were best (MSWEP) followed by R (ERA, MRA, NCEP) then SR (CHIRP).
Blankenau et al. (2020)	GLDAS NCEP-CFS v2 NLDAS-2 gridMET RTMA NDFD 1-d NDFD 7-d	GS RS GR G G G G	103 weather stations, US, Guam, Puerto Rico	2013-2015	Calibrate ETo	Penman-Monteith ETo	Gridded datasets overestimated ETo vs. using station data (12-31% median bias).
Dembélé et al. (2020) [W Africa]	TAMSAT v3 CHIRPS v2 ARC v2 RFE v2 MSWEP v2.2 GSMaP-std v6 PERSIANN-CDR CMORPH-CRT v1 TMPA-3B42RT v7 TMPA-3B42 v7 JRA-55 EWEMBI v1.1 WFDEI-CRU WFDEI-GPCC MERRA-2 PGF v3 ERA5	SG SRG SG SG SRG RG SG SG S SG R RG RG RG RSG RG R	415,000 km^2, <400 m asl.	2000-2012	Calibrate daily Q, monthly Ea, Su, St	mHM, daily, 0.25° (28 km) discretization.	Best performing P datasets differed for: **Q** (TAMSAT, CHIRPS, PERSIANN-CDR), **temporal Su** (EWEMBI, WFDEI-GPCC, PGF), **spatial Su** (MSWEP, TAMSAT, ARC) **temporal Ea** (ARC, RFE, GSMaP), and **spatial Ea** (MSWEP, TAMSAT, MERRA-2)

Essou et al. (2016a) [CONUS]	MOPEX Santa-Clara CPC Daymet	G G G G	424 basins (66-10,325 km^2), 5 climate regions	1980-2003	Compare among observed climate data and simulated Q	HSAMI, daily, conceptual	Differences in P and T did not translate to differences in Q.
Essou et al. (2016b) [CONUS]	Santa-Clara ERA-Interim NCEP-CFSR MERRA NCEP-NARR WFDEI-CRU WFDEI-GPCC	G R RS R RG RG RG	370 basins (104-10,325 km^2), 5 climate regions	1979-2003	Compare to observed climate data (Santa Clara) and Q (MOPEX)	HSAMI, daily, conceptual	Overall, global reanalyses were good proxies for observed P and T data.
Essou et al. (2017) [Canada]	ERA-Interim NCEP-CFSR MERRA NRCan	R RS R G	316 basins (440-127,635 km^2), 3 climate regions	1979-2010	Compare P, T reanalyses to NRCan, and Q to CANOPEX.	HSAMI, daily, conceptual	Reanalysis performs better than gridded for low station density (1 per 1000 km^2).
Gampe & Ludwig (2017) [Italy]	MESAN APGD E-OBS PERSIANN-CDR MERRA-2 ERA-Interim GPCC-FDD ERA-20C	DRG G G SG RSG R G R	12,100 km^2, 0-3865 m asl, 500-1600 mm/y P	1989-2008	Compare to observed climate data.	WaSiM, daily, 1 km resolution (not used in this study)	Recommend using an ensemble, excluding datasets with seasonal deviations (PERSIANN, ERA-Interim, ERA-20C).
Gupta & Tarboton (2016) [W US]	MERRA RFE v2	R SG	1,000,000 km^2 region	2009-2010	Compare downscaled climate data to SNOTEL.	UEB snowmelt (SWE), 3 h, 120 m climate downscale.	Good SWE simulation (NSE-0.67). Downscaling limitations noted.
Hafzi & Sorman (2022) [Turkey]	CPC v1 MSWEP v2.8 ERA5 CHIRPS v2 CHIRP v2 IMERG-Early v6 IMERG-Late v6 IMERG-Final v6 TMPA-3B42RT v7 TMPA-3B42 v7 PERSIANN-CDR PERSIANN-CCS PERSIANN	G SRG R SRG SR S S SG SG S SG S S	10,250 km^2, 1130-3500 m asl	2015-2019	Evaluate climate data consistency and simulated Q	TUW, daily, conceptual	Most gridded P data were poor, but Q simulation quite accurate. Recommend calibrating Q model with same gridded data used to run simulation (not observed P data).

Henn et al. (2018) [W US]	H10 L15 PRISM-M NLDAS-2 N15 Daymet	G G G G G G	Western US (32-49°N, 105-125°W)	1982-2006	Intercompare spatial patterns, interannual variability, and multi-year trends in P	Limited comparison to Swe, Q.	Differences among datasets (especially high elevation, arid) may introduce substantial uncertainty.
Kouakou et al. (2023) [W, C Africa]	ARC v2 CHIRP v2 CHIRPS v2 PERSIANN-CDR MSWEP v2.2 TAMSAT v3 ERA5 JRA-55 Adj MERRA-2 P-TOT MERRA-2 P-COR WFDEI-CRU WFDEI-GPCC CPC v1 CRU-TS v4 GPCC v7	SG SR SRG SG SRG SG R RG RSG RSG RG RG G G G	68 basins (1,279-600,000 km^2), 200-5,000 mm/y P	1984-2005	Evaluate P datasets, monthly Q simulation.	GR2M, monthly, lumped	Best P from G datasets. CHIRPS best for Q.
Laiti et al. (2018) [Italy]	E-OBS MSWEP MESAN APGD ADIGE	G SRG DRG G G	12,100 km^2, 185-3,500 m asl	1989-2008	Assess hydrologic coherence of gridded data for daily Q.	HYPERstream + SCS-CN, daily, 5 km grid	The higher-res G datasets had best Q.
Massmann (2020) [CONUS]	CERA-20C 20CR Livneh	R R G	168 basins	1900s-2010s	Assess century datasets for P, T (vs. Daymet), Q simulation	HBV, daily, conceptual	Quality decreases further back in history; T better than P. G better than R.
Mazzoleni et al. (2019) [Global]	CHIRP v2 CMORPH v1 PERSIANN PERSIANN-CCS SM2RAIN-ASCAT TMPA-3B42RT v7 CHIRPS v2 CMORPH-CRT v1 GPCP1DD v1.2 MSWEP v2.1 PERSIANN-CDR TMPA-3B42 v7 CPC Glob Unified GPCC GSMaP-RNL	SR S S S S S SRG SG SG SRG SG SG RG RG RG	8 basins, 200-6,150,000 km^2, tropical to temperate climate zones	2007-2013	Compare P datasets for Q simulation, assess P density, model effects	HBV-96, daily?, conceptual, ~0.25° grid	No single best P dataset. Basin characteristics important. Q affected by basin scale, human footprint, climate. S poorest, most variable. SG best in Tropical, Temperate-arid climates. RG best in Temperate, Temperate-cold climates and densely gauged P basins. Subbasins had different best P dataset than outlet (distributed

	PFD WFDEI CRU WFDEI GPCC	RG RG RG					model better than lumped).
Mei et al. (2022) [Texas]	TMPA-3B42 NCEP-CFSR PRISM	SG RS G	535.76 km^2, 176-548 m asl	1989-2009	Compare P data to NOAA, modeled Q in urban basin.	SWAT, daily, subbasins ~21.4 km^2 (~4.6 km)^2, and ANN, daily, lumped	PRISM had best P, TMPA underestimated P, PRISM and TMPA outperformed CFR or gauge data for Q. SWAT and ANN had similar results for same P data.
Meng et al. (2014) [NE Tibetan Plateau]	TMPA-3B42 v6	SG	122,000 km^2, 4,000 m asl, 250-750 mm/y P	1998-2008	Compare P to NCC gauge and simulated Q	CREST, daily, distributed, 1 km^2 grid	TMPA daily P less than monthly P. TMPA unsatisfactory for daily Q, acceptable for monthly Q simulation.
Mourtzinis et al. (2017) [Midwest US]	Daymet PRISM NASA-POWER	G G RS	45 stations in US Corn Belt.	1980-2014 (12-35 yrs)	Compare ETo calculated with station and gridded data.	FAO-PM ETo.	Poor ETo related to poor rh, esp. for PRISM.
Muche et al. (2020) [Kansas]	Daymet PRISM NLDAS GLDAS	G G G G	2,988 km^2, 252-428 m asl	1983-2013	Compare to GHNC. Calibrate monthly Q, simulate daily Q.	SWAT, daily, subbasins ~76.6 km^2 (~8.8 km)^2	All monthly Q simulation similar (except GLDAS).
Pokorny et al. (2020) [Canada]	ANUSPLIN NCEP-NARR ERA-Interim WFDEI GFD-HYDRO	G RG RS RG RSG	1,400,000 km^2 basin (7 subbasins), diverse climate regions	1984-2010	Compare P data aggregations.	--	All gridded datasets showed spatial performance variations. Some aggregation reduces input uncertainty, but info lost as aggr. incr.
Radcliffe & Mukundan (2017) [Georgia]	PRISM NCEP-CFSR	G RS	44.7 km^2	2003-2010	Assess P datasets for Q simulation.	SWAT, daily, subbasins ~1.4 km^2 (~1.2 km)^2.	**P**: CFSR better. **Q**: PRISM better. Note: PRISM data do not appear to be time-shifted.
Raimonet et al. (2017) [France]	SAFRAN MESAN E-OBS WFDEI-GPCC	RG DRG G RG	931 stations, 10-10,000 km^2, diversity of climate, topo, elev.	1989-2010	Evaluate P datasets, daily Q simulation.	GR4J, daily, conceptual,	High-res and reanalysis Q performed better. Essential to account for high-res topo.
Ray et al. (2022) [Texas]	Daymet v3 PRISM IMERG-Early v6	G G S	4,300 km^2, 111-596 m asl	2000-2019	Assess P datasets for Q simulation.	SWAT, daily, subbasins	Daymet, PRISM, CHIRPS best for Q.

