Contrasting uncertainties in estimating floods and extreme low flow

Hadush Kidane Meresa¹ and Yongqiang Zhang¹

¹Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research

November 21, 2022

Abstract

Evaluation and quantification of possible sources of uncertainty and their influence on water resource planning and extreme management is very important for risk modeling and extreme hydrological management. The main objective of this research work is to combine statistical climate ensembles, multiple parameter sets for three conceptual hydrological model structure and five flood frequency distribution models to investigate the interplay among the associated uncertainty in flood and low flow modelling. Uncertainty in the modeling of extreme high flow frequency mainly comes from the quality of the input data, while in the modeling of low flow frequency, the main contributor to the total uncertainty is from model parameterization. This result is also confirmed by using the Analysis Of Variance Analysis (ANOVA) that considers additional information about the interaction impact of the main factors. The total uncertainty of QT90 (extreme peak flow quantile at 90-year return period) quantile shows the interaction of input data and extreme frequency models has significant influence on the total uncertainty. In contrast, in the QT10 (extreme low flow quantile at 10-year return period) estimation, the hydrological models and hydrological parameters have significant impact on the total uncertainty. This implies that the four factors and their interactions may cause significant risk in water resource management and flood and drought risk management, and neglecting of these four factors and their interaction in disaster risk management, water resource planning and evaluation of environmental impact assessment is not feasible and may lead to big risk.

1	Contrasting uncertainties in estimating floods and extreme				
2	low flows				
3	Hadush Meresa ¹ and Yongqiang Zhang ^{1*}				
4 5	¹ Key Laboratory of Water Cycle and Related Land Surface Processes, Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China				
6	* Corresponding author: Yongqiang Zhang				
7	Email: yongqiang.zhang2014@gmail.com; zhangyq@igsnrr.ac.cn				
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	Key points:				
16	• A comprehensive uncertainty estimation approach developed for hydrological extremes				
17	• It quantifies four uncertainty sources from inputs to hydrological extreme distributions				
18	• Individual source of uncertainty separated from the total source of uncertainty				
19	• Flood magnitude and frequency controlled by input data and frequency distribution				
20	• Low flow magnitude and frequency dominated by model types and parameters				
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					

28 Abstract

29 The accuracy and reliability of river flow model predictions and hydrological extreme frequencies are influenced by different sources of uncertainties that results from the input variables, conceptual model structures, model 30 parameters, and extreme frequency distributions. Therefore, evaluation and quantification of possible sources of 31 32 uncertainty and their influence on water resource planning and extreme management is very important for risk modeling and extreme hydrological management. The main objective of this research work is to identify and 33 holistically address the uncertainty propagation from the input data to frequency of hydrological extremes. This 34 35 includes to identify and estimate their contribution to flood and low flow magnitude by using two objective 36 functions in flood (NSE) and low flow (LogNSE) modeling, three hydrological models (XAJ, HBV, and GR8J), 37 50, 000 hydrological parameter sets and five frequency distribution models (LN, Pearson-III and GEV). The influence of uncertainty on the simulated flow is not uniform across all the selected eight catchments due to 38 different flow regimes and mechanism for runoff generation. Uncertainty in the modeling of extreme high flow 39 frequency mainly comes from the quality of the input data, while in the modeling of low flow frequency, the main 40 41 contributor to the total uncertainty is from model parameterization. This result is also confirmed by using the Analysis Of Variance Analysis (ANOVA) that considers additional information about the interaction impact of 42 the main factors. The total uncertainty of QT90 (extreme peak flow quantile at 90-year return period) quantile 43 shows the interaction of input data and extreme frequency models has significant influence on the total 44 45 uncertainty. In contrast, in the QT10 (extreme low flow quantile at 10-year return period) estimation, the hydrological models and hydrological parameters have significant impact on the total uncertainty. This implies 46 47 that the four factors and their interactions may cause significant risk in water resource management and flood and drought risk management, and neglecting of these four factors and their interaction in disaster risk management, 48 49 water resource planning and evaluation of environmental impact assessment is not feasible and may lead to big risk. 50

- 52 Key works: uncertainty, GLUE, ANOVA, hydrological model, extremes, frequency
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- -
- 58
- 59
- 60

62 **1. Introduction**

Numerous hydrological river flow models are used to characterize, understand and forecast surface water flow 63 under both climatic and land use influences to provide valuable information for water resources management and 64 planning, risk analysis and decision making. The accuracy and reliability of river flow predictions are essential for 65 water extreme management, policy making and water allocation as well as integrated and sustainable water 66 67 resource management practices (disaster management, irrigation water management, hydropower regulation, ecological water requirement) (Meresa and Romanowicz, 2017; Meresa and Gatachew, 2018; Meresa, 2019; 68 69 Okoli et al., 2019). The precision and trustworthiness of river flow model predictions and extreme frequencies 70 are influenced by different sources of uncertainty that results from hydrological model input variables (such as 71 temperature and precipitation) (Kavetski et al., 2006; Bae et al., 2018), conceptual model structures (Dams et al., 72 2015; Mockler et al., 2016; Vetter et al., 2017), model parameters, and extreme frequency distributions (Meresa 73 and Romanowicz, 2017). Defining and estimation of the critical uncertainty sources at each stage from input data 74 to frequency of hydrological extremes is important to have comprehensive understanding on the role of systematic 75 and inherent errors. The nonlinear and inerasable character of uncertainty propagation requires to contrasted at 76 each stage of uncertainty level that starts from the model input (precipitation and temperature) to the low flow and 77 flood frequencies for better water extreme management and infrastructure construction (e.g. dam, dyke, bridge, 78 flood control structures).

