1 Spatiotemporal change and trend analysisof potential
2 evapotranspirationover the Loess Plateau of Chinaduring 2011–2100

3 Shouzhang Peng ^{a, b}, Yongxia Ding^c, Zhongming Wen ^{a, b}, Yunming Chen ^{a, b, *}, Yang Cao ^{a, b}, Jingyu
4 Ren^d

5 ^a State Key Laboratory of Soil Erosion and Dryland Farming on the Loess Plateau, NorthwestA&F
6 University, Yangling 712100, China

7 ^bInstitute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences and Ministry of Water
8 Resources, Yangling 712100, China

9 ^cCollege of Earth Environmental Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China

10 ^d Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, NorthwestA&F University, Yangling 712100, China

11

12

13 *Corresponding author.

14 Yunming Chen

15 No. 26, Xinong Road, Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Yangling, Shaanxi 712100, PR
16 China

17 Tel: +86 131 5200 7691

18 E-mail: ymchen@ms.iswc.ac.cn

19

20

21

22

Abstract: The spatiotemporal change and trend of annual potential evapotranspiration (PET) over the Loess Plateau of China from 2011 to 2100 are assessed in this work. PET is calculated using the Hargreaves model with monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperatures and a 1 km spatial resolution, which are generated using the Delta downscaling method and general circulation models (GCMs) with four representative concentration pathway (RCP) scenarios. The PET trend is detected via Mann–Kendall and Sen’s slope estimator tests. The following results are drawn: (1) the Delta downscaling method shows a favorable performance in detecting GCM monthly temperatures based on the mean absolute error and regression analysis between downscaled data and independent surface observations. Among the 28 GCMs, the NorESM1-M and GISS-E2-R models show the best performance in reproducing the monthly mean/maximum and minimum temperatures over the Loess Plateau, respectively; (2) the average annual PET over this region will increase by 12.7% to 23.9% from 1961–1990 to the end of this century (2071–2100). However, these increments show strong spatial variations; (3) the annual PET during the 2011–2100 period at each grid of the region demonstrates a significantly increasing trend under each RCP scenario, while RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP6.0, and RCP8.5 have average magnitudes of trend of 10.4 mm/10yr, 17.7 mm/10yr, 21 mm/10yr, and 29.7 mm/10yr, respectively; (4) the annual PET with significant trends during the other three periods (2011–2040, 2041–2070, and 2071–2100) present various spatial distributions in their magnitudes of trend under the aforementioned RCP scenarios. RCP2.6 showed a significant decrease during 2041–2070 and 2071–2100, although such trends are only observed at 0.3% and 1.2% of the Loess Plateau, respectively; and (5) the spatial results provide some information, such as locations and area ratios, which are valuable in assessing future PET changes and trends. These spatiotemporal results represent the PET changes and trends in detail and provide insights for developing flexible adaptation and mitigation strategies to

combat the effects of global warming in this region.

Keywords: Potential evapotranspiration; Delta downscaling; Hargreaves model; Mann–Kendall trend test; Sen’s slope estimator; Loess Plateau

1. Introduction

The Loess Plateau (LP) of China is known for its severe soil erosion (Sun et al., 2015). Given that most areas in this region have semiarid and sub-humid climates with an annual mean precipitation (1961–2009) of 143.6 mm to 811.8 mm along the southeast–northwest direction, the LP is also threatened by severe water shortage (Li et al., 2012a). Over the past 50 years, the annual precipitation and air temperature over the LP decreased and increased, respectively (Bi et al., 2009; Miao et al., 2011; Sun et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2012), thereby exacerbating the water shortage and threatening the development of this region (Li et al., 2012a). Under the effects of global warming, the temperature over the LP will continuously increase throughout the century (Li et al., 2012b) and subsequently accelerate the water loss in this region (Aouissi et al., 2016). Potential evapotranspiration (PET) is a key hydrological variable for quantifying water loss in a region; this variable can be used to calculate actual evapotranspiration, schedule irrigation projects, and prepare input data for hydrological models (Aouissi et al., 2016; Li et al., 2012a). Therefore, the future PET in the LP must be investigated to develop suitable adaptation and mitigation strategies for combating the effects of global warming.

Studies on PET have a long history and have proposed several calculation methods, including the Penman–Monteith (Allen et al., 1998), Hargreaves (Hargreaves and Samani, 1985), and Priestly–Taylor methods (Priestley and Taylor, 1972), which can indirectly calculate PET using meteorological data (Aouissi et al., 2016). The Penman–Monteith method has been considered as a universal standard for estimating PET (Allen et al., 1998; Aouissi et al., 2016). However, this method

67 requires five daily weather parameters that influence evaporation, namely, solar radiation, minimum and
 68 maximum air temperature, relative humidity, and wind speed. The other methods also provide acceptable
 69 results (Arnold et al., 1998). Considered the best method for estimating PET in the LP (Zhao et al., 2004),
 70 the Hargreaves method only depends on three monthly climate parameters, namely, mean,
 71 maximum, and minimum temperatures (Hargreaves and Samani, 1985).

72 General circulation models (GCMs) provide valuable information on long-term temperature projections
 73 at a global or sub-continental scale (IPCC, 2013). The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5
 74 (CMIP5) of the World Climate Research Program provides the state-of-the-art multi-model dataset used
 75 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change for its fifth assessment report. Most of the extant
 76 GCMs have horizontal resolutions of a few hundred kilometers (Meehl et al., 2007), and several
 77 researchers have attempted to downscale CMIP5 model datasets to a 0.5 degree (approximately 55 km)
 78 (Brekke et al., 2013). However, spatial resolution limits the ability of GCM datasets to represent complex
 79 topography, land surface characteristics, and other processes in the climate system (Xu et al.,
 80 2016). Therefore, GCM datasets cannot draw realistic and reliable temperature change data at fine scales,
 81 which are required when developing suitable adaptation and mitigation strategies at the regional-to-local
 82 scale (Giorgi et al., 2009). Dynamic or statistical downscaling models for GCM data are necessary for
 83 downscaling a temperature dataset because these models add values to the data (Mosier et al., 2014; Xu et
 84 al., 2016). Dynamic downscaling requires numerous inputs and computational requirements (Brekke et
 85 al., 2013; Xu et al., 2016) and sometimes cannot represent reliable temperature change data at fine scales
 86 compared with statistical downscaling (Ahmed et al., 2013; Dosio et al., 2015; Xu et al.,
 87 2016). Therefore, statistical downscaling cannot generate a high spatial resolution temperature dataset for
 88 drawing PET information of the LP at a fine scale.

The statistical downscaling framework often involves regression and Delta downscaling methods. The former constructs multiple linear regression relationships between raw GCM data and station observations in the historical period, and then applies these relationships to future GCM grid outputs (Li et al., 2012b; Timm et al., 2015). This framework generates substantial climate element data at target stations in future periods, but cannot construct a high spatial resolution future climate dataset that prevents drawing detailed spatial variations at fine scales. The latter uses a low-resolution monthly timeseries and high-resolution reference climatology as inputs; the high-resolution climatology input must present a physically representative, fine-scale distribution of the meteorological variable over the landscape (Brekke et al., 2013; Mosier et al., 2014). Unlike the direct interpolation of low spatial resolution sources to a higher spatial resolution, the Delta downscaling process incorporates high-resolution orographic effects that are not represented in low-resolution input grids (Mosier et al., 2014).