Reference	Dataset	Data Source	Basin	Period	Analysis Goals	Model	Hydrologic Outcomes
	IMERG-Late v6 IMERG-Final v6 PERSIANN PERSIANN-CCS PERSIANN-CDR CHIRPS v2	S SG S S SG SRG				~50 km^2 (~7 km)^2	
Setti et al. (2020) [India]	IMD TMPA-3B42RT TMPA-3B42 NCEP-CFSR	G S SG RS	9,056 km^2, 152-1600 m asl, 1,140 mm/y P	1998-2012	Assess P datasets for Q simulation.	SWAT, daily, subbasins ~211 km^2 (~14.5 km)^2	Good P for all datasets. Q simulation (monthly calibration) good for all (IMD best).
Shuai et al. (2022) [Colorado]	PRISM Daymet NLDAS-2	G G G	53.2 km^2	2016-2019 (PRISM shift 1 d)	Assess datasets for P (7 sta), T (4 sta), simulated Q, SWE, ET.	ATS, hourly, resolution 0.005-0.05 km^2, distributed	Small T diff (r>0.95). Strong P corr (r>0.9) for PRISM 93 sites), Daymet (1 site), NLDAS (0 sites). Q (hourly): Daymet > PRISM > NLDAS.
Singh & Najafi (2020) [Canada]	NRCan NCEP-CFSR GRASP NCEP-NARR S14FD	G RS R RG DR	113 stations, 3 basins: 46,600 km^2, 2130-3700 m asl; 600 km^2, 0-2,000 m asl; 261 km^2, 0.4-1584 m asl.	1980-2010	Assess P, T covariability	Raven, daily, lumped/semi-distributed	Gridded T shows cold bias over Rockies vs warm bias over Prairies. NRCan (and S14FD) best T.
Tarek et al. (2020) [N Amer]	EPA-Interim EPA5	R R	3,138 basins in US, Canada	1979-2018	Evaluate ERA5 vs observations with emphasis on Q modelling	GR4J, HMETS, daily, conceptual	ERA5 improved over ERA-Interim, with biases in SE US, W coast of N Amer. Translated into Q skill, except E US.
Yang et al. (2014) [China]	NCEP-CFSR APHRODITE China-trend	RS G G	2 basins: 1098 km^2, 366 km^2	2000-2006	Calibrate daily Q simulation	SWAT, daily, subbasins ~29 km^2 (~5.4 km)^2	China-trend was best. Poor results in areas with topo influence on P.
Zhu et al. (2018) [NE China]	Fengyun TMPA-3B42RT TMPA-3B42 CMORPH-BLD v1 CMORPH v1	SRG S SG SG S	12,385 km^2, 172-1391 m asl, 776 mm/y P	2006-2010	Evaluate five P datasets with gauge P and simulated Q.	SWAT, daily, monthly, subbasins ~459 km^2 (~21 km)^2	Better P agreement from Fengyun, TMPA-3B42, CMORPH-BLD (all gauge-adjusted). Daily Q satisfactory for Fengyun, TMPA-3B42. Model parameters were only applicable for dataset used for calibration.

Reference: [Location]=General region of study. **Data Source**: G=ground-based observations (with interpolation), S=satellite, R=reanalysis, D=downscaling. **Analysis Goals, Hydrologic Outcomes**: NSE=Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency

4.1 Humidity, Wind, and Solar Radiation Dataset Assessment

270 Two of the 29 studies summarized in **Table 4** assessed and compared humidity (rh, sh, Tdp, or Vp), windspeed (u), and/or solar radiation (Rs, sc, cc) to station data or their effects on hydrologic analyses. Mourtzinis et al. (2017) assessed and compared G gridded datasets for rh (Daymet [derived from Vp], PRISM [derived from Tmin, Tmax]) and Rs (Daymet, NASA-POWER [RS]) to observed data from 45 stations in the midwest U.S. They found good agreement between daily Rs and station data (RMSE = 8% for both datasets) with 98% of data within 15% of the measured data. However, daily rh agreement was poor for

275 both Daymet (RMSE = 13%) and PRISM (RMSE = 18%). Blankenau et al. (2020) compared six G datasets to 3 years of data at 103 weather stations across the U.S., Guam, and Puerto Rico. For Vp, u, and Rs, performance was best for RTMA and NDFD 1-d forecasts and worst for NLDAS. High spatial resolution did not necessarily confer accuracy, as coarser GLDAS (28 km) and NCEP-CFS v2 (22 km) datasets outperformed finer NLDAS (14 km). Bandaru et al. (2017) compared four gridded datasets (three G, one RG) to observed monthly data from five flux towers in the northwest U.S. and found different results

280 for humidity (Tdp) and Rs. For Tdp, performance decreased from NCEP-NARR (RG) to PRISM to Daymet to NLDAS (G). Conversely for Rs, performance decreased from NLDAS to Daymet (both with negative bias) to NCEP-NARR (positive bias). McEvoy et al. (2014) compared P, T and rh data from four G datasets to 14 stations in Nevada. Gridded datasets, particularly Daymet, had difficulty representing cold-air drainage in this mountainous terrain; PRISM incorporates methods to represent inversions and performed better across the 1-year comparison study. Finer resolution (PRISM: 800 m, Daymet: 1 km) had less

285 bias than coarser resolution (PRISM, gridMet: 4 km) datasets. Also, the common assumption that daily Tmin approximates Tdp (used by Daymet) was unrealistic in this semiarid environment.

Current literature is too limited to provide a consensus for humidity, u, or Rs gridded dataset selection. More studies are needed both to assess the accuracy of available humidity, u, or Rs gridded datasets (**Tables 1, 2, 3**) and to assess their impacts on hydrologic model performance. A key conclusion was that analyses where rh, u, and Rs are primary forcing variables (e.g.,

290 ET, airshed, snowpack, or surface soil moisture dynamic analyses) would benefit from an assessment of available dataset suitability (e.g., comparison of the gridded dataset to reference, ground-based weather stations in or around the study area) and a sensitivity analysis of the model (how responsive is the response variable to the noted gridded climate dataset uncertainty) prior to dataset selection. Hybrid data sources (station and gridded) need to be considered regarding both model skill for simulating hydrology and optimal model parameter sets, because effects of mixing data sources are generally unknown.

295 Dependencies among climate variables (such as discussed in Section 4.4 for P-T dependencies) may also be an important consideration for humidity, u, and Rs and lead to prioritizing a gridded dataset that represents covariances among variables of concern. As such, methods to retain coupling of climate variables in gridded datasets are needed.

4.2 Temperature (T) Dataset Assessment

Accuracy and agreement of gridded datasets of air temperature (T) at 2 m above ground (**Table 4**), about crop canopy height,

300 were dependent on many factors, including spatial region of interest and topography. Essou et al. (2016b) found T from six R

datasets generally were comparable to station data in 370 basins across the CONUS. Behnke et al. (2016) evaluated eight G datasets and found gridded T data highly correlated (r > 0.9) with station data, but biased towards cooler T, across the CONUS; the best dataset differed by region, and spatial resolution was not an important factor. Massmann (2020) analysed three datasets (two R, one G) with long (century) periods of record in 168 basins throughout the CONUS and found T datasets generally were adequate across the U.S. but were less adequate (lower daily rank correlation, higher long-term bias) in the Rocky Mountains. In the Rockies, Shuai et al. (2022) found strong correlation (r > 0.95) with measured station data in Colorado for G datasets (PRISM, Daymet, NLDAS-2). In the Midwest U.S., Mourtzinis et al. (2017) found good agreement (RMSE < 5%) for both PRISM and Daymet. Tercek et al. (2021) revealed a characteristic of G datasets tending to underrepresent higher elevation point locations (e.g., mountain tops), which corresponded to gridded monthly maximum T data. McEvoy et al. (2014) found G datasets (PRISM, Daymet, gridMet) in montane regions underestimated inversion strength and Tmin in foothills. As expected, datasets resulting from downscaling methods were constrained by inherent inaccuracies of the original gridded T dataset (Gupta & Tarboton, 2016).