79 defining and estimation of uncertainty in water resource planning and extreme management is very important in 80 risk modeling and extreme hydrological events, and is identified by hydrological community as one of the 23 unsolved problems in hydrology (Blöschl et al., 2019). Numerous water resource and hydrologic researchers have 81 82 attempted to identify different sources of uncertainty in water resources and hydrological extreme frequencies 83 (Vrugt et al., 2008; Xu et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2013; Vetter et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2016; Qi et al., 2016; 84 Meresa and Romanowicz, 2017; Sun et al., 2017; Bae et al., 2018; Hattermann et al., 2018; Kusangaya et al., 2018; Prein, 2019; Her et al., 2019). These research works have addressed uncertainty in water resources and 85 86 hydrological extreme modeling in the isolated form, and requires to contrasting the critical sources in projected 87 high and low flow. For example, Kavetski et al. (2006) examined input uncertainty in hydrological modeling 88 using a Bayesian approach in two catchments in North America. Her et al. (2019) branded the sources of uncertainty using Analysis Of Variance Analysis (ANOVA) and come up with the hydrological structure and 89 90 parameters and climate change has significant contribution to hydrological extreme condition. They strongly recommended to incorporate input uncertainty in Ohio river basin. Chen et al. (2013) considered hydrological 91 92 model structure and hydrological parameter uncertainty in their uncertainty analysis using GLUE approach, and 93 found that the three sources has significant contribution to the high flow in China. Prein, (2019) stated that the 94 extreme precipitation events and its implication of intense hydrologic cycle could highly expose to uncertainty. 95 Similarly, Sun et al. (2017) identified multiple sources of uncertainty (distribution types, distribution parameters 96 and peak over threshold) in flood frequency and found that distribution types could play a major role in

97 controlling the flood magnitude. Zhang et al. (2016) also did uncertainty investigation in snow dominated 98 catchments from China and found that input uncertainty is greater than hydrological parameters in peak flow 99 estimation. others have investigated input and hydrological parameters (e.g Zhang et al., 2016; Bae et al., 2018), hydrological parameters and model structure (e.g. Butts et al., 2004; Jin et al., 2010), climate change and 100 hydrological parameters (e.g. Krysanova et al., 2018; Her et al., 2019; Meresa, 2019), climate change and flood 101 frequency (e.g. Qi et al., 2016a; Meresa and Romanowicz, 2017), distribution parameters and types (e.g. Sun et 102 103 al., 2017). These studies have shown that only one aspect of systematic and/or inherent uncertainty is not enough to address the problem in estimation of extreme flow. However, it is not widely studied the contrasting of 104 105 uncertainty propagation at stage and level from input data to frequency of hydrological extremes (flood and low flow) (Marton and Paseka, 2017; Kiang et al., 2018). This uncertainty propagation comprises input data, 106 hydrological model structure, hydrological parameters, and extreme probability distribution types, as well as, 107 108 desired to analyze its effect on magnitude and frequency of extremes. the accuracy of meteorological variables 109 can be impacted by systematic, instrumental errors and external factors (Mcmillan et al., 2011;Karakoram, 2016; Yen et al., 2018); parameter representation and instability of hydrological models may lead to significant 110 error in timing and magnitude of hydrological process and regimes (Zhang et al., 2016; Meresa and Romanowicz, 111 2017; Bae et al., 2018); simplification of the real watershed processes is another source of error in water resource 112 modeling (Song et al., 2015; Meresa and Gatachew, 2018) and difficult to represent in a single model, which is 113 114 mainly due to the lack of precise mathematical principles, catchment heterogeneity and complexity of water cycle 115 (Jiang et al., 2017; Emam et al., 2018); and the frequency-magnitude relationship is strongly influenced by distribution type and parameters (Ham et al., 2017), and only one extreme distribution may led to a certain level 116 117 of uncertainty. Furthermore, there is no unique hydrological parameter sets, single hydrological structure that can represent different hydrological process represent, hydro-climatic and physiographic conditions due to non-118 119 stationerity and uniform high or low flow percentile distribution and can have an error in distribution fitting (Hu 120 et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2017; Winter, 2018).

The main objective of this research work is to identify and address the critical uncertainty sources in extreme flow modeling under using variety plausible rainfall characteristics and combine with hydrological parameters and structures to assess extreme frequency using different distributions. This combines statistical climate ensembles, multiple parameter sets for three conceptual hydrological model structure and five flood frequency distribution models to investigate the interplay among the associated uncertainty in flood and low flow modeling, i.e calibration of conceptual hydrological models using two objective functions for high and low flow, three hydrological models, 50,000 hydrological parameter sets and five frequency distribution models.

Following this part, section 2 describes in detail about the study river basins and datasets, section 3 presents the methods and numerical modeling experiments. Results and detail discussion are presented in section 4. Finally, in section 5 the main conclusions are summarized.

131 2. Study river basins and datasets

132 To avoid the human intervention effect on flow prediction, eight medium sized natural river catchments 133 (unregulated and unurbanized) were selected from four countries for estimation of uncertainty propagation from 134 input to frequencies of hydrological extremes modeling. These eight river basins are located in different hydroclimatic and physiographic conditions: in Poland (C1P: Nysaklodska and C2P: Dunajec catchments), Norway 135 (C1N: Viksvaten and C2N: Fustvatn catchments), Ethiopia (C1E: Hombole and C2E: Awash Bello catchments), 136 and China (C1C: Gaoshiya and C2C: Hanjiamou catchments) (Figure 1). The selected case study catchments vary 137 138 in climate regime, drainage density, river length, catchment area and shape, topography, soil type, surface and subsurface properties and land use land cover type. Each has been the focus of many hydrologic investigations 139 (e.g. Feng et al., 2016; Meresa et al., 2017; Meresa and Gatachew, 2018). streamflow properties of these eight 140 catchments are summarized in Table 1. of the selected catchments, Awash bello from Ethiopia and Gaoshiyo from 141 China have zero m^3/s flow in their tenth percitile value. while, the median (Q50) shows very low flow value (0.26) 142 m³/s and 0.34 m³/s, respectively) in these catchments. This may happen and is commonly seen in ephemeral 143 watersheds. 144



145

146 Figure 1. location of study areas

The observed time series of precipitation, temperature and streamflow data were collected from their respective country offices. The length and quality of available meteorological and hydrological record is good; 30+ years of recorded data from 1973 to 2018, from which the first 20 years recorded data was used for calibration and the remaining nine years recorded data for validation of three hydrological models. Daily potential evapotranspiration for each catchment was estimated by using a temperature-based technique (Hamon, 1963).

- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156

Table 1. Statistical description of observed streamflow

Code: Name	Area [Km ²]	Log/Lat	Q10 [m ³ /s]	Q50 [m ³ /s]	Q95 [m ³ /s]	CV [-]	Time period
C1P: Nysaklodska	1061.5	16.65/50.43	4.58	9.00	33.6	0.86	1973-2009
C2P: Dunajec	681.1	20.03/49.48	4.30	10.00	37.3	0.88	1973-2009
C1E: Hombole	7656.2	38.783/8.383	3.17	8.40	212.97	0.56	1988-2018
C2E: Awash Bello	2566.1	38.416/8.85	0.01	0.26	14.24	0.29	1988-2018
C1N: Viksvatn	508.1	5.886/61.333	6.79	34.00	118.97	1.19	1974-2009
C2N: Fustvatn	525.7	13.308/65.905	4.73	24.02	101.81	1.04	1974-2009
C1C: Gaoshiya	1252.1	111.05/39.0	0.01	0.34	4.93	0.73	1973-2012
C2C: Hanjiamou	2452.1	109.15/38.0	1.32	2.63	4.00	0.13	1973-2012

0 *Note: C1P represents catchment one from Poland, C2P catchment two from Poland, C1E catchment one from Ethiopia, C2E catchment one from Ethiopia,

161 C1N catchment two from Norway, C2N catchment one from Norway, C1C catchment one from China, and C2C catchment one from China.