Previous studies have assessed the future PET change and trend over the LP (Li et al., 2012a). However, these studies were conducted at the station scale, used the regression downscaling framework to obtain future climate data, and adopted a geo-statistical interpolation method to describe the spatial variations of PET. The limited amount of information on the detailed spatial variations of PET change and trend over the LP during future periods hinders the development of flexible adaptation and mitigation strategies to combat the effects of global warming in this region.

This study aims (1) to generate future monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperature data with high spatial resolution using the Delta downscaling method and GCMs data, and (2) to calculate and assess future annual PET changes, trends, and their spatial variations based on the downscaled temperature data during 2011–2100.

2. Data and methods

2.1 Study area

The LP region is situated in North China (33.7°–41.3° N, 100.8°–114.6°E) and traversed by the upper–middle reaches of the Yellow River (Figure 1). The region starts from the Taihang Mountains in the east, reaches the Riyue Mountains in the west, and borders on the Qinling and Yin Mountains in the south and north, respectively (Liu et al., 2016). The LP has a warm or temperate continental monsoon climate with extensive monsoonal influence. Approximately 60%–70% annual precipitation occurs in this region from June to September in the form of high-intensity storms (Wang et al., 2012). The annual mean temperature ranges from 3.6 °C in the northwest to 14.3 °C in the southeast. The region demonstrates a large diurnal temperature range throughout the year and faces dry and cold winters, hot and humid summers, rapid temperature reduction during autumn, and rapid temperature increase during spring. The annual potential evaporation in this area (865 mm to 1274 mm) is estimated to exceed the precipitation level (Li et al., 2012a). The region spans arid, semiarid, and semi-humid zones and is considered as a semiarid-to-semihumid transitional zone that is sensitive to climate change (Liu and Sang, 2013).

2.2 Data collection

GCM monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperature data were obtained from the downscaled CMIP5 dataset with a 0.5 degree resolution (http://gdo-dcp.ucllnl.org/downscaled_cmip_projections/). This dataset was processed from raw 28 GCM data using the bias-correction spatial disaggregation (BCSD) method described in Brekke et al. (2013). Table 1 lists the basic information of the 28 GCM models and the associated institutions. This dataset covers the period from January 1950 to December 2100; the data from 1950 to 2005 are historical data under the historical emissions scenario, while those from 2006 to 2100 are future data under future

representative concentration pathway(RCP) scenarios (i.e.,RCP2.6,RCP4.5,RCP6.0,and RCP8.5).

The high-resolution reference climatologies were presented as grid data with a 1km (approximately 30 arcseconds) resolution as suggested by the Chinese Ecosystem Research Network (CERN, www.cnern.org.cn). These climatologies were processed using spatial interpolation and geographic information systems that covered 740 national weather stations in China and a 1km digital elevation model. These instruments covered each month from 1961 to 2000.

The surface observation data for the monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperatures were obtained from 113 national weather stations in and around the LP (Figure 1) (<http://data.cma.cn/>); these data were used to evaluate the downscaled monthly temperature grids from January 1991 to December 2005 (period of the available temperature data). The surface observation data for monthly pan evaporation were obtained from 26 evaporation pans belonging to the national weather stations in and around the LP (Figure 1); these data were used to evaluate the calculated monthly PET grids from January 1985 to December 2005 (period of the available pan evaporation data).

2.3 Delta downscaling procedure

The Delta downscaling method was applied on the aforementioned data to produce monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperature grids with a 1km resolution from January 1950 to December 2100. A part of the BCSD method, the Delta downscaling process has been described in many studies (Maurer et al., 2002; Ning et al., 2015; Wood et al., 2002). Figure 2 shows a rectangular region (red zone in Figure 1) that covers the LP region and illustrates the components and steps of the Delta downscaling process for determining mean temperature using the GCM 0.5 degree time series and CERN 30-arcsecond climatology datasets. The first step (Figure 2(a)) constructs a 0.5 degree climatology for each month from the 0.5 degree time-series dataset. The low-resolution climatology is produced using

the 1961–2000 period, which is also used by CERN to construct its climatology data. A 0.5 degree anomaly (Figure 2(b)) is then calculated. The anomaly for temperature is computed as the difference between the timeseries element and climatology. The anomaly is then interpolated to the 30-arcsecond CERN grid using the spatial interpolation method (Figure 2 (c)). The final step (Figure 2(d)) transforms the high-resolution anomaly back to an absolute surface by scaling this anomaly using the CERN climatology for the corresponding month. This transformation undoes the creation of the anomaly; therefore, addition is used for temperature.

The anomaly grid from the original to high-resolution coordinates, as illustrated in Figure 2(c), can be interpolated using several interpolation methods, including nearest-neighbor, bilinear, cubic spline, and bicubic interpolations. The nearest-neighbor interpolation uses the values of nearby grids to estimate the value of the original grid. Bilinear interpolation fits a linear function over each interval on the original grid in one dimension and in another. Cubic spline interpolation fits a “natural” spline (i.e., without a tension parameter) to each interval. Bicubic interpolation is an extension of cubic interpolation that interpolates the value on a two-dimensional regular grid. The interpolated surface is smoother than the corresponding surfaces obtained via bilinear or nearest-neighbor interpolation. These four interpolation methods were conducted using the interp2 function of MATLAB.

2.4 Evaluation of the Delta downscaling method

The spatial downscaling process for temperature was conducted over the red zone in Figure 1. Surface observation records from 113 national weather stations across the red zone were used to verify the accuracy of each downscaled grid. The observation records from January 1991 to December 2005 were used to verify the downscaled results.

The average model-performance error was quantified using mean absolute error (MAE), which is a more

natural measure of average error compared with the root-mean-square error (Wang and Chen, 2014; Willmott and Matsuura, 2005). This accuracy estimator can be mathematically expressed as follows:

$$MAE = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n |P_i - O_i|, \quad (1)$$

where P_i and O_i are the downscaled and observed values, respectively, and n is the number of records of all validated stations.

2.5 Calculation of PET

Monthly PET (mm/month) is calculated via the Hargreaves method and by using monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperatures. Several improvements were applied to the original equation (Hargreaves and Samani, 1982; Hargreaves and Samani, 1985). The form used in this study was published in 1985 (Hargreaves and Samani, 1985) and expressed as follows:

$$PET = 0.0023 \cdot S_0 \cdot (MaxT - MinT)^{0.5} \cdot (MeanT + 17.8), \quad (2)$$

where $MaxT$ is the maximum air temperature for a specific month ($^{\circ}C$), $MinT$ is the minimum air temperature for a specific month ($^{\circ}C$), $MeanT$ is the mean air temperature for a specific month ($^{\circ}C$), and S_0

is the extra-terrestrial solar radiation (mm/month) at the top of the Earth's atmosphere on a horizontal

surface (Allen et al., 1998). S_0 can be calculated according to the solar constant, number of days in a year,

latitude, and solar declination. The detailed calculation procedure has been described in Allen et al. (1998)

and Zhao et al. (2004).