Several studies specifically addressed gridded T dataset contribution to hydrologic model performance. A consensus across many studies was that T dataset selection was less influential on hydrologic simulation accuracy than P dataset selection (Dembélé et al., 2020; Essou et al., 2016a; Mei et al., 2022; Shuai et al., 2022). Laiti et al. (2018) evaluated five gridded daily T datasets covering a basin in the Italian Alps, with elevations ranging from 185 to 3,500 m. They found G datasets with higher resolution produced the best streamflow (Q) simulation, but suggested T datasets from various sources (G, S, R) can be used interchangeably, with negligible impacts on simulation results. The consensus from these nine studies (discussed in this section and cited in Table 4) suggests that gridded T datasets generally can be used interchangeably for hydrologic analyses in most parts of the CONUS or globally, but differences in hydrologic response may arise in areas of more complex (i.e., mountain) topography.

4.3 Precipitation (P) Dataset Assessment

Precipitation (P) datasets were less reliable than T datasets both in their accuracy and in their performance forcing hydrologic models. P data often lack accuracy and spatial variability in complex, mountain topography (Hafzi & Sorman, 2022; Henn et al., 2018) and need to be gauge corrected (Raimonet et al., 2017; Mazzoleni et al., 2019; Laiti et al., 2018; Essou et al., 2017; Hafzi & Sorman, 2022). In mountainous regions as well as humid regions, R datasets generally performed better than G in areas with low station density (< 1 per 1000 km^2), but for higher station densities (> 3 per 1000 km^2), there was no difference (Essou et al., 2017). Gampe & Ludwig (2017) and Essou et al. (2016b) found that R datasets show great potential to provide reasonable P data where station location and density cause high errors and uncertainty, especially in higher elevations and topographically complex regions. Ang et al. (2022) found P data from G (APHRODITE), SG (TMPA-3B42, IMERG) and R (ERA5) datasets all performed well (r > 0.75) in a data-sparse region (< 3 per 1000 km^2) of southeast Asia. Essou et al. (2016b) judged that differences between R and observed G data across the CONUS were small enough to allow direct use of R-based

P and T data for hydrologic modelling without bias correction. Satellite datasets corrected with either R or G datasets increased P accuracy (Hafzi & Sorman, 2022). In hydrologic models, inputs of daily or hourly P are partitioned into rain (liquid) and

335 snow (solid) based primarily on T (daily Tmin), but little information exists on the relative accuracy of P for rain, snow, and rain/snow mixes. See Sections 4.4 and 4.6 for P-T interactions and estimation of snow-water equivalent (SWE).

The G methods provided the most accurate gridded P data (Kouakou et al., 2023; Massmann, 2020), although performance of G datasets deteriorate in gauge-sparse regions (Beck et al., 2017b). With adequate station density, weather-station network data were superior at local to regional scales (Tarek et al., 2020; Meng et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2014). Datasets that directly

340 integrated higher temporal resolution gauge data performed best, with decreasing performance from those incorporating daily gauge data (CPC-Unified, MSWEP v1.2 and v2) compared to 5-day gauge data (CHIRPS v2), monthly gauge data (GPCP-1DD v1.2, TMPA-3B42 v7, WFDEI-CRU), or monthly SG GPCP product (PERSIANN) (Beck et al., 2017b).

Global R datasets often were good proxies for P data (Essou et al., 2016b). Massmann (2020) found R datasets were more appropriate for short-term P in the northwest U.S., with some difficulties in representing P in the south and east U.S. From a

345 comparison of 18 gridded datasets, Mazzoleni et al. (2019) found no single best P dataset. The R datasets performed better than G datasets for low station density (< 1 per 1000 km^2); otherwise, little difference was observed (Essou et al., 2017; Tarek et al., 2020). Gampe & Ludwig (2017) found higher resolution P data performed better, but coarse data provided close representation of overall, longer-term climate characteristics. Raimonet et al. (2017) demonstrated the importance of accounting for the impacts of high-resolution topography on P gridded data, and that low-altitude, less-complex topographies

350 were less sensitive to the choice of gridded dataset. Similar results were reported by Laiti et al. (2018), who added that simple bias correction cannot overcome P dataset deficiencies.

Overall, the literature suggests the interaction of station density and basin characteristics, primarily topography, is of central importance and can drive performance. In regions with high station density (> 3 per 1000 km^2), G datasets or those corrected using G data (SG, RG, SRG, RSG) perform similarly. However, in areas with lower station density (< 1 per 1000 km^2) as well

355 as in higher elevations and topographically complex regions, R datasets perform better. Unadjusted S datasets, without G or R correction, generally were least reliable. Other site and dataset considerations may also be important for specific hydrologic modelling applications and are discussed in the following sections.

4.4 P-T Dependency

Climatological dependencies can exist between P and T. Gridded datasets decouple P and T, which can cause problems with

360 hydrologic simulation (Singh & Najafi, 2020). For example, Singh & Najafi (2020) noted failure of gridded datasets to represent warm-wet dependencies in north and southwest Canada and hot-dry dependencies in spring and summer seasons in the Canadian prairies that were present in the observed data. This led to inaccurate modelling of hydrologic processes (rain/snow partitioning, extreme events), which may be particularly important in representing hydrological reality under a changing climate. In response to this need for coupled P and T data, Raimonet et al. (2017) suggested a process of dynamically

calibrating a conceptual hydrological model on meteorological datasets, which was able to assess consistency of the meteorological datasets, including covariance of P and T, as well as improve streamflow simulation performance. Again, these results suggest that methods to retain coupling of climate variables in gridded datasets are needed.

4.5 Streamflow (Q) Modelling

Not surprisingly, as noted above, Q was more responsive to P than T (Dembélé et al., 2020; Essou et al., 2016a; Mei et al., 2022; Shuai et al., 2022). Most gridded P datasets were adequate for Q simulation at the monthly scale and spatial scales ranging from 3,000 to 122,000 km^2 (Ray et al., 2022; Meng et al., 2014; Muche et al., 2020; Setti et al., 2020). Some studies found that G-based P datasets generally were better than S or R datasets for hydrological modelling (Ray et al., 2022; Meng et al., 2014; Kouakou et al., 2023; Massmann, 2020), especially for high spatial resolution datasets (Laiti et al. 2018). In addition, hydrologic performance using G datasets was not affected by basin size, but that performance of the G datasets did improve slightly as the weather station density of their source data increased (Essou et al., 2017). However, total basin size did not influence Q performance (Tarek et al., 2020). In a study of 8 large-scale basins globally, Mazzoleni et al. (2019) found Q simulation was affected by basin scale, human footprint, and climate: S datasets had the poorest performance and were the most variable; SG datasets were the best performers in tropical and temperate-arid climates; and RG datasets were the best performers in temperate and temperate-cold climates and within basins having densely gauged P.

In a study of 9 gridded datasets applied with a conceptual hydrologic model to simulate streamflow in 9,053 basins (< 50,000 km^2) worldwide, Beck et al. (2017b) found MSWEP v2 P dataset provided consistently better performance than other products across North America, Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and southern and western Brazil, whereas CHIRPS v2 performed better than other products in Central America, and central and eastern Brazil, but no one dataset performed best everywhere. They also concluded, based on good performance of CPC-United, CHIRPS v2, and MSWEP v1.2 and v2, that incorporation of sub-monthly gauge data improved Q simulation.

Interestingly, the best P dataset was not always the best for Q modelling (Yang et al., 2014), and lower P and T performance did not always translate into lower Q performance (Essou et al., 2016a; Hafzi & Sorman, 2022). Similarly, Ang et al. (2022) found that S datasets corrected with G observations had better Q performance than other G or R datasets that performed similarly in comparison to observed P data.

Datasets with the best representation of temporal dynamics did not necessarily align with those with the best representation of spatial patterns, with more hydrologic uncertainty associated with misrepresenting spatial patterns than temporal dynamics (Dembélé et al., 2020). Hafzi & Sorman (2022) found most gridded P datasets had low performance in representing daily P over space and time, but some still had accurate Q simulation. Mazzoleni et al. (2019) found that the best P dataset for a basin outlet was not necessarily the best for its subbasins, which reflects the influence of scale and suggests a benefit to distributed hydrologic modelling over lumped modelling approaches.

Hydrologic model calibration approaches were also sensitive to selection of gridded dataset. Ray et al. (2022) found that model parameter uncertainty decreased when calibrating the SWAT model using G-based P datasets. In addition, hydrologic models calibrated using one gridded dataset did not work as well when applied using forcings from other datasets (Zhu et al., 2018; Hafzi & Sorman, 2022).

400 Dependency between P and T did not appear to affect Q simulation. Shuai et al. (2022) found that inter-mixing T datasets among PRISM, Daymet, and NLDAS P datasets had little effect on Q.