3. Modeling and numerical methods

The uncertainty propagation from input to extreme hydrological condition was conducted using three conceptual hydrological models (Xinanjiang (simplified as XAJ thereafter) (Zhao, 1992), HBV (Bergstrom, 1976) and GR8J ((Perrin et al., 2003))), five distribution models (LN, Pearson-III, GEV, Gamma and Exponential) and 50,000 hydrological parameter sets using Monte-Carlos simulation (Figure 2). Realizations of 1,000 precipitation and temperature time series generation using statistical approach for input data uncertainty band estimation, sampling of 50,000 hydrological parameters sets via MCS-GLUE for hydrological parameter uncertainty band estimation (Beven and Binley, 1992), three conceptual hydrological models (XAJ, HBV and GR8J) for hydrological model structure impact understanding and to estimate the extreme frequency of peak and low flow by applying five different frequency distribution models (Figure 5).



193 Figure 2. The research flow chart of this study

3.1 Precipitation and temperature ensemble generation/modeling

Precipitation and temperature variables are the main drivers of hydrological simulations. Climate variables play a 195 key role in hydrological process and are highly varied with time and space. of which, temperature and 196 197 precipitation are associated with the pattern of regional and local atmospheric circulations (Kidd and Huffman, 2011; Wu et al., 2011; Mockler et al., 2016). In recent decades, various advanced statistical and stochastic 198 199 approaches have been developed for climate predictions by incorporating the seasonal and annual fluctuations 200 (Wu et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2013; Khazaei and Ahmadi, 2013; Breinl et al., 2017). These studies were highly 201 exposed uncertainty due to complex stochastic approach (Vesely et al., 2019) and number of parameters (Breinl et al., 2017; Okoli et al., 2019). 202

In this study, input data, such as precipitation and temperature were used for forcing the three conceptual hydrological models. For the input uncertainty analysis, the ensemble realization of precipitation and temperature were generated using a statistical approach (equation (1) and equation (2)). The statistical approach that introduced in this study for generation of ensemble precipitation and temperature is as follows:

$$PPE_{n,j} = PPO_n * EPE_{n,j}; \text{ where } EPE_{n,j} \approx N(0.01, \sigma_p^2)$$
 (1)

208
$$TTE_{n,j} = TTO_n + ETE_{n,j}; \text{ where } ETE_{n,j} \approx N(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$$
(2)

where n represents a simulation at specific time and j denotes the jth ensemble of realizations. $PPE_{n,j}$ and $TTE_{n,j}$ represent the number of ensemble of precipitation and temperature realization at time n, respectively. TTO_n and PPO_n symbolize the observed precipitation and temperature at time n, respectively. The $EPE_{n,j}$ and $ETE_{n,j}$ represent the possible ensemble of errors variability range of generated precipitation and temperature at time n, respectively.

Monte Carlo simulation with Gaussian distribution sampling was used to sample 1000 precipitation and temperature ensemble of realizations by multiplying (high variability nature) and adding (less variability) noise term EPE_{j,n} and ETE_{j,n}, to observed precipitation and temperature recorded data, respectively (Ajami et al., 2007). The observed climate variables are perturbed at a given time by the error terms derived from the Gaussian distribution with constant mean and standard deviation, $N(0.01, \sigma_p^2)$ and $N(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$ for precipitation and temperature, respectively.

220 **3.2 Hydrological extreme modeling**

Three hydrological models were considered to investigate the impact of hydrological model structures on the hydrological extremes. The three hydrological models (XAJ, HBV and GR8J) used daily precipitation and daily temperature as input to simulate runoff at the outlet of the catchment.

224 The Hydrologiska Byråns Vattenbalansavdelning (HBV) (Bergstrom, 1976) is widely applied in different hydro-225 climate condition of the world (Meresa et al., 2017; Meresa and Gatachew, 2018; He et al., 2018b). HBV is 226 mainly designed to simulate streamflow using precipitation, temperature and evapotranspiration (Bergstrom, 1976). Catchment forest status and elevation of precipitation station (or centroid elevation) are also used. The 227 228 HBV model structure used in this study has three storage reservoirs in snow routing, soil moisture, and sub-229 surface routing to characterize river flow. The model has fourteen parameters set to control the input and output 230 catchment process (Table 2). Génie Rural à 8 paramètres Journalier (GR8J) (Perrin et al., 2003) is a daily lumped 231 conceptual hydrological model with eight parameters and applied in many parts of the world (Meresa et al., 232 2017: Meresa and Gatachew, 2018). GR8J was used with eight hydrological parameters (Table 2). GR8J model structure has two consecutive stores: one relates to runoff production and the other associates to routing store 233 package. Daily precipitation and daily evapotranspiration are the main climate variables. The detailed information 234 about the model is described in Perrin et al. (2003). The Xinanjiang (XAJ) hydrological model is also used to 235 236 simulate streamflow in different hydro-climatic zones of the world (Zhao, 1992). It is a daily conceptual hydrological model and consists of three runoff generation packages. The conceptual structure is governed by 237 238 fourteen hydrological parameters (Table 2). Like HBV and GR8J, the XAJ model requires daily precipitation and 239 evapotranspiration to simulate streamflow at the outlet of the catchment.