2.6 Trend analysis methods

The significant trends in climatologic time series can be tested using parametric and non-parametric methods. Parametric trend tests require the data to be independent and normally distributed, while non-parametric trend tests only require independent data (Gocic and Trajkovic, 2013). Two non-parametric methods (Mann–Kendall and Sen's slope estimator tests) were used to detect

the PET trends over the LP in each grid from 2011 to 2100. The Mann–Kendall test provides a measure (Z_s) that indicates whether the long-term change of a variable is significant or not (Atta-ur-Rahman and Dawood, 2016). A comparison analysis was conducted at the 95% confidence level. The time series trend was significant at the 95% confidence level when $|Z_s| > 1.96$. $Z_s > 1.96$ indicates a significant increase, while $Z_s < -1.96$ indicates a significant decrease. The magnitude of the PET trend was calculated via Sen's slope estimator test (Atta-ur-Rahman and Dawood, 2016).

3. Results

3.1 Evaluation of downscaled temperature and calculated PET

Table 2 shows the MAE between the downscaled and observed monthly MeanT, MaxT, and MinT under the four interpolation methods. The MAE under bilinear interpolation is the smallest for each GCM, although such error slightly differs across the four interpolation methods. Similarly, the MAE under the bilinear interpolation ranges from 1.342°C to 1.599 °C for monthly MeanT, from 1.715°C to 1.978 °C for monthly MaxT, and from 1.336°C to 5.527 °C for monthly MinT. The NorESM1-M model demonstrates the best performance in reproducing the monthly MeanT and MaxT over the LP, while the GISS-E2-R model demonstrates the best performance in reproducing the monthly MinT in the LP. The regression analysis reveals that the monthly temperature values downscaled by the most suitable GCMs data are close to the observed values at the four seasons (Figure 3). Although the monthly PET values calculated by the most accurate MeanT, MaxT, and MinT values are slightly smaller than the observed values, the statistical indicators between these values present a high evaluation for calculating the monthly PET (Figure 4).

3.2 Spatiotemporal changes in PET

As mentioned in Section 3.1, the monthly PET during the 1950–2100 period was calculated by the MeanT,

MaxT, and MinT, and the temperature values were downscaled by the most suitable GCM data using the bilinear interpolation method. A reference period (1961–1990) was set, and the future period (2011–2100) was divided into three periods (2011–2040, 2041–2070, and 2071–2100) to assess the spatiotemporal change and trend of annual PET in the future period.

Figure 5 shows the spatial patterns of mean annual PET changes in the future period (2011–2100) under the four RCP scenarios relative to the reference period (1961–1990). Under each RCP, the zones that showed the largest changes were located in high-elevation regions, such as Wutai Mountain in the northeast, Hua Mountain in the south, and Qilian Mountains in the west. Table 3 shows the corresponding Min, Max, Mean, and coefficient of variation (CV) for each spatial distribution in Figure 5. The CV indicates that RCP8.5 shows the largest spatial variation (10.9%), while RCP2.6 shows the smallest spatial variation (9.2%). The difference between Max and Min indicates that RCP8.5 shows the most extreme spatial variation (20.6%; ranging from 11.9% to 32.6%), while RCP2.6 shows the most moderate spatial variation (10.9%; ranging from 7.6% to 18.5%). The Mean indicates that the PET over the LP changes by 9.5% for RCP2.6, 10.8% for RCP4.5, 10.1% for RCP6.0, and 14.1% for RCP8.5.

Figure 6 shows the spatial patterns of the mean annual PET changes in 2011–2040, 2041–2070, and 2071–2100 under the four RCP scenarios relative to the reference period (1961–1990). During each period, the zones with the largest PET change were located in some high-elevation regions under all RCP scenarios as shown in the 2011–2100 period. Table 3 shows the corresponding Min, Max, Mean, and CV for each spatial distribution in Figure 6. The CV indicates that RCP4.5 shows the largest spatial variation in 2011–2040 (21.8%), while RCP6.0 shows the smallest spatial variation in 2071–2100 (8.3%). The difference between Max and Min indicates that RCP8.5 shows the most extreme spatial variation in 2071–2100 (31.9%; ranging from 20.6% to 52.5%), while RCP6.0 shows the most

moderate spatial variation in 2011–2040 (9.7%; ranging from 1.8% to 11.5%). The Mean indicates that the averaged PET change over the LP increases with time under each RCP scenario in the future periods.

3.3 Trend analysis in PET

Mann–Kendall and Sen’s slope estimator tests were conducted at each grid over the LP. Figure 7 maps the spatial patterns of annual PET trend during 2011–2100 (i.e., 90-year span) under the four RCP scenarios, while Table 4 lists the corresponding statistical indexes (Min, Max, Mean, and CV) and area ratios (AR) of the significant trend zones over the entire LP region. The Mann–Kendall test reveals that the annual PET during 2011–2100 at each grid over the LP demonstrates a significantly increasing trend under each RCP scenario, that is, the AR under each RCP scenario is equal to 100% at the 95% confidence level. The CV indicates that RCP2.6 shows the largest spatial variation (17.6%), while RCP8.5 shows the smallest spatial variation (7.1%). The difference between Max and Min indicates that RCP8.5 shows the most extreme spatial variation (14.2 mm/10yr; ranging from 22.9 mm/10yr to 37.1 mm/10yr), while RCP2.6 shows the most moderate spatial variation (12.9 mm/10yr; ranging from 3.1 mm/10yr to 16 mm/10yr). The Mean indicates that the averaged magnitude of PET trend over the LP increases along with emission intensity; the averaged magnitude is equal to 10.4 mm/10yr for RCP2.6, 17.7 mm/10yr for RCP4.5, 21.0 mm/10yr for RCP6.0, and 29.7 mm/10yr for RCP8.5.

Figure 8 maps the spatial patterns of annual PET trends in the three future periods (i.e., 30-year span) under the four RCP scenarios, while Table 4 lists the corresponding indexes (Min, Max, Mean, CV, and AR). The trend significantly increases under each scenario during 2011–2040. Specifically, the significantly increasing trend ranges from 10.9 mm/10yr to 41.9 mm/10yr with a mean of 26.5 mm/10yr for RCP2.6, from 9.8 mm/10yr to 48.7 mm/10yr with a mean of 29.1 mm/10yr for RCP4.5, from 7.7 mm/10yr to 29.3 mm/10yr with a mean of 18.5 mm/10yr for RCP6.0, and from 7.4 mm/10yr to 30.9