4.6 ET and SWE Modelling

Few studies were found that compared the effects of gridded datasets on simulation of other spatially distributed hydrologic variables, such as ET or SWE. Mourtzinis et al. (2017) found Daymet outperformed PRISM in calculating FAO-Penman-

405 Monteith reference ET (ETo) in the midwest U.S. Although both were similar in comparisons of P and T, ETo bias was less for Daymet (-4 mm) than PRISM (+253 mm), and both had poor agreement in the high and low ranges of measured ETo. Errors were related to poor agreement with rh, especially for PRISM. Similarly, ETo was generally overestimated (relative to ETo from weather station data) by all six G datasets evaluated by Blankenau et al. (2020), with median biases from 12 to 31%, consistent with overestimation of T, u, and Rs and underestimation of Vp. In a comparison of different gridded datasets forcing

410 ET simulation in SWAT, Ang et al. (2022) found that using P from TRMM and IMERG with T from a Southeast Asia observational network (SA-OBS) outperformed other gridded datasets (P: Aphrodite, ERA5, NCEP CFS v2, T: CPC) in this tropical region. Poor performance of gridded dataset P and T was credited with the poor ET simulation. Shuai et al. (2022) found little difference between simulation of ET from PRISM, Daymet, and NLDAS in Colorado and assumed the similarity was related to using the same Rs forcing. Shuai et al. (2022) also evaluated the effects of G datasets on SWE in Colorado.

415 They found fine spatial scale helped PRISM (0.8 km) and Daymet (1 km) outperform NLDAS (12 km) in simulating spatial SWE, with the highest correlation from PRISM. Gupta & Tarboton (2016) used spatially downscaled R datasets (MERRA data for T, rh, u, and Rs; RFE v2 data for P) and found good SWE simulation compared to SNOTEL data (mean NSE = 0.67 across 8 sites). Key sources of discrepancies were from P and Rs data uncertainty. These results indicate that accuracy in climate data translated into accuracy in ET and SWE simulation and suggest that all gridded data be scrutinized, and possibly

420 bias corrected, before use in ET and SWE modeling.

4.7 P Ensembles

Ensembles of gridded datasets often were recommended to account for gridded dataset uncertainty and better represent overall climatology (Gampe & Ludwig, 2017; Pokorny et al., 2020), but with some caveats. For example, Gampe & Ludwig (2017) found R data (compared to station data) showed fewer consecutive dry days (CDDs, P < 1 mm), more consecutive wet days

425 (CWDs, P > 1 mm), and lower contribution of heavy P events (i.e., more low but steady P events) to annual P, which has the potential to impact hydrologic simulation (more infiltration, less streamflow, greater baseflow, fewer floods, etc.). They

recommended identification and removal of such non-representative datasets from ensembles. Pokorny et al. (2020) suggested that data should be assessed in relation to the target hydrologic model's spatio-temporal scale. Notably, ensembles dampen extreme events and decrease the frequency of low/high P events, which can lead to non-representative hydrological simulation (Pokorny et al., 2020). Laiti et al. (2018) demonstrated a Hydrologic Coherence Test (HyCoT), essentially a metric-independent method of comparing gridded datasets according to their performance in a hydrologic model, to exclude meteorological data less capable of reproducing a hydrologic outcome.

4.8 Latency

The latency with which gridded datasets become available for use may be a critical factor in gridded dataset selection. Few studies assessed latency effects. Hafzi & Sorman (2022) found that some real-time datasets that were available with short latency (e.g., 1-h lag, PERSIANN-CSS with 0.04°) sacrificed accuracy compared to coarser, longer-latency datasets, such as IMERG-Late v6 (14-h lag, 0.1°), MSWEP v2.8 (few-month lag, 0.1°) and CHIRPS v2 (1-month lag, 0.05°).

5 Conclusions

This study summarized characteristics, primary references, and data availability of 63 gridded datasets at CONUS to global extents to assist in dataset selection by hydrologic investigators. Our review of information from 29 recent (past 10 years) intercomparison studies spans a wide range of gridded datasets, study settings and scales, and hydrologic modelling objectives. Readers are referred to these studies for a wealth of details on their results and recommendations; we encourage particular focus on studies with similar climatic setting and hydrologic objectives to the planned investigation. From this review and synthesis we formulated the following interpretations and, where appropriate, guidelines:

No single gridded climate dataset or data source was universally superior for hydrologic analyses. Several common themes arose among the 29 studies reviewed. Gridded daily temperature (T) datasets improved when derived from greater station density, though they were relatively interchangeable in hydrologic analyses. Gridded daily precipitation (P) data were more accurate when derived from higher-density station data, when used in spatially less-complex terrain, and when corrected using ground-based (G) data. In mountainous or humid regions, reanalysis-based (R) gridded datasets generally performed better than G gridded datasets when the underlying station density was low; but when station densities were higher, there was no difference. Ground-based (G) gridded P datasets generally performed better than satellite-based (S) or R datasets, though better P and T datasets did not always translate into better streamflow modelling. Hydrologic analyses would benefit from advances in creating gridded datasets that retain climate variable interdependencies and better represent climate variables in complex topography. The caveat that some studies were insensitive to using independent sources of P and T may not be a good rationale for ignoring possible cross-correlations between climate variables. Rather, this result may point to the insensitivity of hydrologic models that don't necessarily capture space-time process interactions within a watershed. Use of hybrids of gridded

datasets and station data for a particular region remains a topic for further investigation because there can be substantial differences between data at a particular station and its corresponding grid-cell data.

Hydrologic studies rarely defend their selection of a particular dataset to address research questions, but investigators should justify their selection of a particular gridded dataset with full consideration of both the climatologic setting and the hydrologic analysis type and objectives. Through a thorough review of the recent literature, this study provides general consensus recommendations for dataset selection, though characteristics of a given hydrologic analysis or study may warrant more specific selection processes and criteria. The authors' overall recommendations to hydrologic modellers are to select the gridded dataset (from Tables 1, 2, and 3) (a) having spatial and temporal resolutions that match modelling scales, (b) that are primarily (G) or secondarily (SG, RG) derived from ground-based observations, especially in areas of high topographic relief, (c) with sufficient spatial and temporal coverage for the analysis, (d) with adequate latency for analysis objectives, and (e) that includes all climate variables of interest, so as to better represent interdependencies.

Appendix

Table A1. Summary of Different Data Formats, Descriptions, and Processing Approaches for Gridded Climate Datasets using Programming Languages and Software

Data Format Name	Description
NetCDF (Network Common Data Form)	The NetCDF format was first developed in the 1980s by researchers at the Unidata Program Center at the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR). Since then, it has undergone several revisions and updates to address technology and user needs changes. The latest version, NetCDF-4, includes support for compression, chunking, and parallel I/O, as well as new data types and features for handling large and complex datasets. NetCDF files are widely used in the atmospheric and climate science communities and are supported by many software packages. They include metadata that describe the file's contents and allow easy data access. NetCDF is a self-describing format, meaning the metadata are embedded within the file. This makes sharing and using the data more accessible, as the metadata travel with the data. NetCDF files can be read and written using a variety of software packages, including Python, R, and MATLAB. The NetCDF format can be accessed and manipulated using a variety of software packages, including: • NetCDF software library: A library of programming functions for working with NetCDF files in C, Fortran, and other programming languages. • NetCDF4-Python: A Python package that provides access to NetCDF files using the NetCDF-4 library. • RNetCDF: An R package that provides access to NetCDF files using the NetCDF library. • Panoply: A Java-based application for visualizing and analyzing NetCDF files. Some tutorials on working with NetCDF files include:

HDF5 (Hierarchical Data Format 5)	The HDF5 format was first introduced in 1997 by the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Since then, it has become a widely used format for scientific data, including climate data. HDF5 has undergone several revisions and updates, including supporting compression, chunking, parallel I/O, and new features for managing large and complex datasets. HDF5 is a flexible and efficient format that can handle various data types, including climate data. It includes features for managing large and complex datasets, such as compression, chunking, and parallel I/O. HDF5 files are portable across platforms and can be accessed using a variety of programming languages, including Python, R, and MATLAB. However, HDF5 can be more complex to work with than other formats, and the metadata are not always embedded within the file itself, making it harder to share and use the data. The HDF5 format can be accessed and manipulated using a variety of software packages, including: • HDF5 software library: A library of programming functions for working with HDF5 files in C, C++, Fortran, and other programming languages. • h5py: A Python package that provides access to HDF5 files using the HDF5 library. • rhdf5: An R package that provides access to HDF5 files using the HDF5 library. • HDF Compass: A graphical tool for exploring and editing HDF5 files. Some tutorials on working with HDF files include: • HDF Group HDF5 tutorial: https://portal.hdfgroup.org/display/HDF5/Tutorials • Python h5py tutorial: https://www.h5py.org/docs/ • R hdf5r tutorial: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/hdf5r/vignettes/hdf5r.pdf
ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange)	ASCII is a simple text format that has been in use for decades. While there have been no significant changes to the format, technological advances have made working with large datasets in ASCII format easier. ASCII files are easy to read and write but can be less efficient for storing large datasets. ASCII files can be opened and edited using any text editor, but additional processing may be required in other software packages. Some tutorials to handle simple text files include: • Python CSV tutorial: https://realpython.com/python-csv/ • R readr tutorial: https://readr.tidyverse.org/articles/readr.html • MATLAB import data function documentation: https://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/ref/importdata.html
GRIB (Gridded Binary)	The GRIB format was first introduced in the 1980s by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to standardize the exchange of weather and climate data. Since then, it has undergone several revisions and updates to address technology and user needs changes. The latest version, GRIB2, includes support for new data types and features for encoding and compressing data, which can make them more compact than other formats. However, GRIB files can be more complex than other formats and may require specialized software to read and write. The GRIB format can be accessed and manipulated using a variety of software packages, including:

- ECMWF GRIB API: A software library for working with GRIB files developed by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF).
- PyGRIB: A Python package that provides access to GRIB files using the ECMWF GRIB API.
- R package "gribtools": Provides tools to manipulate, read and write GRIB files.
- wgrib2: A command-line tool for manipulating and converting GRIB files.