244	Table 2 A Range of hydrological parameters of XAJ, HBV and GR8J models. L stands for Lower value and U for
245	upper part of the model parameters

Model	parameter	description	HBV L	HBV U
XAJ	SM	the free water capacity of the surface soil layer		100
	KG	outflow coefficients of the free water storage to groundwater	0.5	0.65
	KSS_KG	daily recession constant of groundwater storage		0.8
	KKG	outflow coefficients of the free water storage to interflow		0.8
	KKSS	recession constant of the lower interflow storage		0.8
	WUM	water capacity in the upper soil layer		400
	WLM	water capacity in the lower soil layer		400
	WDM	Water capacity in the deeper soil layer		400
	IMP	recession constant for channel routing	0.005	0.8
	В	exponent of the tension water capacity curve	0.05	0.6
	С	coefficient of deep evapotranspiration	0.05	0.3
	EX	exponent of the free water capacity curve		5
	XE	Flow proportion factor	0	0.5
	KE	Slot storage coefficient	0.5	10
HBV	FC	Maximum soil storage	0.1	250
	BETA	Shape coefficient	0.01	5
	LP	threshold for reduction of evaporation	0.1	2
	ALPHA	Measure for non-linearity of flow in quick runoff	0.1	0.6
	KF	Recession coefficient for runoff from quick runoff	0.005	0.6
	KS	Recession coefficient for runoff from base flow	0.005	0.6
	PERC	Percolation rate occurring when water is available	0.01	400
	CFLUX	Rate of capillary rise	0.5	400
	TT	Temperature threshold for snowfall	-1	10
	TTI	Temperature threshold interval length	0.5	15
	CFMAX	Snowmelt rate	3	30
	FOCFMAX	correction to give a threshold temperature	0.6	2.6
	CFR	Refreezing	0.05	2.05
	WHC	Water holding capacity of snow	0.1	2.1
GR8J	TT	Temperature threshold for snowfall	-1	10
	TTI	Temperature threshold interval length	0.5	7.99
	CFMAX	Snowmelt rate	3	20
	CFR	Refreezing	0.05	2.1
	X1	production store capacity [mm]	200	229.05
	X2	Inter-catchment exchange coefficient [mm/d]	0	1.6
	X3	routing store capacity [mm]	10	46.77
	X4	unit hydrograph time constant [d]	0	1.98

247 The upper and lower limits of the three hydrological models are listed in Table 2.

- 249
- **3.3 hydrological model parameter selection and evaluation**

251 There are different ways of parameter sampling from the upper and lower boundary of hydrological parameters, 252 which depends on the computing times and number of parameters in a specific hydrological model. Beven and 253 Binley, (2014) stated that there is no fixed threshold in parameter sampling that varies from thousand to hundred 254 thousand of parameters sets. In this study, 50,000 parameter sets were generated from each GR8J, HBV, XAJ 255 hydrological model parameters range. High flow and low flows have different characteristics, and need two 256 objective functions for calibration . Meresa and Romanowicz, (2017) stated that NSE likelihood function is good 257 for high flow simulation due to the interest on peak flow and LogNSE for low flow. In this study, two objective 258 functions were used to simulate both flow regimes (high and low flow regimes) and evaluated against observed 259 streamflow. NSE, objective function is for high flow simulation and LogNSE for low flow simulation. Based on 260 the performance of each model, 200 sets of simulations for each hydrological model and data input were selected 261 as behavioral condition.

262
$$NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{j} (Q_{0,t} - Q_{m,t})^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{j} (Q_{0,t} - \bar{Q}_0)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad LogNSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{j} (\log(Q_{0,t}) - \log(Q_{m,t}))^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{j} (\log(Q_{0,t}) - \overline{\log(Q_{0,t})})^2}$$
(3)

where Qo,t and Qm,t are observed and simulated flow at time t, Qo is the mean observed flow and j is the length of the time series. For each hydrologic model, the best values of NSE and LogNSE are selected for hydrological model structure and parameter uncertainty analyses.

3.4 Evaluation of ensemble simulations

In this research work, the ensemble of simulations was evaluated using the proportion of extreme flow inside 95% confidence intervals (PCI) principle. Two hydrological extremes, peak and low flow were used and evaluated by the derived CI. This is very helpful to identify (fix threshold) the behavioral and non-behavioral simulations, and to select the best threshold value of NSE and LogNSE. According to Li et al. (2011) and Xu, (2014), PCI way of ensemble evaluation is more reliable and efficient in uncertainty analysis.

272
$$PCI = \left[1 - \left|\left(\frac{NQ_{i,p}}{T} - 0.95\right)\right|\right] * \frac{1}{T} * \left[\left(\sum \frac{L_{u,t,p} - L_{l,t,p}}{Q_{o,t}}\right)\right]$$
(4)

where $L_{L,t,p}$ and $L_{U,t,p}$ are the lower and upper boundary values of the extreme flow at time t and portion p, T is the sum of time steps, $Q_{o,t}$ is the observed extreme flow at t time step, $NQ_{in,p}$ is the number of extreme flow observations which lie within the extreme flow CI. The PCI is used in 95% CI evaluation, which ranges from zero to infinity values (Li et al., 2011). The shape of the 95% CI is governed by the value of PCI; if PCI is closer to 0.95 it means more of the observed time series extreme fall in the confidence interval band.

Zero flows were commonly observed in the low flow analysis and handled by setting the low boundary of PCI is
zero, whereas the upper part of the PCI is calculated using equation (4).

281

282 **3.5 Extreme Frequency Analysis (EFA)**

283 Extreme frequency analysis is very crucial to understand the probability of occurrence of floods and/or low flows 284 various distributions have been to estimate these frequencies. For example the Log-Pearson III distribution model 285 is very popular in the USA and Australia for infrastructure design (Griffis and Stedinger, 2007), General Extreme 286 Value and Pearson Type III are used in Europe (Madsen et al., 2013) and the Wakeby and Log-Normal 287 distributions have been frequently used in Asian countries (Chen et al., 2013). a single distribution model may 288 not be able to capture the entire temporal and spatial variability of hydrological extremes. Therefore, in extreme 289 frequency uncertainty analysis, five common distribution types (LN, Pearson-III, GEV) applied across the world 290 in extreme frequency modeling. Those distributions were fitted to annual maximum flow and annual seven days 291 minimum flow in order to understand hydrological flood and low flow in the selected eight catchments from 292 Poland, Norway, Ethiopia, and China. In equations (5)-(9), the respective probability density function (PDF) of 293 each distribution is presented. Exponential distribution is a simple model with one parameter; whereas, LN and 294 Gamma has two parameters and GEV has three parameters. In this research, one-two-three parameter distributions 295 were considered.

296 Log-Normal
$$f(x) = \frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\ln x - \mu}{\sigma}\right)^2)}{x\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \qquad \sigma, \mu \ (\sigma > 0)$$
(5)

297 Pearson-III
$$f(x) = \frac{(x-\gamma)^{\alpha-1}}{\beta^{\alpha}\Gamma(\alpha)} \exp(-\frac{x-\gamma}{\beta}) \quad \alpha, \beta, \Upsilon (\alpha > 0, \beta > 0)$$
 (6)

298 GEV
$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp(-(1+kz)^{-\frac{1}{k}})(1+kz)^{-1-\frac{1}{k}} & k \neq 0\\ \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp(-z - \exp(-z)) & k = 0 \end{cases}$$
 K, σ, μ (σ >0) (7)

299

300 **3.6** Generalize Likelihood Uncertainty Estimation (GLUE)

The Generalize Likelihood Uncertainty Estimation (Beven and Binley, 1992) approach is widely applied to quantify different sources of uncertainty in hydrological modeling (Mockler et al., 2016; Meresa and Romanowicz, 2017; Bae et al., 2018). GLUE is based on Monte Carlo (MC) simulations and the behavioral condition of the parameter sets is controlled by the chosen objective function. GLUE focuses on reasonable possible solution generation from a large set of likelihood of sets using a nominal threshold, which defines best behavioral condition (Beven and Binley, 2014).