mm/10yr with a mean of 20.2mm/10yr for RCP8.5. This trend is observed in most of the LP region with 97.7% and 97.4% ARs under RCP2.6 and RCP4.5, respectively, in the west and north of the LP region with 36.3% AR under RCP6.0, and in the west and east of the LP region with 30% AR under RCP8.5. The trend also increases significantly under the three scenarios during 2041–2070. Specifically, the significantly increasing trend ranges from 12.7mm/10yr to 49.3mm/10yr with a mean of 29.9mm/10yr for RCP4.5, from 10mm/10yr to 42.5mm/10yr with a mean of 27.1mm/10yr for RCP6.0, and from 12.9mm/10yr to 46.2mm/10yr with a mean of 28.5mm/10yr for RCP8.5. This trend is observed in most of the LP region with 99.9%, 76.9%, and 95.7% ARs under RCP4.5, RCP6.0, and RCP8.5, respectively. During this same period, the trend significantly decreases under the RCP2.6 scenario and it ranges from 8.6 mm/10yr to 19.8mm/10yr with a mean of 14.8mm/10yr. This trend is observed in north of the LP with a 0.3% AR. The trend significantly increases under the three scenarios during 2071–2100; Specifically, the significantly increasing trend ranges from 7.5mm/10yr to 33 mm/10yr with a mean of 18.7mm/10yr for RCP4.5, from 12.8mm/10yr to 50.5mm/10yr with a mean of 26.7 mm/10yr for RCP6.0, and from 20.5mm/10yr to 55.8mm/10yr with a mean of 37.2mm/10yr for RCP8.5. This trend is observed in the southeast and northwest of the LP with 10.3% and 97.5% ARs for RCP4.5 and RCP6.0, respectively. This trend is observed across the entire LP region under the RCP8.5 scenario. During this same period, the trend significantly decreases under the RCP2.6 scenario; it ranges from 10.2mm/10yr to 29.4mm/10yr with a mean of 18.7mm/10yr and is located in northeast of the LP region with 1.2% AR. According to the CV analysis, RCP4.5 shows the largest spatial variation in 2011–2040 (23.2%), while RCP2.6 shows the smallest spatial variation in 2041–2070 (10.4%).

4. Summary and discussion

Although the significant changes in the PET trend over the LP have been studied in the literature (Li et al.,

2012a), previous studies were performed at the station scale and did not provide the magnitude of PET trend. This study assesses the PET changes and trends over the LP in future periods (i.e., 2011–2040, 2041–2070, 2071–2100, and 2011–2100) based on the high spatiotemporal resolution future temperature data generated through the Delta downscaling method and GCMs data of CMIP5. These spatiotemporal results represent the PET changes and trends over the LP in detail and provide insights for developing flexible adaptation and mitigation strategies to combat the effects of global warming in this region.

The PET changes in each future period demonstrate a very strong spatial variability (Figures 5 and 6, Table 3). Therefore, high spatial resolution temperature data are crucial in capturing PET variation at the fine scale. Large PET changes are also observed in some high-elevation regions (Figures 5 and 6). Based on the PET equation (i.e., Eq. (2)), these changes can be attributed to the fact that the high-elevation regions show a higher increment in the difference between MaxT and MinT than the low-elevation regions, especially for the Qilian Mountains located west of the LP region (Figure 9). Moreover, the average annual PET over the LP region will increase by 12.7% to 23.9% from 1961–1990 to the end of this century (2071–2100) (Table 3), while Wang and Chen (2014) predicted that the average annual precipitation over the LP region would increase by 10% in the same period. These results imply an increasing trend of water shortage over the LP region at the end of the century. Such accelerating water shortage may further decrease the crop yields and threaten the functioning of the native vegetation ecosystem. Therefore, the necessary adaptation and mitigation strategies must be adopted in the future to address these issues.

The magnitude of PET trend in each future period also demonstrates a very strong spatial variability (Figures 7 and 8, Table 4). The significant trends in PET are mapped over the LP, and their distributions present diverse characteristics, especially in terms of location and AR (Figures 7 and 8). The

Delta downscaling method reveals that the above detailed spatial results differ from those presented in other climate change studies, which have mapped the climate variables (e.g., temperature, precipitation, and PET) based on multiple weather stations data and by using geo-statistical interpolation methods, such as inverse distance weighted interpolation (Li et al., 2012a) and ordinary kriging interpolation (Atta-ur-Rahman and Dawood, 2016). Overall, unlike those from other studies, the spatial results in this study can draw the detailed orographic effects on MeanT, MaxT, MinT, and PET, as well as provide highly accurate information, such as location, AR, and other statistical indexes. These differences can be attributed to two reasons. First, other studies directly interpolated their station data to reveal the spatial patterns of climate variables, while this study employed the Delta downscaling framework to detect such patterns. Second, this study adopted a high-resolution climatology that represented an orographic effect with a 1 km spatial resolution in the Delta downscaling framework.

The significant PET trends in each future period (2011–2040, 2041–2070, and 2071–2100) under the four RCP scenarios show diverse spatial patterns and statistical results (Figure 8 and Table 4). By comparing the three major uncertainties in climate predictions that result from future natural fluctuations, model responses, and emission scenarios (Hawkins and Sutton, 2009; Hawkins and Sutton, 2011), the above diverseness can be attributed to inter-GCM (i.e., the spread of changes among GCMs under the same RCP scenario) and scenarios uncertainties (Ning and Bradley, 2015; Ning and Bradley, 2016). Given that this study adopted the data from two GCMs (i.e., NorESM1-M and GISS-E2-R models) to calculate the high-resolution future PET under the four RCP scenarios, the inter-GCM and scenarios uncertainties have a conjunction effect on the PET trends. Moreover, the PET trends under the RCP2.6 and RCP4.5 scenarios in 2011–2040 are larger than those under the RCP6.0 and RCP8.5 scenarios (Table 4), which implies that the uncertainties resulting from the NorESM1-M and GISS-E2-R models are

greater than those resulting from the different scenarios in this period. By contrast, in 2071–2100, the total uncertainties increase along with the emissionscenarios, and the largest trend is observed under the RCP8.5scenario.

This study employed the Delta downscaling framework to generate the monthly mean,maximum, and minimum temperatures with a 1km spatial resolution from January 1950 to December 2100 based on the GCM dataset with a 0.5 degree spatial resolution and high-resolution climatology representing anorographic effect. The MAE and regression analysis between the downscaled data and the independent surface station observations reflected the excellent performance of the Delta downscaling method(Table 2 and Figure 3). Wang and Chen (2014) used the Delta method to downscale raw 35 GCM data to a 0.5 degree spatial resolution; the MAE of monthly mean temperature ranged from 1.6 °C to 5.7 °C with a mean of 3.2 °C. Compared with those in Wang and Chen (2014), the MAE of monthly mean temperature in this study was smaller and ranged from 1.34 °C to 1.6 °C with a mean of 1.45 °C (Table 2). Wang and Chen (2014)also identified EC-EARTH as the model with the smallest MAE;this model generated a 0.5 degree spatial resolution temperature in China. By contrast, this studyidentifies the NorESM1-M and GISS-E2-Rmodelsas the best models for reproducing the monthly mean/maximum and minimum temperaturesover the LP, respectively.These differences may beattributed to the fact that this study adopted high-resolution climatology with a 1km spatial resolution for downscaling and used surface station observations to evaluate the downscaled results.Thesedifferencesemphasized the importance of high-resolution climatology and evaluation data in using the Delta downscaling framework. Until now, WorldClim(Mosier et al., 2014) and the employed climatology in this study are the best available high-resolution climatologies in the world and in China, respectively.Both climatologies have a 1 km spatial resolution in the Delta downscaling framework.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (41601058), CAS“Light of West China” Program (XAB2015B07), China Special Fund for Meteorological Research in the Public Interest (Major projects) (GYHY201506001-3), and Key cultivation project of Chinese Academy of Sciences “The promotion and management of ecosystem functions of restored vegetation in Loess Plateau, China”. The authors are grateful to the World Climate Research Programme's Working Group on Coupled Modelling, which is responsible for CMIP, and the authors thank the climate modeling groups (listed in Table 1 of this paper) for producing and making available their model output. For CMIP the U.S. Department of Energy's Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison provides coordinating support and led development of software infrastructure in partnership with the Global Organization for Earth System Science Portals. *In addition, the authors wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for their constructive suggestions to improve the quality of this article.*