Some tutorials on working with GRIB files include:

- ECMWF GRIB API tutorial: https://software.ecmwf.int/wiki/display/GRIB/GRIB+API+tutorial
- Python PyGRIB tutorial: https://jswhit.github.io/pygrib/docs/pygrib.html
- R rNOMADS tutorial: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/rNOMADS/vignettes/rNOMADS.html

GeoTIFF (Georeferenced Tagged Image File Format)	The GeoTIFF format was first introduced in the 1990s to include georeferencing information in TIFF image files. Since then, it has become a widely used format for storing and analyzing spatial data, including climate data. GeoTIFF has undergone several revisions and updates, including the addition of support for new coordinate systems and projections and new features for managing large and complex datasets. GeoTIFF files include spatial information, making them useful for storing and analyzing climate data that are geographically referenced. GIS software packages widely support them and include metadata describing the coordinate system, projection, and other data attributes. However, GeoTIFF files can be larger than other formats and may require specialized software to read and write.

The GeoTIFF format can be accessed and manipulated using a variety of software packages, including:

- GDAL (Geospatial Data Abstraction Library): A software library for reading and writing geospatial data, including GeoTIFF files. GDAL can be accessed using Python, R, and other programming languages.
- R package "raster": Provides tools to manipulate, read, and write GeoTIFF files in R.
- QGIS: A free and open-source GIS software package that includes tools for working with GeoTIFF files.
- ArcGIS: A proprietary GIS software package that includes tools for working with GeoTIFF files.

Some tutorials to help understand working with GeoTIFF files include:

- GDAL/OGR tutorial: https://gdal.org/tutorials/raster_api_tut.html
- Python rasterio tutorial: https://rasterio.readthedocs.io/en/latest/topics/index.html
- QGIS training manual: https://docs.qgis.org/3.16/en/docs/training_manual/index.html

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Author contribution

KM conceptualized the study and prepared original draft. SM compiled the data and contributed to preparing the original draft, KM and SM developed methodologies and interpreted data. TG and DB provided manuscript critical review and revisions.

Competing Interests

The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

USDA is an equal opportunity employer and provider. This research was supported by the USDA, Agricultural Research Service. The findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the author(s) and should not be construed to represent any official USDA or U.S. Government determination or policy. Mention of trade names or commercial products in this publication is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the USDA.

References

Abatzoglou, J. T.: Development of gridded surface meteorological data for ecological applications and modelling, Int. J. Climatol., 33(1), 121-131, https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3413, 2013.

Adler, R. F., Kidd, C., Petty, G., Morissey, M., and Goodman, H. M.: Intercomparison of global precipitation products: The third precipitation intercomparison project (PIP-3), Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 82, 1377–1396, 2001

Ang, R., Kinouchi, T., and Zhao, W.: Evaluation of daily gridded meteorological datasets for hydrological modeling in data-sparse basins of the largest lake in Southeast Asia, J. Hydrol., Regional Studies, 42, 101135, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2022.101135, 2022.

Ashouri, H., Hsu, K. L., Sorooshian, S., Braithwaite, D. K., Knapp, K. R., Cecil, L. D., Nelson, B. R., and Prat, O. P.: PERSIANN-CDR: Daily precipitation climate data record from multisatellite observations for hydrological and climate studies, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 96(1), 69-83, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00068.1, 2015.

Bandaru, V., Pei, Y., Hart, Q., and Jenkins, B. M.: Impact of biases in gridded weather datasets on biomass estimates of short rotation woody cropping systems, Agric. Forest Meteorol., 233, 71–79, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.11.008, 2017.

Barrett, E. C., Adler, R. F., Arpe, K., Bauer, P., Berg, W., Chang, A., Ferraro, R., Ferriday, J., Goodman, S., Hong, Y., Janowiak, J., Kidd, C., Kniveton, D., Morrissey, M., Olson, W., Petty, G., Rudolf, B., Shibata, A., Smith, E., and Spencer, R.: The first WetNet precipitation intercomparison project (PIP-1): Interpretation of results, Remote Sens. Reviews, 11, 303–373, https://doi.org/10.1080/02757259409532268, 1994.

Beck, H. E., Wood, E. F., Pan, M., Fisher, C. K., Miralles, D. M., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., McVicar, T. R., and Adler, R. F.: MSWEP V2 global 3-hourly 0.1° precipitation: methodology and quantitative assessment, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 100(3), 473–500, 2019.

Beck, H. E., van Dijk, A. I., Levizzani, V., Schellekens, J., Miralles, D. G., Martens, B., and De Roo, A.: MSWEP: 3-hourly 0.25 global gridded precipitation (1979–2015) by merging gauge, satellite, and reanalysis data, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21(1), 589-615, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-589-2017, 2017a.

Beck, H. E., Vergopolan, N., Pan, M., Levizzani, V., van Dijk, A. I, Weedon, G. P., Brocca, L., Pappenberger, F., Huffman, G. J., and Wood, E. F.: Global-scale evaluation of 22 precipitation datasets using gauge observations and hydrological modeling, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21(12), 6201-6217, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-6201-2017, 2017b.

Behnke, R., Vavrus, S., Allstadt, A., Albright, T., Thogmartin, W. E., Radeloff, V. C.: Evaluation of downscaled, gridded climate data for the conterminous United States, Ecol. Appl., 26(5), 1338–1351, 2016.

Berg, P., Almén, F., and Bozhinova, D.: HydroGFD3.0 (Hydrological Global Forcing Data): A 25 km global precipitation and temperature data set updated in near-real time, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 13, 1531–1545, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-1531-2021, 2021.

Berg, P., Donnelly, C., and Gustafsson, D.: Near-real-time adjusted reanalysis forcing data for hydrology, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 22, 989–1000, 2018.

Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., Moramarco, T., Hahn, S., Hasenauer, S., Kidd, R., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., and Levizzani, V.: Soil as a natural rain gauge: Estimating global rainfall from satellite soil moisture data, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 119, 5128–5141, 2014.

Buster, G., Bannister, M., Habte, A., Hettinger, D., Maclaurin, G., Rossol, M., Sengupta, M., and Xie, Y.: Physics-guided machine learning for improved accuracy of the National Solar Radiation Database, Solar Energy, 232,483-492, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2022.01.004, 2022.

Chen, M., Shi, W., Xie, P., Silva, V. B., Kousky, V. E., Wayne Higgins, R., and Janowiak, J. E.: 2008. Assessing objective techniques for gauge-based analyses of global daily precipitation, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 113(D4), https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009132,

Compo, G. P., et al.: The Twentieth Century Reanalysis project, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 137, 1–28, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.776, 2011.

Daly, C., Halbleib, M., Smith, J. I., Gibson, W. P., Doggett, M. K., Taylor, G. H., Curtis, J., and Pasteris, P. P.: Physiographically sensitive mapping of climatological temperature and precipitation across the conterminous United States, Int. J. Climatol.: A Journal of the Royal Meteorol. Soc., 28(15), 2031-2064, https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.1688, 2008.

Decker, M., Brunke, M. A., Wang, Z., Sakaguchi, K., Zeng, X., and Bosilovich, M. G.: Evaluation of the Reanalysis Products from GSFC, NCEP, and ECMWF Using Flux Tower Observations, J. Climate, 25, 1916-1944, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00004.1, 2012.

Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, D. P., and Bechtold P.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 137(656), 553-597, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828, 2011.

Dembélé, M., Schaefli, B., van de Giesen, N., and Mariéthoz, G.: Suitability of 17 gridded rainfall and temperature datasets for large-scale hydrological modelling in West Africa, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 24, 5379–5406, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-5379-2020, 2020.

De Pondeca, M. S. F. V., Manikin, G. S., DiMego, G., Benjamin, S. G., Parrish, D. F., Purser, R. J., Wu, W. -S., Horel, J. D., Myrick, D. T., Lin, Y., Aune, R. M., Keyser, D., Colman, B., Mann, G., and Vavra, J.: The real-time mesoscale analysis at NOAA's national centers for environmental prediction: current status and development, Wea. Forecast., 26, 593–612, https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-10-05037.1, 2011.

Durre, I., Arguez, A., Schreck III, C. J., Squires, M. F., and Vose, R. S.: Daily high-resolution temperature and precipitation fields for the Contiguous United States from 1951 to Present, J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-22-0024.1, 2022.