307 GLUE is a non-formal statistical approach that includes Monte Carlos simulations. The hydrological model runs 308 using the entire space of hydrological parameter combinations and is evaluated by deploying goodness-of fit 309 criterion (Beven, 2007). A likelihood function H(X) is used to separate the non-behavioral and behavioral 310 simulations produced by different variables X, such as input data, hydrological model parameters, hydrological model structures, and extreme frequency models. Every ith of the variable X has its own one likelihood measure at time t. The ensemble of each variable X_i (i=1.....m) provide the multi-likelihood measure values $H(X_i)$. The GLUE function is shown in Equation (8), where the standard deviation/ variance of residual σ_e^2 value is the error in the estimated results affected by the model parameters/input data/hydrological model type/extreme frequency distribution models. If the estimated value of σ_e^2 is near equal to the estimated maximum likelihood or equal to the standard deviation/variance of the observation data σ_o^2 , the likelihood measure H(X) is equal to zero, which indicates extremely high uncertainty.

$$H(X) = 1 - \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_a^2} \tag{8}$$

In this study, GLUE was used to estimate the propagation of uncertainty from the input to extreme frequencies.
 GLUE was extended to quantify the uncertainty associated with hydrological parameters, input data, hydrological
 models and extreme frequencies.

322 The overall procedure and concept are presented in Figure 2.

323 **3.7** Total and each uncertainty component estimation and combination methods

The cumulative uncertainty approach was applied to define the total uncertainty in extreme flood frequency modeling. Thus, first defines the aggregate uncertainty up to stage k=4 denoted by $U^{cum}(X_1 \dots X_k)$. Intuitively, the uncertainty due to hydrological model selection, the choice of input quality and type, hydrological parameter sets or flood frequency models, up to stage k=4 can be characterized as the variation in the extreme hydrological design values due to these four factors, and include a choice up to stage k, after stage are fixed. That is, the sum of uncertainty up to stage k=4 is defined as

331 332

318

$$U^{cum}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \frac{1}{\pi_{j=k+1}^{n_j}} \sum_{x_{k+1} \in x_{k+1}} \dots \sum_{x_k \in x_k} U(q_{x\,k+1,\dots,x_k})$$
(9)

333

As it is proven in the result section, one of the most fascinating estates of this uncertainty approach is that it keeps summing as the factor steps progress and type of the extreme hydrological values. That is, for most acceptable uncertainty measures of U, which $U^{cum}(x_1, ..., x_j) \le U^{cum}(x_1, ..., x_k)$ for all j < k=4. More explicitly, as more k stages increase, more uncertainty is appeared the extreme hydrological design variable.

339

Since the aggregated uncertainty has an ascending character, each uncertainty defines at each successive stage and expressed as the difference between successive sum of uncertainties of each factor. That is, the uncertainty of stage k=4, denoted by $U^{cum}(X_k)$, can be described as

343

344
$$U^{cum}(X_k) = U^{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_k) - U^{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_{k-1})$$
(10)

Note that each uncertainty at stage k=4 is a magnitude of contribution to the total uncertainty. Also, the sum of uncertainties of individual sources is always equal to the cumulated uncertainty $U^{cum}(X_1, ..., X_k)$.

- 349
- 350
- 351

352 **3.8 Uncertainty decomposition**

Four sources of uncertainty in extreme frequency analysis driving from input data, hydrological model structure, hydrological parameters and extreme frequency distribution models were estimated by means of variances decomposition approach (ANOVA). ANOVA can decompose the aggregated source of uncertainty into individual terms and their interactions (Meresa and Romanowicz, 2017). In this study, n-way ANOVA was used to distinguish the main variable effects and their interaction effect on the aggregated extreme frequency indices.

$$SST = SS_{ID} + SS_{HM} + SS_{HP} + SS_{EF} + SS_{IDHM} + SS_{IDHP} + SS_{IDEF} + SS_{HMHP} + SS_{HMEF} + SS_{HPEF}$$
(11)

where SST is the square sum of the total error, SSID is the sum of standard error of input data, SSHM stands for sum standard error of hydrological models, SSHP is the sum of standard of hydrological parameters, SSEF sum standard error of extreme frequency, SSIDHM is the sum of standard errors of combined effect of input data and hydrological models, SSIDEF is the sum of standard error of combined effect of input data and extreme frequency, SSHMHP is the sum of standard error of combined effect of hydrological models and hydrological parameters.

365 4. Results

366 4.1 Ensemble of input precipitation and temperature evaluation

367 Figure 3A, B evaluates the ensembles of input precipitation and temperature time series data with 95% confidence interval, respectively. The correlation of best 100 time series of daily precipitation (Figure 3A) and daily air 368 369 temperature (Figure 3 B) was selected for further use in forcing of hydrological models and assess the input 370 uncertainty. The generated ensemble of precipitation and temperature has shown very high correlation and the 371 observed values are falls in the 95% of confidence interval. In fact, 95% confidence interval (CI) of the 100 372 groups of generated precipitation is much more highly correlated to observed data than the total ensembles. This indicates that the proposed statistical climate generator approach performs well in generating ensemble of 373 precipitation and temperature, as well as, in capturing the annual dynamics and variability of the climate 374 375 variables. From the 1000 generated precipitation and temperature time series values, 100 of them were selected 376 using correlation and variability of their extreme values. Interestingly, spread of the correlation values of 377 Gaoshiyo, Hinjiuma and Fustvatn catchments are significantly wider and it may have a clear impact on the 378 uncertainty band of extreme flow (Figure 3A). Meanwhile, the spread of temperature values is not significantly

changed within the sample (Figure 3B). This implies that precipitation has relatively higher variability in terms of
 magnitude and intensity, while temperature is not significantly varied in the given period.



381

Figure 3A. Scatter representation of 1000 generated precipitation time series correlation value with maximum and average observed precipitation for eight sub-catchments. Each red or blue dote represents individual maximum and average precipitation simulation, respectively. The time period of each sub-catchment is presented in Table 1.