References

- Ahmed, K.F., Wang, G., Silander, J., Wilson, A.M., Allen, J.M., Horton, R., Anyah, R., 2013. Statistical downscaling and bias correction of climate model outputs for climate change impact assessment in the U.S. northeast. *Global. Planet. Change* 100, 320–332.
- Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop evapotranspiration-Guidelines for computing crop water requirements-FAO Irrigation and drainage paper 56. FAO, Rome 300, D05109.
- Aouissi, J., Benabdallah, S., Chabaâne, Z.L., Cudennec, C., 2016. Evaluation of potential evapotranspiration assessment methods for hydrological modelling with SWAT–Application in data-scarce rural Tunisia. *Agr. Water Manage.* 174, 39–51.
- Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Williams, J.R., 1998. Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment part I: Model development1. *J. Am. Water Resour. As* 34, 73–89.
- Atta-ur-Rahman, Dawood, M., 2016. Spatio-statistical analysis of temperature fluctuation using Mann–Kendall and Sen's slope approach. *Clim. Dynam.* doi: 10.1007/s00382-016-3110-y.
- Bentsen, M., Bethke, I., Debernard, J.B., Iversen, T., Kirkevåg, A., Seland, Ø., Drange, H., Roelandt, C., Seierstad, I.A., Hoose, C., Kristjánsson, J.E., 2013. The Norwegian Earth System Model, NorESM1-M - Part 1: Description and basic evaluation of the physical climate. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 6, 687–720.
- Bi, H., Liu, B., Jie, W., Yun, L., Chen, Z., Cui, Z., 2009. Effects of precipitation and landuse on runoff during the past 50 years in a typical watershed in Loess Plateau, China. *Int. J. Sediment Res.* 24, 352–364.

- Brekke, L., Thrasher, B., Maurer, E., Pruitt, T., 2013. Downscaled CMIP3 and CMIP5 climate and hydrology projections: Release of downscaled CMIP5 climate projections, comparison with preceding information, and summary of user needs. US Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Services Center, Denver, Colorado.
- Chylek, P., Li, J., Dubey, M.K., Wang, M., Lesins, G., 2011. Observed and model simulated 20th century Arctic temperature variability: Canadian Earth System Model CanESM2. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 2011, 22893–22907.
- Collins, M., Tett, S.F.B., Cooper, C., 2001. The internal climate variability of HadCM3, a version of the Hadley Centre coupled model without flux adjustments. *Clim. Dynam.* 17, 61–81.
- Donner, L.J., Wyman, B.L., Hemler, R.S., Horowitz, L.W., Ming, Y., Zhao, M., Golaz, J.-C., Ginoux, P., Lin, S.-J., Schwarzkopf, M.D., Austin, J., Alaka, G., Cooke, W.F., Delworth, T.L., Freidenreich, S.M., Gordon, C.T., Griffies, S.M., Held, I.M., Hurlin, W.J., Klein, S.A., Knutson, T.R., Langenhorst, A.R., Lee, H.-C., Lin, Y., Magi, B.I., Malyshev, S.L., Milly, P.C.D., Naik, V., Nath, M.J., Pincus, R., Ploshay, J.J., Ramaswamy, V., Seman, C.J., Shevliakova, E., Sirutis, J.J., Stern, W.F., Stouffer, R.J., Wilson, R.J., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A.T., Zeng, F., 2011. The Dynamical Core, Physical Parameterizations, and Basic Simulation Characteristics of the Atmospheric Component AM3 of the GFDL Global Coupled Model CM3. *J. Climate* 24, 3484–3519.
- Dosio, A., Panitz, H.-J., Schubert-Frisius, M., Lüthi, D., 2015. Dynamical downscaling of CMIP5 global circulation models over CORDEX-Africa with COSMO-CLM: evaluation over the present climate and analysis of the added value. *Clim. Dynam.* 44, 2637–2661.
- Dufresne, J.-L., Foujols, M.-A., Denvil, S., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Aumont, O., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S., Bellenger, H., Benshila, R., Bony, S., Bopp, L., Braconnot, P., Brockmann, P., Cadule, P., Cheruy, F., Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., de Noblet, N., Duvel, J.-P., Ethé, C., Fairhead, L., Fichefet, T., Flavoni, S., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E., Hauglustaine, D., Hourdin, F., Idelkadi, A., Ghattas, J., Joussaume, S., Kageyama, M., Krinner, G., Labetoulle, S., Lahellec, A., Lefebvre, M.-P., Lefevre, F., Levy, C., Li, Z.X., Lloyd, J., Lott, F., Madec, G., Mancip, M., Marchand, M., Masson, S., Meurdesoif, Y., Mignot, J., Musat, I., Parouty, S., Polcher, J., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D., Szopa, S., Talandier, C., Terray, P., Viovy, N., Vuichard, N., 2013. Climate change projections using the IPSL-CM5 Earth System Model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5. *Clim. Dynam.* 40, 2123–2165.
- Dunne, J.P., John, J.G., Adcroft, A.J., Griffies, S.M., Hallberg, R.W., Shevliakova, E., Stouffer, R.J., Cooke, W., Dunne, K.A., Harrison, M.J., Krasting, J.P., Malyshev, S.L., Milly, P.C.D., Philipps, P.J., Sentman, L.T., Samuels, B.L., Spelman, M.J., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A.T., Zadeh, N., 2012. GFDL's ESM2 Global Coupled Climate–Carbon Earth System Models. Part I: Physical Formulation and Baseline Simulation Characteristics. *J. Climate* 25, 6646–6665.
- Giorgi, F., Jones, C., Asrar, G.R., 2009. Addressing climate information needs at the regional level: the CORDEX framework. *World Meteorol. Org. Bull.* 58, 175–183.
- Gocic, M., Trajkovic, S., 2013. Analysis of changes in meteorological variables using Mann-Kendall and Sen's slope estimator statistical tests in Serbia. *Global. Planet. Change* 100, 172–182.
- Hargreaves, G.H., Samani, Z.A., 1982. Estimating potential evapotranspiration. *J. Irrig. Drain. Div.* 108, 225–230.
- Hargreaves, G.H., Samani, Z.A., 1985. Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature. *Appl. Eng. Agric.* 1, 96–99.
- Hawkins, E., Sutton, R., 2009. The Potential to Narrow Uncertainty in Regional Climate Predictions. *B.*

Am. Meteorol. Soc. 90, 1095–1107.

Hawkins, E., Sutton, R., 2011. The potential to narrow uncertainty in projections of regional precipitation change. *Clim. Dynam.* 37, 407–418.

Hazeleger, W., Wang, X., Severijns, C., Ștefănescu, S., Bintanja, R., Sterl, A., Wyser, K., Semmler, T., Yang, S., van den Hurk, B., van Noije, T., van der Linden, E., van der Wiel, K., 2012. EC-Earth V2.2: description and validation of a new seamless earth system prediction model. *Clim. Dynam.* 39, 2611–2629.

IPCC, 2013. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 1535.