Ebert, E. E., Janowiak, J. E., and Kidd, C.: Comparison of near-real-time precipitation estimates from satellite observations and numerical models, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 88, 47–64, 2007.

Essou, G. R. C., Arsenault, R., and Brissette, F. P.: Comparison of climate datasets for lumped hydrological modeling over the continental United States, J. Hydrol., 537, 334-345, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.03.063, 2016a.

Essou, G. R. C., Brissette, F., and Lucas-Picher, P.: The Use of Reanalyses and Gridded Observations as Weather Input Data for a Hydrological Model: Comparison of Performances of Simulated River Flows Based on the Density of Weather Stations, J. Hydrometeorol., 18, 497-513, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-16-0088.1, 2017.

Essou, G. R. C., Sabarly, F., Lucas-Picher, P., Brissette, F., and Poulin, A.: Can Precipitation and Temperature from Meteorological Reanalyses be used for Hydrological Modeling?, J. Hydrometeorol., 17, 1929-1950, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0138.1, 2016b.

Fassnacht, S. R.: Estimating Alter-shielded gauge snowfall undercatch, snowpack sublimation, and blowing snow transport at six sites in the coterminous USA, Hydrol. Proc., 18(18), 3481-3492, 2004.

Funk, C., Peterson, P., Landsfeld, M., Pedreros, D., Verdin, J., Shukla, S., Husak, G., Rowland, J., Harrison, L., Hoell, A., and Michaelsen, J.: The climate hazards infrared precipitation with stations—a new environmental record for monitoring extremes, Sci. Data, 2(1), 1-21, https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2015.66, 2015.

Gampe, D., and Ludwig, R.: Evaluation of Gridded Precipitation Data Products for Hydrological Applications in Complex Topography, Hydrol., 4, 53, https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology4040053, 2017.

Gebremichael, M.: Framework for satellite rainfall product evaluation, In: Rainfall: State of the Science, edited by Testik, F. Y., and Gebremichael, M., Geophysical Monograph Series, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C., https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GM000974, 2010.

Gebremichael, M., Hossain, F., Huffman, G. J., Adler, R. F., Bolvin, D. T., and Nelkin, E. J.: The TRMM Multi-Satellite Precipitation Analysis (TMPA), 3-22, http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-90-481-2915-7_1, 2010.

Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., Randles, C. A., Darmenov, A., Bosilovich, M. G., Reichle, R., and Wargan, K.: The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, version 2 (MERRA-2), J. Climate, 30(14), 5419-5454, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0758.1, 2017.

Glahn, H. R., and Ruth, D. P.: The new digital forecast database of the national weather service, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 84, 195–202, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-84-2-195. 2003.

Gupta, A. S., and Tarboton, D. G.: A tool for downscaling weather data from large-grid reanalysis products to finer spatial scales for distributed hydrological applications, Environ. Modelling & Software, 84, 50e69, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.06.014, 2016.

Hafzi, H., and Sorman, A. A.: Assessment of 13 Gridded Precipitation Datasets for Hydrological Modeling in a Mountainous Basin. Atmos., 13, 143, https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13010143, 2022.

Harada, Y., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Onoda, H., Onogi, K., Miyaoka, K., and Takahashi, K.: The JRA-55 Reanalysis: Representation of atmospheric circulation and climate variability, J. Meteor. Soc. Japan, 94, 269-302, https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2016-015, 2016.

Harris, I., Osborn, T. J., Jones, P., and Lister, D.: Version 4 of the CRU TS monthly high-resolution gridded multivariate climate dataset, Sci. Data, 7(1), 109, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0453-3, 2020.

Henn, B., Newman, A. J., Livneh, B., Daly, C., and Lundquist, J. D.: An assessment of differences in gridded precipitation datasets in complex terrain, J. Hydrol., 556, 1205–1219, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.03.008, 2018.

Hersbach, H., de Rosnay, P., Bell, B., Schepers, D., Simmons, A. J., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Berrisford, P., Bidlot, J., de Boisséson, E., Bonavita, M., Browne, P., Buizza, R., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D. P., Dragani, R., Diamantaki, M., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Geer, A. J., Haiden, T., Hólm, E. V., Haimberger, L., Hogan, R., Horányi, A., Janisková, M., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Muñoz Sabater, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Richardson, D., Thépaut, J.-N., Vitart, F., Yang, X., Zsótér, E., and Zuo, H.: Operational global reanalysis: progress, future directions and synergies with NWP, ERA Report Series no. 27, ECMWF, Reading, UK, 2018.

Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlin, Q., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G., de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Villaume, S., and Thépaut, J. N.: The ERA5 global reanalysis, Quart. J. Royal Meteorol. Soc., 146(730), 1999-2049, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803, 2020.

Hoehn, D. C., Niemann, J. D., Green, T. R., Jones, A. S., and Grazaitis, P. J.: Downscaling soil moisture over regions that include multiple coarse-resolution grid cells, Remote Sensing Environ., 199, 187-200, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.07.021, 2017.

Hong, Y., Hsu, K. L., Sorooshian, S., and Gao, X. G.: Precipitation estimation from remotely sensed imagery using an artificial neural network cloud classification system, J. Appl. Meteorol., 43(12), 1834–1852, 2004.

605   Hou, A. Y., Kakar, R. K., Neeck, S., Azarbarzin, A. A., Kummerow, C. D., Kojima, M., Oki, R., Nakamura, K., and Iguchi, T.: The global precipitation measurement mission, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 95(5), 701-722, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00164.1, 2014.

Huffman, G. J., Adler, R. F., Morrissey, M. M., Bolvin, D. T., Curtis, S., Joyce, R., McGavock, B., and Susskind, J.: Global precipitation at one-degree daily resolution from multi-satellite observations, J. Hydrometeorol., 2(1), 36-50,
610   https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2001)002%3C0036:GPAODD%3E2.0.CO;2, 2001.

Huffman, G. J., Bolvin, D. T., Braithwaite, D., Hsu, K. L., Joyce, R. J., Kidd, C., Nelkin, E. J., Sorooshian, S., Stocker, E. F., Tan, J., and Wolff, D. B.: Integrated multi-satellite retrievals for the global precipitation measurement (GPM) mission (IMERG), Satellite Precipitation Measurement: Volume 1, 343-353, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-24568-9_19, 2020a.

615   Huffman, G. J., Bolvin, D. T., Braithwaite, D., Hsu, K., Joyce, R., Kidd, C., Nelkin, E. J., Sorooshian, S., Tan, J., and Xie, P.: NASA Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Integrated Multi-satellite Retrievals for GPM (IMERG), Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD), version 06, https://gpm.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-05/IMERG_ATBD_V06.3.pdf, 2020b.

Huffman, G. J., Adler, R. F., Behrangi, A., Bolvin, D. T., Nelkin, E. J., Gu, G., and Ehsani, M. R.: The new version 3.2 Global
620   Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) monthly and daily precipitation products, J. Climate, 36(21), 7635-7655, 2023.

Huffman, G. J., Bolvin, D. T., Nelkin, E. J., Wolff, D. B., Adler, R. F., Gu, G., Hong, Y., Bowman, K. P., and Stocker, E. F.: The TRMM multi-satellite precipitation analysis (TMPA): Quasi-global, multiyear, combined-sensor precipitation estimates at fine scales, J. Hydrometeorol., 8(1), 38-55, 2007.

Iguchi, T., Kozu, T., Kwiatkowski, J., Meneghini, R., Awaka, J., and Okamoto, K.: A Kalman filter approach to the Global
625   Satellite Mapping of Precipitation (GSMaP) from combined passive microwave and infrared radiometric data, J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan, 87A, 137–151, 2009.

Iizumi, T., Okada, M., and Yokozawa, M.: A meteorological forcing data set for global crop modeling: Development, evaluation, and intercomparison, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 119, 363–384, https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD020130, 2014.

Iizumi, T., Takikawa, H., Hirabayashi, Y., Hanasaki, N., and Nishimori, M.: Contributions of different bias-correction methods
630   and reference meteorological forcing data sets to uncertainty in projected temperature and precipitation extremes, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 122, 7800–7819, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026613, 2017.

Joyce, R. J., Janowiak, J. E., Arkin, P. A., and Xie, P.: CMORPH: A method that produces global precipitation estimates from passive microwave and infrared data at high spatial and temporal resolution, J. Hydrometeorol., 5, 487–503, 2004.

Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Harada, Y., Ebita, A., Moriya, M., Onoda, H., Onogi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H.,
635   Miyaoka, K., and Takahashi, K.: The JRA-55 reanalysis: General specifications and basic characteristics, J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan, Ser. I, 93, 5–48, https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2015-001, 2015.

Kouakou, C., Paturel, J. E., Stage, F., Tramblay, Y., Defrance, D., and Rouche, N.: Comparison of gridded precipitation estimates for regional hydrological modeling in West and Central Africa, J. Hydrol.: Regional Studies, 47, 101409, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2023.101409, 2023.