Figure 3B. Scatter representation of 1000 generated temperature time series correlation value with maximum and

average observed temperature for eight sub-catchments. Each red or blue dot represents individual maximum and
average temperature simulation, respectively. The time period of each sub-catchment is presented in Table 1.

389 4.2 Hydrological simulations

390 In order to ultimately capture the extreme streamflow predictions, two objective functions were used., The NSE 391 for extreme high streamflow prediction and LogNSE is for extreme low flow were used to separate the most behavioral parameter sets from the lower one. Figure 4 presents the results of best 100 hydrological parameter 392 sets and their respective weights using XAJ, HBV and GR8J hydrological models. The LogNSE and NSE results 393 394 are not one to one related sets and had not significant correlation. This confirms that each hydrological regime 395 governed by different hydrological parameter values. The simulated extreme hydrological flow using these NSE and LogNSE values were used further for hydrological parameter uncertainty investigation. The result of median 396 397 of each objective function for each hydrological model was quite good and promising for uncertainty estimation. For example, the NSE value of Fustvaten, Dunajec, Hombole and Gaoshivo is 0.8, 0.7, 0.67, and 0.6, respectively 398 399 (Figure 3). The simulated extreme flow was weighted by NSE and LogNSE and produce quite high values for 400 these 100 behaviour sets using XAJ, HBV and GR8J models (Figure 7). The average NSE of the three 401 hydrological models is almost uniform across the catchments and produces above the minimum NSE threshold 402 value. XAJ is relatively perform good in Hamoble and Awahsbello, whereas, GR8J model was explained the 403 observed flow of Dunajec and Nysaklodska very well. This is likely due to model structure differences and 404 number of parameters, such as the number of water storage reservoirs and flow generation mechanisms.

405 Overall, Figure 4 shows the results of three hydrological model performance with the application of MC sampling with GLUE and a bounded NSE and LogNSE objective functions for each catchment. The bounded likelihood 406 407 function has more advantages to compare the results of hydrological models (Mathevet et al., 2006). Unlike, the 408 NSE (one side bounded objective function), has fixed upper and lower boundaries ([-1 1]). The three hydrological 409 models performed quite well to simulate river flow. However, the extreme flow simulation is very difficult, and 410 the three hydrological models had a very wide range of NSE values. The mean NSE and LogNSE value of each catchment shows a reasonably acceptable value and feasible to understand the uncertainty in the catchments, 411 keeping the varying results between the catchments. The uniform distribution sampling from the hydrological 412 413 parameter ranges (Table 2) has its own impact on the simulated hydrological extremes.



Figure 3. Bounded NSE for peak flow (left column) and LOGNSE for low flow evaluation (right column) results 415 416 for eight catchments from best/behavioral simulations of GR8J (blue), HBV (red) and XAJ (green) models. The 417 hydrological parameters of XAJ, HBV and GR8J models are one of the critical sources of uncertainty to river 418 extreme flow simulations and evaluated using seasonal high and low flow indices. 95% CI of simulated extreme 419 flow using three hydrological models are estimated to examine the extent to which hydrological parameter 420 uncertainty caused on model simulation. The uncertainty associated with the hydrological parameters in the 421 simulation of the extreme river flow data was estimated by applying the GLUE approach described in section 3.6, 422 which was evaluated using seasonal extreme indices derived from daily river flow time series, and presented in 423 Figure 5A (high flow) and Figure 5B (low flow). Figure 5A, B indicates temporal evolvement of hydrological 424 parameter uncertainty and its band on simulation of extreme peak flow using XAJ (red band), GR8J (blue) and 425 HBV (green).

426 Generally, from Figure 5 A, B, it is clearly seen that the three hydrological parameters sets were lacking to capture the extreme values characteristics and the very extreme low values. Particularly, Hunjium catchment has 427 428 very high events and these models were lacking to simulate these peaks (Figure 5A). Similarly, Gaoshiyo and 429 Awash Bello catchments are Ephemeral River and with prolonged dry season, the simulation of the low flow was 430 not 100% in the 95% CI. Overall, the structure of the hydrological models may provide important information in 431 estimation of uncertainty. This indicates that simulations of low flow in ephemeral catchments are very difficult 432 due to their prolonged dry conditions. For the estimation of peak flows, the uncertainty comes from the observed 433 time series characteristics (the number of events). For example, if the catchment has few extremes, the model gives smaller band, but few extremes fall outside the 95% CI band. A single model is not able to consider all the 434

processes in a watershed. Therefore, there is no perfect and universally applicable hydrological model andestimation of the uncertainty is important to build confidence in extreme flow prediction.



Figure 5A. Hydrological parameter uncertainty and its band on simulation of extreme monthly high flow using
XAJ (green band), HBV (reddish) and GR8J (blue). Each color stands for the 95% confidence interval of 100
simulations from 100 best hydrological parameters. The red dot represents observed extreme maximum flow of
respective stations.



445

Figure 5B. Hydrological parameter uncertainty and its band on simulation of extreme monthly low flow using
XAJ (green band), HBV (reddish) and GR8J (blue). Each color stands for the 95% confidence interval of 100
simulations from 100 best hydrological parameters. The red dot represents observed extreme minimum flow of
respective stations.

451 **4.3 Evaluation of temporal evolvement of hydrological model structure uncertainty**

Figure 6A, B reveals simulated and observed peak flow and low flow of eight stations using three hydrological 452 453 models for the given period. This shows the ensemble variability over time and has central line for mean of 454 ensemble simulations from three hydrological model, fixed upper line of the ensample 95% and lower 5%, and 455 shows the variability of the simulation compare to observed (blue broken lines) and temporal mean (Blue solid lines). Most of the extreme high flow are consistent and within the 95% (red line). This is affected by the temporal 456 variation. Each box contains a result of GR8J, XAJ, HBV simulations, and the observed time series is presented 457 458 with blue dotted line. The mean of the three hydrological models together is more comparable with the observed annual peak flow (Figure 6A) and low flow (Figure 6B) than the individual hydrological model simulation with 459 460 observed flow time series. However, hydrological model uncertainty becomes much higher than the individual 461 one. the models are failing to simulate two very big events in the Hinjiuma catchment and one large peak in the

Goashiyo catchment. In the Awash Bello catchment, the models are not able to produce observations due to the external forces like physiographic and ground water (Figure 6A). The remaining stations are almost reasonably fit with the median of these model simulations. In the low flow, the median of the simulation fit with the observed low flow except in the Goashiyo catchment. Except the Viksvatn and Nysaklodska catchments, the observed minimum flow is under the 95% fixed confidence interval (Figure 6B). the values are almost lies in the fixed mean value and reasonably comparable with observed low flow.