Ji, D., Wang, L., Feng, J., Wu, Q., Cheng, H., Zhang, Q., Yang, J., Dong, W., Dai, Y., Gong, D., Zhang, R.H., Wang, X., Liu, J., Moore, J.C., Chen, D., Zhou, M., 2014. Description and basic evaluation of Beijing Normal University Earth System Model (BNU-ESM) version 1. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 7, 2039–2064.

Li, Z., Zheng, F., Liu, W., 2012a. Spatiotemporal characteristics of reference evapotranspiration during 1961–2009 and its projected changes during 2011–2099 on the Loess Plateau of China. *Agr. Forest. Meteorol.* 154, 147–155.

Li, Z., Zheng, F., Liu, W., Jiang, D., 2012b. Spatially downscaling GCMs outputs to project changes in extreme precipitation and temperature events on the Loess Plateau of China during the 21st Century. *Global. Planet. Change* 82, 65–73.

Liu, W., Sang, T., 2013. Potential productivity of the *Miscanthus* energy crop in the Loess Plateau of China under climate change. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 8, 044003.

Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Shao, M., Jia, X., Li, X., 2016. Spatiotemporal analysis of multiscalar drought characteristics across the Loess Plateau of China. *J. Hydrol.* 534, 281–299.

Long, M.C., Lindsay, K., Peacock, S., Moore, J.K., Doney, S.C., 2013. Twentieth-Century Oceanic Carbon Uptake and Storage in CESM1(BGC). *J. Climate* 26, 6775–6800.

Marsland, S.J., Bi, D., Uotila, P., Hirst, A.C., 2013. Evaluation of ACCESS climate model ocean diagnostics in CMIP5 simulations. *Aust. Meteorol. Ocean.* 63, 101–119.

Maurer, E.P., Wood, A.W., Adam, J.C., Lettenmaier, D.P., Nijssen, B., 2002. A Long-Term Hydrologically Based Dataset of Land Surface Fluxes and States for the Conterminous United States. *J. Climate* 15, 3237–3251.

Meehl, G., Covey, C., Delworth, T., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, J., Stouffer, R., Taylor, K., 2007. The WCRP CMIP3 multi-model dataset: A new era in climate change research. *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* 88, 1383–1394.

Miao, C., Ni, J., Borthwick, A.G., Yang, L., 2011. A preliminary estimate of human and natural contributions to the changes in water discharge and sediment load in the Yellow River. *Global. Planet. Change* 76, 196–205.

Mosier, T.M., Hill, D.F., Sharp, K.V., 2014. 30-Arcsecond monthly climate surfaces with global land coverage. *Int. J. Climatol.* 34, 2175–2188.

Neale, R.B., Richter, J., Park, S., Lauritzen, P.H., Vavrus, S.J., Rasch, P.J., Zhang, M., 2013. The Mean Climate of the Community Atmosphere Model (CAM4) in Forced SST and Fully Coupled Experiments. *J. Climate* 26, 5150–5168.

- Ning, L., Bradley, R.S., 2015. Snow occurrence changes over the central and eastern United States under future warming scenarios. *Sci. Rep.* 5, 17073.
- Ning, L., Bradley, R.S., 2016. NAO and PNA influences on winter temperature and precipitation over the eastern United States in CMIP5 GCMs. *Clim. Dynam.* 46, 1257–1276.
- Ning, L., Riddle, E.E., Bradley, R.S., 2015. Projected Changes in Climate Extremes over the Northeastern United States. *J. Climate* 28, 3289–3310.
- Priestley, C., Taylor, R., 1972. On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large scale parameters. *Mon. Weather. Rev.* 100, 81–92.
- Qiao, F., Song, Z., Bao, Y., Song, Y., Shu, Q., Huang, C., Zhao, W., 2013. Development and evaluation of an Earth System Model with surface gravity waves. *J. Geophys. Res.* 118, 4514–4524.
- Ren, H.L., Wu, J., Zhao, C.B., Cheng, Y.J., Liu, X.W., 2016. MJO ensemble prediction in BCC-CSM1.1(m) using different initialization schemes. *Atmos. Ocean. Sci. Lett.* 9, 60–65.
- Rotstayn, L.D., Collier, M.A., Dix, M.R., Feng, Y., Gordon, H.B., O'Farrell, S.P., Smith, I.N., Syktus, J., 2010. Improved simulation of Australian climate and ENSO-related rainfall variability in a global climate model with an interactive aerosol treatment. *Int. J. Climatol.* 30, 1067–1088.
- Schmidt, G.A., Ruedy, R., Hansen, J.E., Aleinov, I., Bell, N., Bauer, M., Bauer, S., Cairns, B., Canuto, V., Cheng, Y., Genio, A.D., Faluvegi, G., Friend, A.D., Hall, T.M., Hu, Y., Kelley, M., Kiang, N.Y., Koch, D., Lacis, A.A., Lerner, J., Lo, K.K., Miller, R.L., Nazarenko, L., Oinas, V., Perlwitz, J., Perlwitz, J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Russell, G.L., Sato, M., Shindell, D.T., Stone, P.H., Sun, S., Tausnev, N., Thresher, D., Yao, M.-S., 2006. Present-Day Atmospheric Simulations Using GISS ModelE: Comparison to In Situ, Satellite, and Reanalysis Data. *J. Climate* 19, 153–192.
- Scoccimarro, E., Gualdi, S., Bellucci, A., Sanna, A., Fogli, P.G., Manzini, E., Vichi, M., Oddo, P., Navarra, A., 2011. Effects of Tropical Cyclones on Ocean Heat Transport in a High-Resolution Coupled General Circulation Model. *J. Climate* 24, 4368–4384.
- Sun, Q., Miao, C., Duan, Q., Wang, Y., 2015. Temperature and precipitation changes over the Loess Plateau between 1961 and 2011, based on high-density gauge observations. *Global. Planet. Change* 132, 1–10.
- Timm, O.E., Giambelluca, T.W., Diaz, H.F., 2015. Statistical downscaling of rainfall changes in Hawai'i based on the CMIP5 global model projections. *J. Geophys. Res.* 120, 92–112.
- Voldoire, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Salas y Mélia, D., Decharme, B., Cassou, C., Sénési, S., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Déqué, M., Deshayes, J., Douville, H., Fernandez, E., Madec, G., Maisonnave, E., Moine, M.-P., Planton, S., Saint-Martin, D., Szopa, S., Tyteca, S., Alkama, R., Belamari, S., Braun, A., Coquart, L., Chauvin, F., 2013. The CNRM-CM5.1 global climate model: description and basic evaluation. *Clim. Dynam.* 40, 2091–2121.
- Volodin, E.M., Dianskii, N.A., Gusev, A.V., 2010. Simulating present-day climate with the INMCM4.0 coupled model of the atmospheric and oceanic general circulations. *Izv. Atmos. Ocean. Phys.* 46, 414–431.
- Wang, H.J., Chen, H.P., Liu, J.p., 2015. Arctic Sea Ice Decline Intensified Haze Pollution in Eastern China. *Atmos. Ocean. Sci. Lett.* 8, 1–9.
- Wang, L., Chen, W., 2014. A CMIP5 multimodel projection of future temperature, precipitation, and climatological drought in China. *Int. J. Climatol.* 34, 2059–2078.
- Wang, Q., Fan, X., Qin, Z., Wang, M., 2012. Change trends of temperature and precipitation in the Loess Plateau Region of China, 1961–2010. *Global. Planet. Change* 92, 138–147.
- Watanabe, M., Suzuki, T., O'ishi, R., Komuro, Y., Watanabe, S., Emori, S., Takemura, T., Chikira, M.,