640 Kubota, T., Shige, S., Hashizume, H., Aonashi, K., Takahashi, N., Seto, S., Hirose, M., Takayabu, Y. N., Ushio, T., Nakagawa, K., Iwanami, K., Kachi, M., and Okamoto, K.: Global precipitation map using satellite-borne microwave radiometers by the GSMaP project: Production and validation, IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., 45, 2259–2275, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2007.895337, 2007.

Kubota, T., Aonashi, K., Ushio, T., Shige, S., Takayabu, Y. N., Kachi, M., Arai, Y., Tashima, T., Masaki, T., Kawamoto, N.,
645 Mega, T., Yamamoto, M. K., Hamada, A., Yamaji, M., Liu, G., and Oki, R.: Global Satellite Mapping of Precipitation (GSMaP) products in the GPM era, Satellite Precipitation Measurement, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24568-9_20, 2020.

Laiti, L., Mallucci, S., Piccolroaz, S., Bellin, A., Zardi, D., Fiori, A., Nikulin, G., and Majone, B.: Testing the hydrological coherence of high-resolution gridded precipitation and temperature data sets, Water Resour. Res., 54, 1999–2016,
650 https://doi.org/10.1002/2017WR021633, 2018.

Laloyaux, P., de Boisseson, E., Balmaseda, M. A., Bidlot, J.-R., Broennimann, S., Buizza, R., Dalhgren, P., Dee, D. P., Haimberger, L., Hersbach, H., Kosaka, Y., Martin, M., Poli, P., Rayner, N., Rustemeier, E., and Schepers, D.: CERA-20C: a coupled reanalysis of the twentieth century, J. Adv. Modeling Earth Syst., 10(5), 1172–1195, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001273, 2018.

655 Liu, C., Ikeda, K., Rasmussen, R., Barlage, M., Newman, A., Prein, A., Chen, F., Chen, L., Clark, M., Dai, A., Dudhia, J., Eidhammer, T., Gochis, D., Gutman, E., Kurkute, S., Li, Y., Thompson, G., and Yates, G.: Continental-Scale Convection-Permitting Modeling of the Current and Future Climate of North America. Climate Dynamics, 49, 71-95, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3327-9, 2017.

Livneh, B., Rosenberg, E. A., Lin, C., Nijssen, B., Mishra, V., Andreadis, K. M., Maurer, E. P., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: A
660 long-term hydrologically based dataset of land surface fluxes and states for the conterminous United States: Update and extensions, J. Climate, 26(23), 9384-9392, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00508.1, 2013.

Maggioni, V., Meyers, P. C., and Robinson, M. D.: A review of merged high resolution satellite precipitation product accuracy during the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM)-era, J. Hydrometeorol., 17, 1101–1117, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0190.1, 2016.

665 Massari, C., Crow, W., and Brocca, L.: An assessment of the performance of global rainfall estimates without ground-based observations. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 21, 4347–4361, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-4347-2017, 2017.

Massmann, C.: Evaluating the Suitability of Century-Long Gridded Meteorological Datasets for Hydrological Modeling, J. Hydrometeorol., 21, 2565-2580, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-19-0113.1, 2020.

Matsuura, K., National Center for Atmospheric Research Staff (Eds.): The Climate Data Guide: Global (land) precipitation
670 and temperature: Willmott & Matsuura, University of Delaware (last modified 2023-11-27), Retrieved from

https://climatedataguide.ucar.edu/climate-data/global-land-precipitation-and-temperature-willmott-matsuura-university-delaware; Accessed 2023-12-03, 2023.

Maurer, E. P., Wood, A. W., Adam, J. C., Lettenmaier, D. P., and Nijssen, B.: A long-term hydrologically based dataset of land surface fluxes and states for the conterminous United States. J. Climate, 15(22), 3237-3251, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2002)015,3237:ALTHBD.2.0.CO;2, 2002.

Mazzoleni, M., Brandimarte, L., and Amaranto, A.: Evaluating precipitation datasets for large-scale distributed hydrological modelling. J. Hydrol., 578, 124076, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124076, 2019.

McEvoy, D. J., Mejia, J. F., and Huntington, J. L.: Use of an observation network in the Great Basin to evaluate gridded climate data, J. Hydrometeorol., 15, 1913-1931, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0015.1, 2014.

Mei, X., Smith, P. K., Li, J., and Li, B.: Hydrological evaluation of gridded climate datasets in a Texas urban watershed using soil and water assessment tool and artificial neural network. Front. Environ. Sci., 10, 90577., https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.905774, 2022.

Melsen, L. A., Teuling, A. J., Torfs, P. J. J. F., Uijlenhoet, R., Mizukami, N., and Clark, M. P.: HESS Opinions: The need for process-based evaluation of large-domain hyper-resolution models. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20, 1069–1079, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-1069-2016, 2016.

Meng, J., Li, L., Hao, Z., Wang, J., and Shao, Q.: Suitability of TRMM satellite rainfall in driving a distributed hydrological model in the source region of Yellow River. J. Hydrol., 509, 320-332, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.049, 2014.

Mesinger, F., DiMego, G., Kalnay, E., Mitchell, K., Shafran, P. C., Ebisuzaki, W., Jović, D., Woollen, J., Rogers, E., Berbery, E. H., and Ek, M. B.: North American regional reanalysis. Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 87(3), 343-360, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-87-3-343, 2006.

Mourtzinis, S., Rattalino Edreira, J. I., Conley, S. P., and Grassini, P.: From grid to field: Assessing quality of gridded weather data for agricultural applications. Europ. J. Agron., 82, 163–172, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2016.10.013, 2017.

Muche, M. E., Sinnathamby, S., Parmar, R., Knightes, C. D., Johnston, J. M., Wolfe, K., Purucker, S. T., Cyterski, M. J., and Smith, D.: Comparison and Evaluation of Gridded Precipitation Datasets in a Kansas Agricultural Watershed Using SWAT, J. Amer. Water Resour. Assoc., 56(3), 486–506, https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12819, 2020.

Oyler, J. W., Ballantyne, A., Jencso, K., Sweet, M., and Running, S. W.: Creating a topoclimatic daily air temperature dataset for the conterminous United States using homogenized station data and remotely sensed land skin temperature, Int. J. Climatol., 35(9), 2258-2279, https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.4127, 2015.

Panahi, M., and Behrangi, A.: Comparative analysis of snowfall accumulation and gauge undercatch correction factors from diverse data sets: In situ, satellite, and reanalysis, Asia-Pacific J. Atmos. Sci., 56, 615-628, 2020.

Pokorny, S., Stadnyk, T. A., Lilhare, R., Ali, G., Dery, S. J., and Koening, K.: Use of Ensemble-Based Gridded Precipitation Products for Assessing Input Data Uncertainty Prior to Hydrologic Modeling, Water, 12, 2751, https://doi.org/10.3390/w12102751, 2020.

705   Poli, P., Hersbach, H., Dee, D. P., Berrisford, P., Simmons, A. J., Vitart, F., et al.: ERA-20C: An atmospheric reanalysis of the twentieth century, J. Climate, 29(11), 4083–4097, 2016.

Radcliffe, D. E., and Mukundan, R.: PRISM vs. CFSR Precipitation Data Effects on Calibration and Validation of SWAT Models, J. Amer. Water Resour. Assoc., 53(1), 89-100, https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12484, 2017.

Raimonet, M., Ouden, L., Thieu, V., Silvestre, M., Vautard, R., Rabouille, C., and Le Moigne, P.: Evaluation of Gridded
710   Meteorological Datasets for Hydrological Modeling, J. Hydrometeorol., 18, 3027-3041, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-17-0018.1, 2017.

Rasmussen, R. M., Chen, F., Liu, C. H., Ikeda, K., Prein, A., Kim, J., Schneider, T., Dai, A., Gochis, D., Dugger, A., Zhang, Y., Jaye, A., Dudhia, J., He, C., et al.: CONUS404: The NCAR–USGS 4-km Long-Term Regional Hydroclimate Reanalysis over the CONUS, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 104(8), E1382–E1408, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-21-
715   0326.1, 2023.

Ray, R. L., Sishodia, R. P., and Tefera, G. W.: Evaluation of Gridded Precipitation Data for Hydrologic Modeling in North-Central Texas, Remote Sens., 14, 3860, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14163860, 2022.

Reichle, R. H., Draper, C. S., Liu, Q., Girotto, M., Mahanama, S. P. P., Koster, R. D, and De Lannoy, G. J. M.: Assessment of MERRA-2 Land Surface Hydrology Estimates, J. Climate, 30, 2937–2960, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0720.1,
720   2017.

Rienecker, M. M., Suarez, M. J., Gelaro, R., Todling, R., Bacmeister, J., Liu, E., Bosilovich, M. G., Schubert, S. D., Takacs, L., Kim, G. K., and Bloom, S.: MERRA: NASA's modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, J. Climate, 24(14), 3624-3648, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00015.1, 2011.

Rodell, M., Houser, P. R., Jambor, U., Gottschalck, J., Mitchell, K., Meng, C. J., and Arsenault, K., et al.: The Global Land
725   Data Assimilation System, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 85, 381–94, 2004.