Figure 6A. Time evolution in hydrological model structure uncertainty. The upper and lower red lines represent the 95% confidence interval, blue solid indicates the ensemble median and broken blue line is the observed of extreme high flow simulation using three hydrological models (XAJ, HBV and GR8J), and green is the center of the 95% confidence interval.



Figure 6B. Time evolution in hydrological model structure uncertainty. The upper and lower red lines represent the 95% confidence interval, blue solid indicates the ensemble median and broken blue line is the observed of extreme low flow simulation using three hydrological models (XAJ, HBV and GR8J), and green is the center of the 95 % confidence interval.

484 **4.4 Evaluation of uncertainty propagation**

The uncertainty that aggregated from the input data, hydrological model structure, hydrological parameters, and extreme frequency distribution models becomes larger and has significant implication in water resource and flood risk management. The total uncertainty increases as the number of sources of uncertainty increases in peak flow and low flow frequency estimation (Figure 7A, B). The potential impact of each source of uncertainty is estimated by comparing the 95% CI band in the extreme peak and low flow frequencies (Figure 7. A, B). Figure 6A, B, displays the total frequency curves of peak and low flow based on the given period. Each source of uncertainty 491 presented by each color shade (the colors are additive): green represent extreme frequency models, orange color 492 for input data, blue for hydrological models and pink color for hydrological parameters. Their corresponding 493 median values are presented in solid lines of respective uncertainty bands color: red line, yellow line, blue line, 494 and green line.

495 The additive way of total uncertainty presentation in Figure 7A, B does not illustrate both the main variables and their interaction uncertainty at the same time. It shows only the impact of the sources of uncertainty. The 496 aggregated uncertainty source accounted significant differences in estimation of peak flow and low flow 497 498 quantiles. In peak flow quantiles estimation at different return period, the input data uncertainty band is higher 499 than other sources of uncertainty. hydrological parameters have a larger impact on estimation of low flow 500 frequency values. This implies that high quality input data is important to reduce uncertainty in water resource 501 management (Figure 7A); and parameters and good structure of hydrological model play major role in the 502 reliability and accuracy of environmental flow simulation (Figure 7B). This has a significant contribution for decision makers and water resource managers. Based on median of each sources of uncertainty deviation from 503 504 total medium value, the extreme peak flow frequency mainly influenced by the uncertainty that come from the quality of the input data with 40% contribution to the total uncertainty, frequency distribution models contributed 505 506 30% to the total uncertainty, hydrological parameter sets contributed 20% and model structure 10% to the total uncertainty (Figure 7A), in the modeling of low flow frequency, the contributors to the total uncertainty are ranked 507 508 as parameter uncertainty (35%), hydrological model structure (28%), quality of input data (25%) and frequency 509 distribution models (12%) (Figure 7B).



510

Figure 7A. Aggregated/total uncertainty of peak flow quantiles for eight catchments based on 30 years simulated data. These uncertainties are related to four main variables: input data (blue color), hydrological parameters (pink color), hydrological models (orange color) and extreme frequency distribution models (green color). The solid lines are median of the respective uncertainty bands: blue line, pink line, red line, and green line.





Figure 7B. Aggregated/total uncertainty of low flow quantiles for eight catchments based on 30 years simulated data. These uncertainties are related to four main variables: input data (orange color), hydrological parameters (green color), hydrological models (blue color) and extreme frequency distribution models (pink color). The solid lines are median of the respective uncertainty bands: red line, green line, blue line, and pink line.

520 **4.5** Uncertainty decomposition using their variances

Variance based uncertainty decomposition is helpful to understand the interaction of the main sources of uncertainty. Figure 8A, B, shows the results of the variance decomposition and provides the percentile contribution of each variable and its interactions. For peak and low flow quantiles, four main variables and their interactions were identified using ANOVA. The low flow quantile at 10-year return period (QT10) and the peak flow quantile at 90-year return period (QT90) were considered for ANOVA analysis (Figure 8A, B). These values

were derived from four main groups flow simulations and weighted by logNSE and NSE likelihood, respectively. 526 527 The variance based sensitively analysis results presented in Figure 8A, B confirm our earlier results on the major influences of the input data spread on the magnitude of high flow quantile (QT90) and supreme influence of 528 529 hydrological parameters on the magnitude of low flow quantile (OT10). Even though, Figure 7A, B and Figure 530 8A, B show that the main variables have a huge impact on the estimation of low flow frequency and peak flow frequency at different return period, but at the same time, the interaction of these variables also played significant 531 532 role to the total uncertainty band. In particular, the interaction of input data band and extreme frequency models band have significant influence on peak flow quantile values. Similarly, the interaction of hydrological models 533 and hydrological model parameters have big role on low flow quantile estimation. The ANOVA analysis result 534 also confirms that inter-dependency of these four sources of uncertainty is high and should be considered in water 535 resource modeling and in flood risk management. 536



539 Figure 8A. the shares of uncertainty related to HM-hydrological models, HP-hydrological parameters, ID-input 540 data, EF-extreme frequency and their interaction terms (HMHP-hydrological models and hydrological parameters, HMID- hydrological models and input data, HMEF- hydrological models and extreme frequency, IDEF-input 541 data and extreme frequency) for the selected eight catchments at QT90 (extreme peak flow quantile at 90 years 542 543 return period).

544



Figure 8B. the shares of uncertainty related to HM-hydrological models, HP-hydrological parameters, ID-input data, EF-extreme frequency and their interaction terms (HMHP-hydrological models and hydrological parameters, HMID- hydrological models and input data, HMEF- hydrological models and extreme frequency, IDEF-input data and extreme frequency) for the selected eight catchments at QT10 (extreme low flow quantile at 10-year return period).

554 **5.** Discussion

This study demonstrates the importance of uncertainty propagation quantification and understanding for extreme river flow simulations and its frequency at different return periods. The associated uncertainty in extreme frequently modeling is varied and depends on the catchment characteristics, adequacy and quality of forcing data, flow regime, choice of model and parameterization approach.

This framework is new and highly proposed to quantify the uncertainty propagation from input to frequency of floods and hydrological droughts. A Gaussian distribution model with a specific mean and standard deviation was used to generate realizations of precipitation time series data. This error term was multiplied with the observed precipitation time series data to get the possible realization of precipitation values. Temperature data were generated using mean and standard deviation of observed temperature data by adding or error term to observed temperature time series. Both generated realizations of precipitation and temperature time series were used as input to three hydrological models to estimate the role of input data time series uncertainty on extreme flows.