- Ogura, T., Sekiguchi, M., Takata, K., Yamazaki, D., Yokohata, T., Nozawa, T., Hasumi, H., Tatebe, H., Kimoto, M., 2010. Improved Climate Simulation by MIROC5: Mean States, Variability, and Climate Sensitivity. *J. Climate* 23, 6312–6335.
- Watanabe, S., Hajima, T., Sudo, K., Nagashima, T., Takemura, T., Okajima, H., Nozawa, T., Kawase, H., Abe, M., Yokohata, T., Ise, T., Sato, H., Kato, E., Takata, K., Emori, S., Kawamiya, M., 2011. MIROC-ESM 2010: model description and basic results of CMIP5-20c3m experiments. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 4, 845–872.
- Willmott, C.J., Matsuura, K., 2005. Advantages of the mean absolute error (MAE) over the root mean square error (RMSE) in assessing average model performance. *Climate Res.* 30, 79–82.
- Wood, A.W., Maurer, E.P., Kumar, A., Lettenmaier, D.P., 2002. Long-range experimental hydrologic forecasting for the eastern United States. *J. Geophys. Res.* 107, 4429.
- Xin, X.G., Wu, T.W., Li, J.L., Wang, Z.Z., Li, W.P., Wu, F.H., 2013. How Well does BCC_CSM1.1 Reproduce the 20th Century Climate Change over China? *Atmospheric and Oceanic Science Letters* 6, 21–26.
- Xu, J., Gao, Y., Chen, D., Xiao, L., Ou, T., 2016. Evaluation of global climate models for downscaling applications centred over the Tibetan Plateau. *Int. J. Climatol.* doi: 10.1002/joc.4731.
- Yukimoto, S., Adachi, Y., Hosaka, M., Sakami, T., Yoshimura, H., Hirabara, M., Tanaka, T.Y., Shindo, E., Tsujino, H., Deushi, M., Mizuta, R., Yabu, S., Obata, A., Nakano, H., Koshiro, T., Ose, T., Kitoh, A., 2012. A New Global Climate Model of the Meteorological Research Institute: MRI-CGCM3 —Model Description and Basic Performance—. *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.* 90A, 23–64.
- Zhang, X., Wang, Q., Mu, M., 2015. The impact of global warming on Kuroshio Extension and its southern recirculation using CMIP5 experiments with a high-resolution climate model MIROC4h. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* doi:10.1007/s00704-015-1672-y.
- Zhao, C., Nan, Z., Feng, Z., 2004. GIS-assisted spatially distributed modeling of the potential evapotranspiration in semi-arid climate of the Chinese Loess Plateau. *J. Arid Environ.* 58, 387–403.
- Zhou, T., Song, F., Chen, X., 2013. Historical evolution of global and regional surface air temperature simulated by FGOALS-s2 and FGOALS-g2: How reliable are the model results? *Adv. Atmos. Sci.* 30, 638–657.

Figure captions

Figure 1 Location and digital elevation model of Loess Plateau region in China, 131 national weather stations and 26 evaporation pans distributed in and around the region.

Figure 2 Schematic illustration of spatial downscaling process. The downscaled mean temperature (MeanT) field is constructed from GCM data in July 2005.

Figure 3 Comparisons of the observed (*x*) and downscaled (*y*) values of monthly mean temperature (MeanT, °C), maximum temperature (MaxT, °C), and minimum temperature (MinT, °C) at the four

seasons (spring: from March to May; summer: from June to August; autumn: from September to November; and winter: from December to February). The MeanT/MaxTand MinTvalues during 1/1991–12/2005are downscaled from the NorESM1-Mand GISS-E2-R models, respectively, using the bilinear interpolation method.

Figure4 Comparisons of the observed (x) and calculated (y) values of potential evapotranspiration (PET, mm)during 1/1985–12/2005.

Figure 5Geographic distributions of the changes in the mean annual PET (%) from the reference period (1961–1990) to the future period (2011–2100)under four emission scenarios.

Figure 6 Geographic distributions of the changes in the mean annual PET (%) from the reference period (1961–1990) to beginning-of-century (a1, b1, c1, and d1: 2011–2040), mid-century (a2, b2, c2, and d2: 2041–2070), and end-of-century (a3, b3, c3, and d3: 2071–2100) under four emission scenarios (rows).

Figure 7 Geographic distributions of the trend for the annual PET (mm/10yr) during 2011–2100 under four emission scenarios.

Figure 8Geographic distributions of the trend for the annual PET (mm/10yr) during the future periods (columns) under four emission scenarios (rows). The red zone indicates where the trend significantly increases at the 95% confidence level, and the black zone indicates where the trend significantly decreases at the 95% confidence level.

Figure 9 Geographic distributions of the changes in the differences between MaxT and MinT (°C) from the reference period (1961–1990) to the future period (2011–2100)under four emission scenarios.

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588 **Table 1** Summary of 28 general circulation models from CMIP5

	Model acronym	Institution	References
1	ACCESS1.0	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and Bureau of Meteorology, Australia	Marsland et al. (2013)
2	BCC-CSM1.1	Beijing Climate Center, China Meteorological Administration, China	Xin et al. (2013)
3	BCC-CSM1.1(m)		Ren et al. (2016)
4	BNU-ESM	Beijing Normal University, China	Ji et al. (2014)
5	CanESM2	Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, Canada	Chylek et al. (2011)
6	CESM1-BGC	NSF/DOE NCAR, USA	Long et al. (2013)
7	CESM1-CAM5		Neale et al. (2013)
8	CMCC-CM	Centro Euro-Mediterraneo per I Cambiamenti Climatici, Italy	Scoccimarro et al. (2011)
9	CNRM-CM5	Centre National de Recherches Meteorologiques, Meteo-France, France	Voldoire et al. (2013)
10	CSIRO-MK-3.6.0	Australian Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial	Rotstayn et al. (2010)

		ResearchOrganization, Australia	
11	EC-EARTH	EC-EARTH consortium, Europe	Hazeleger et al. (2012)
12	FGOALS-g2	Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China	Zhou et al. (2013)
13	FIO-ESM	The First Institution of Oceanography, SOA, China	Qiao et al. (2013)
14	GFDL-CM3	NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, USA	Donner et al. (2011)
15	GFDL-ESM2G		Dunne et al. (2012)
16	GFDL-ESM2M		Dunne et al. (2012)
17	GISS-E2-H-CC	NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, USA	Wang et al. (2015)
18	GISS-E2-R		Schmidt et al. (2006)
19	GISS-E2-R-CC		Wang et al. (2015)
20	HadCM3	Met Office Hadley Centre, UK	Collins et al. (2001)
21	INMCM4.0	Institute for Numerical Mathematics, Russia	Volodin et al. (2010)
22	IPSL-CM5A-LR	Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace, France	Dufresne et al. (2013)
23	MIROC4h	Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology,	Zhang et al. (2015)
24	MIROC5	University of Tokyo, and National Institute for	Watanabe et al. (2010)
25	MIROC-ESM	Environmental Studies (Japan)	Watanabe et al. (2011)
26	MIROC-ESM-CHEM		Watanabe et al. (2011)
27	MRI-CGCM3	Meteorological Research Institute, Japan	Yukimoto et al. (2012)
28	NorESM1-M	Norwegian Climate Centre, Norway	(Bentsen et al. (2013))