Rohde, R. A., and Hausfather, Z.: The Berkeley Earth Land/Ocean Temperature Record, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 12, 3469–3479, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-3469-2020, 2020.

Saha, S., Moorthi, S., Pan, H. L., Wu, X., Wang, J., Nadiga, S., Tripp, P., Kistler, R., Woollen, J., Behringer, D., and Liu, H.: The NCEP climate forecast system reanalysis, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 91(8), 1015-1058,
730   https://doi.org/10.1175/2010BAMS3001.1, 2010.

Saha, S., Moorthi, S., Wu, X., Wang, J., Nadiga, S., Tripp, P., Behringer, D., Hou, Y. T., Chuang, H. Y., Iredell, M., and Ek, M.: The NCEP climate forecast system version 2, J. Climate, 27(6), 2185-2208, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00823.1, 2014.

Schamm, K., Ziese, M., Becker, A., Finger, P., Meyer-Christoffer, A., Schneider, U.,… and Stender, P.: Global gridded
735   precipitation over land: A description of the new GPCC First Guess Daily product, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 6(1), 49–60, 2014.

Schneider, U., Finger, P., Meyer-Christoffer, A., Rustemeier, E., Ziese, M., and Becker, A.: Evaluating the hydrological cycle over land using the newly-corrected precipitation climatology from the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre (GPCC), Atmosphere, 8(3), 52, 2017.

Schneider, U., Ziese, M., Meyer-Christoffer, A., Finger, P., Rustemeier, E., and Becker, A.: The new portfolio of global precipitation data products of the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre suitable to assess and quantify the global water cycle and resources, Proc. IAHS, 374, 29–34, https://doi.org/10.5194/piahs-374-29-2016, 2016.

Sengupta, M., Xie, Y., Lopez, A., Habte, A., Maclaurin, G., and Shelby, J.: The national solar radiation data base (NSRDB), Renewable Sustainable Energy Reviews, 89, 51-60, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.003, 2018.

Setti, S., Maheswaran, R., Sridhar, V., Barik, K. K., Merz, B., and Agarwal, A.: Inter-Comparison of Gauge-Based Gridded Data, Reanalysis and Satellite Precipitation Product with an Emphasis on Hydrological Modeling, Atmos., 11, 1252, https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos11111252, 2020.

Sheffield, J., Goteti, G., and Wood, E. F.: Development of a 50-year high-resolution global dataset of meteorological forcings for land surface modeling, J. Climate, 19, 3088–3111, 2006.

Shuai, P., Chen, X., Mital, U., Coon, E. T., and Dwivedi, D.: The effects of spatial and temporal resolution of gridded meteorological forcing on watershed hydrological responses, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 26, 2245–2276, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-26-2245-2022, 2022.

Singh, H., and Najafi, M. R.: Evaluation of gridded climate datasets over Canada using univariate and bivariate approaches: Implications for hydrological modelling, J. Hydrol., 584, 124673, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124673, 2020.

Sorooshian, S., Hsu, K. L., Gao, X., Gupta, H. V., Imam, B., and Braithwaite, D.: Evaluation of PERSIANN system satellite-based estimates of tropical rainfall, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 81(9), 2035-2046, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2000)081%3C2035:EOPSSE%3E2.3.CO;2, 2000.

Strangeways, I.: Precipitation: Theory, measurement and distribution, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Sun, Q., Miao, C., Duan, Q., Ashouri, H., Sorooshian, S., Hsu, K. L.: A review of global precipitation data sets: Data sources, estimation, and intercomparisons, Reviews Geophys., 56(1), 79-107, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017RG000574, 2018.

Sun, R., Yuan, H., Liu, X., and Jiang, X.: Evaluation of the latest satellite–gauge precipitation products and their hydrologic applications over the Huaihe River basin, J. Hydrol., 536, 302–319, 2016.

Tan, J., Huffman, G. J., Bolvin, D. T., and Nelkin, E. J.: IMERG V06: Changes to the morphing algorithm. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 36(12), 2471-2482, 2019.

Tang, G., Clark, M. P., Papalexiou, S. M., Newman, A. J., Wood, A. W., Brunet, D., and Whitfield, P. H.: EMDNA: an Ensemble Meteorological Dataset for North America, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 13(7), 3337–3362, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-3337-2021, 2021.

Tarek, M., Brissette, F. P., and Arsenault, R.: Evaluation of the ERA5 reanalysis as a potential reference dataset for hydrological modelling over North America, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 24, 2527–2544. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-2527-2020, 2020.

Tercek, M. T., Rodman, A., Woolfolk, S., Wilson, Z., Thoma, D., and Gross, J.: Correctly applying lapse rates in ecological studies: Comparing temperature observations and gridded data in Yellowstone, Ecosphere 12(3), e03451, https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.3451, 2021.

Thornton, P. E., Shrestha, R., Thornton, M., Kao, S. C., Wei, Y., and Wilson, B. E.: Gridded daily weather data for North America with comprehensive uncertainty quantification, Sci. Data, 8(1), 190, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00973-0, 2021.

Ushio, T., Sasashige, K., Kubota, T., Shige, S., Okamoto, K., Aonashi, K., and Kawasaki, Z. I.: A Kalman Filter Approach to the Global Satellite Mapping of Precipitation (GSMaP) from Combined Passive Microwave and Infrared Radiometric Data, J. Meteorol. Soc. Japan, 87A, 137–151, 2009.

Ushio, T., Mega, T., and Kubota, T.: Multi-satellite Global Satellite Mapping of Precipitation (GSMaP)-Design and Products, In: 2019 URSI Asia-Pacific Radio Science Conference (APRASC), New Delhi, India, 1, https://doi.org/10.23919/URSIAPRASC.2019.8738594, 2019.

Warszawski, L., Frieler, K., Huber, V., Piontek, F., Serdeczny, O., and Schewe, J.: The inter-sectoral impact model intercomparison project (ISI–MIP): Project framework, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 111, 3228–3232, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312330110, 2014.

Weedon, G. P., Gomes, S. S., Viterbo, P. P., Shuttleworth, W. J., Blyth, E. E., Österle, H. H., Adam, J. C., Bellouin, N. N., Boucher, O. O., and Best, M. M.: Creation of the WATCH Forcing Data and Its Use to Assess Global and Regional Reference Crop Evaporation over Land during the Twentieth Century, J. Hydrometeor., 12, 823–848, https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JHM1369.1, 2011.

Weedon, G. P., Balsamo, G., Bellouin, N., Gomes, S., Best, M. J., and Viterbo, P.: The WFDEI meteorological forcing data set: WATCH Forcing Data methodology applied to ERA-Interim reanalysis data, Water Resour. Res. 50, 7505–7514, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015638, 2014.

Xia, Y., Mitchell, K., Ek, M., Sheffield, J., Cosgrove, B., Wood, E., Luo, L., Alonge, C., Wei, H., Meng, J., and Livneh, B.: Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for the North American Land Data Assimilation System project phase 2 (NLDAS-2): 1. Intercomparison and application of model products, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 117(D3), https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016048, 2012a.

Xia, Y., Mitchell, K., Ek, M., Cosgrove, B., Sheffield, J., Luo, L., Alonge, C., Wei, H., Meng, J., Livneh, B., and Duan, Q.: Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for North American Land Data Assimilation System project phase 2 (NLDAS-2): 2. Validation of model-simulated streamflow, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos., 117(D3), https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016051, 2012b.

Xie, P., and Arkin, P. A.: Global precipitation: A 17-year monthly analysis based on gauge observations, satellite estimates, and numerical model outputs, Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc., 78, 2539–2558, 1997.

Xie, P., Chen, M., Yang, S., Yatagai, A., Hayasaka, T., Fukushima, Y., and Liu, C.: A gauge-based analysis of daily precipitation over East Asia, J. Hydrometeorol. 8, 607–626, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM583.1, 2007.

Xie, P., Joyce, R., Wu, S., Yoo, S.-H., Yarosh, Y., Sun, F., and Lin, R.: Reprocessed, bias-corrected CMORPH global high-resolution precipitation estimates from 1998, J. Hydrometeorol., 18, 1617–1641, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-16-0168.1, 2017.

Yang, Y., Wang, G., Wang, L., Yu, J., and Xu, Z.: Evaluation of gridded precipitation data for driving SWAT model in area upstream of three gorges reservoir, PLoS One, 9(11), e112725, 2014.

Zhang, T., Chandler, W. S., Hoell, J. M., Westberg, D., Whitlock, C. H., and Stackhouse, P. W.: A global perspective on renewable energy resources: NASA's prediction of worldwide energy resources (power) project, In: Proceedings of ISES World Congress 2007 (Vol. I–Vol. V) Solar Energy and Human Settlement, 2636-2640, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.

Zhu, H., Li, Y., Huang, Y., Li, Y., Hou, C., and Shi, X.: Evaluation and hydrological application of satellite-based precipitation datasets in driving hydrological models over the Huifa river basin in Northeast China, Atmos. Res., 207, 28-41, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2018.02.022, 2018.

810