589

590

591

592

593

594 **Table 2** MAE between the observed and downscaled monthly MeanT, MaxT, and MinT from 113 national weather stations during 1/1991–12/2005

	Monthly MeanT (°C)				Monthly MaxT (°C)				Monthly MinT (°C)			
	Bicubic	Bilinear	Nearest	Spline	Bicubic	Bilinear	Nearest	Spline	Bicubic	Bilinear	Nearest	Spline
ACCESS1.0	1.460	1.458	1.462	1.460	1.824	1.822	1.824	1.824	1.442	1.439	1.444	1.442
BCC-CSM1.1	1.419	1.418	1.419	1.419	1.780	1.779	1.781	1.780	1.415	1.414	1.416	1.415
BCC-CSM1.1(m)	1.449	1.447	1.450	1.449	1.819	1.818	1.820	1.819	1.458	1.457	1.460	1.458
BNU-ESM	1.429	1.429	1.430	1.429	1.822	1.821	1.822	1.822	1.392	1.391	1.394	1.392
CanESM2	1.363	1.361	1.364	1.363	1.795	1.794	1.796	1.795	1.339	1.337	1.341	1.339
CESM1-BGC	1.434	1.432	1.435	1.434	1.753	1.751	1.754	1.753	1.482	1.480	1.483	1.482
CESM1-CAM5	1.392	1.390	1.392	1.392	1.718	1.716	1.718	1.718	1.415	1.412	1.416	1.415
CMCC-CM	1.484	1.482	1.484	1.484	1.891	1.889	1.891	1.891	1.455	1.453	1.456	1.455
CNRM-CM5	1.451	1.449	1.451	1.451	1.852	1.850	1.852	1.852	1.395	1.393	1.395	1.395
CSIRO-MK-3.6.0	1.424	1.422	1.425	1.424	1.803	1.801	1.803	1.803	1.372	1.370	1.373	1.372
EC-EARTH	1.444	1.442	1.444	1.444	1.865	1.864	1.866	1.866	1.411	1.409	1.412	1.411
FGOALS-g2	1.470	1.469	1.470	1.470	1.833	1.832	1.833	1.833	1.446	1.444	1.447	1.446
FIO-ESM	1.534	1.533	1.535	1.534	1.909	1.908	1.910	1.909	1.512	1.511	1.513	1.512
GFDL-CM3	1.383	1.382	1.384	1.384	1.772	1.770	1.772	1.772	1.389	1.387	1.389	1.389
GFDL-ESM2G	1.415	1.413	1.416	1.415	1.727	1.725	1.729	1.728	1.476	1.474	1.478	1.476
GFDL-ESM2M	1.425	1.423	1.426	1.425	1.809	1.807	1.809	1.809	1.405	1.403	1.406	1.405
GISS-E2-H-CC	1.499	1.498	1.500	1.499	1.921	1.919	1.922	1.921	1.423	1.421	1.424	1.423
GISS-E2-R	1.347	1.346	1.347	1.347	1.729	1.727	1.730	1.729	1.338	1.336	1.338	1.338
GISS-E2-R-CC	1.407	1.406	1.407	1.407	1.802	1.800	1.802	1.802	1.409	1.407	1.410	1.409
HadCM3	1.505	1.503	1.507	1.505	1.860	1.858	1.862	1.860	1.499	1.497	1.501	1.499
INMCM4.0	1.564	1.562	1.565	1.564	1.940	1.939	1.942	1.941	1.536	1.532	1.538	1.536

IPSL-CM5A-LR	1.549	1.548	1.550	1.549	1.725	1.723	1.725	1.725	1.557	1.555	1.559	1.557
MIROC4h	1.471	1.469	1.472	1.471	1.828	1.825	1.830	1.828	1.461	1.459	1.462	1.461
MIROC5	1.446	1.445	1.447	1.446	1.847	1.845	1.848	1.847	5.528	5.527	5.527	5.528
MIROC-ESM	1.379	1.377	1.380	1.379	1.788	1.786	1.788	1.788	1.388	1.386	1.391	1.388
MIROC-ESM-CHEM	1.600	1.599	1.600	1.600	1.980	1.978	1.980	1.980	1.598	1.597	1.599	1.598
MRI-CGCM3	1.571	1.570	1.571	1.571	1.949	1.947	1.950	1.949	1.553	1.551	1.553	1.553
NorESM1-M	1.343	1.342	1.344	1.343	1.717	1.715	1.718	1.717	1.341	1.339	1.341	1.341

Bicubic, Bilinear, Nearest, and Spline represent the bicubic, bilinear, nearest-neighbor, and cubic spline interpolations, respectively.

614 **Table 3** Spatial distribution characteristics of mean annual PET change (%) in the future periods relative to the reference period (1961–1990)

	2011–2040				2041–2070				2071–2100				2011–2100			
	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5
Min	3.9	2.3	1.8	3.5	7.8	9.3	5.7	10.3	9.8	12.7	13.3	20.6	7.6	8.7	7.3	11.9
Max	14.8	14.1	11.5	14.2	19.2	25.3	19.5	31.2	23.2	32.6	33.2	52.5	18.5	24.0	21.4	32.6
Mean	6.2	5.0	4.3	5.4	9.7	11.7	9.0	12.9	12.7	15.8	17.0	23.9	9.5	10.8	10.1	14.1
CV	15.3%	21.8%	19.7%	17.5%	9.1%	9.9%	12.7%	12.9%	9.5%	9.2%	8.3%	9.2%	9.2%	10.5%	10.4%	10.9%

615 Min, Max, Mean, and CV are the minimum, maximum, mean, and coefficient of variation, respectively.

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634 **Table 4** Spatial distribution characteristics of significant trend (mm/10yr) in annual PET in the future periods

	2011–2040				2041–2070				2071–2100				2011–2100			
	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5	RCP2.6	RCP4.5	RCP6.0	RCP8.5
Min	10.9	9.8	7.7	7.4	8.6	12.7	10.0	12.9	10.2	7.5	12.8	20.5	3.1	10.9	14.0	22.9
Max	41.9	48.7	29.3	30.9	19.8	49.3	42.5	46.2	29.4	33.0	50.5	55.8	16.0	23.1	27.8	37.1
Mean	26.5	29.1	18.5	20.2	14.8	29.9	27.1	28.5	18.7	18.7	26.7	37.2	10.4	17.7	21.0	29.7
CV	18.2%	23.2%	15.8%	16.7%	10.4%	20.9%	14.9%	17.5%	11.6%	14%	16.2%	14.1%	17.6%	13.0%	10.3%	7.1%
AR	97.7%	97.4%	36.3%	30.0%	0.3%	99.9%	76.9%	95.7%	1.2%	10.3%	97.5%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

635 AR is the area ratio of the significant trend zones to the entire LP region. The boldface numbers indicate significant decreases at the 95% confidence level.

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Figure 9