566 Different types of sources of uncertainty associated to extreme flow frequency were identified in order to 567 compare and characterize their impact on the quantity of extreme flow. In this framework, ensembles of 568 precipitation and temperature data, three hydrological models, ensembles of hydrological parameter sets and five 569 extreme frequency models were applied in order to understand the uncertainty propagation from each component. 570 Eight study areas were selected from four countries with different flow regime, catchment characteristics and 571 hydro-climate conditions to evaluate the uncertainty propagation framework under different pre-conditions. The 572 sources of uncertainty were evaluated using extreme low flow frequency and extreme high flow frequency at 573 different return periods; these two main variables were defined as main hydrological indicators.

574 **5.1 Uncertainty propagation and robustness of the approach**

Associated sources of uncertainty in flood and low flow frequency magnitude are quantified. The input 575 576 uncertainty was established using the generated realization of precipitation and temperature to address the 577 reliability of hydrological simulations. This is a simple and feasible approach in improving hydrological 578 simulations. Ajami et al. (2007) also used similar way of input uncertainty estimation, but the concept of the 579 model was only applied for precipitation variable under unknown mean and variance, which may lead to bias in 580 sampling and unrealistic ensembles, the accuracy of generated ensembles was demonstrated by capturing the 581 observed maximum precipitation and temperature time series (Figure 3A, B). The generated realization of climate 582 data was better in Viksvatn and Awashbello than the others. This is related to their less maximum precipitation 583 events and dry spell length. If the spread of generated precipitation and temperature realization is wide, it will be 584 transferred to the extreme flow, resulting in the wide range in peak or low flow extremes.

585 The results of input data uncertainty were evaluated using three hydrological models for eight catchments (Figure 586 4) and 100 best input data. The uncertainty range due to input data is presented within the box plot for each 587 catchment. In high flow, the three hydrological models show relatively similar band of 75% and 25% of both plot range. In the low flow simulations, the HBV model has a wider band than the other two hydrological models 588 589 (Figure 4). This indicates that simulations of low flow of ephemeral catchments are very difficult due to their 590 prolonged dry conditions. In estimation of peak flows, the main difficulty comes from the observed time series 591 characteristics (the number of peak or low events). For example, if the catchment has few extremes, the model 592 gives a smaller band, but few extremes fall outside of the band. Tian et al. (2013) compared XAJ, HBV and GR4J 593 hydrological models for climate change impact study in China and found similar results as presented in this study. 594 Meresa and Gatachew, (2018) also compared three hydrological models (GR4J, HBV and HMETS) for climate 595 change impact assessment in Ethiopia and found significant differences.

596 The hydrological parameter uncertainty was estimated using GLUE, which is straight forward and frequently used 597 in parameter uncertainty estimation in hydrology. In addition to the input data and hydrological model 598 uncertainty, hydrological parameter sets have very significant contributions to the extreme flow frequency. 599 Similarly, Yen et al. (2018); Meresa and Romanowicz, (2017); Bae et al. (2018) also found that the contribution 600 of parameter uncertainty is significant as presented in this study. However, the role of hydrological parameter sets 601 is not the same for all flow regimes. The peak flow is less influenced by parameters than the low flow. This is 602 because of the model parameters that governs the slow and fast flow components of the hydrological water 603 balance. The peak flow component is highly influenced by the snow and soil surface layer related parameters, 604 while low flow magnitude is controlled by the snow, surface and sub-surface soil related parameters (Figure 5A,

B). Overall, the three hydrological models showed consistent results and near to the observed peak flow. low flow
simulations band value is not fitted to observed low flow values. This is most likely due to the influence of
physiographic features in the hydrological cycle components (Zhang et al., 2016).

In water resource and flood risk management practical exercise, it is mandatory to estimate the peak or low flow frequency using a statistical distribution. However, estimates depend on the extreme distribution model (Sun et al., 2017). Hydrological and statistical approaches were combined to estimate the frequency of extreme low and peak flow at eight catchments. The result confirms that the frequency distribution uncertainty range (from five distribution types) also significant contributes to the flood design magnitude. Okoli, (2019) found a similar result. These sources of uncertainty play a major role in water resource management and planning, food security, flood risk reduction, poverty reduction and bio-diversity conservation.

615 In this study, one-line chain from the input to the frequency magnitude of extreme flow at different return period 616 and total variance-based approach uncertainty decomposition was deployed (Figure 7A, B and 8A, B, 617 respectively). The results of variance-based analysis showed that input uncertainty has a larger contribution to the 618 peak flow frequency magnitude at different return periods. However, using variance-based decomposition 619 (ANOVA), the second large contributor is the interaction term of input data and extreme frequency model. 620 Whereas, using one-line chain, the second large contributor is extreme frequency model. This is due to lack of 621 consideration of the interaction effect in the one line chain uncertainty decomposition approach; at the same time, 622 it is also visible that the ANOVA has an advantage by considering the interaction effect. Similarly, Meresa and 623 Romanowicz, (2017), and Sun et al. (2017) also found the same result. Therefore, these results are associated 624 with the case study areas considered here; however, the framework can be applied elsewhere to evaluate and 625 examine uncertainty for extreme peak and low flow frequency estimation at different return periods.

The proposed comprehensive uncertainty propagation estimation approach is very important for decision makers and water resource managers. Especially, these results are very mandatory in flood risk modeling and extreme hazard estimation. Therefore, it would be an essential study, if researchers focus further on how these findings will propagate to risk and drought probability maps. This will be done by integrating these results with hydrodynamic model to investigate the uncertainty in flood risk and drought probability maps at different return periods.

632 **5.2** Limitations of this framework

In this study, the nonstationary characteristics of the hydroclimate time series and models have not been considered. Therefore, care is needed to extrapolate the results of uncertainty propagation quantification to future or a different time period. If nonstationary analysis of hydrological parameter and frequency models considered, there are even larger individual uncertainty of both low and peak extremes than those presented.

637 In the last few decades, land use and climate change has been significantly changed, which may affect the
638 characteristics of flow regimes, including excess flow and infiltration. Therefore, it is suggested, if further
639 physical based hydrological model is considered to capture the range of flow dynamics.

640 **6.** Conclusions

641 This study demonstrates the importance of uncertainty propagation quantification in extreme river flow simulation 642 and frequency at different return periods. The associated uncertainty in extreme frequently modeling depends on the catchment characteristics, adequacy and quality of forcing data, flow regime, choice of model and 643 644 parameterization approach. Further, this newly developed framework is a good and comprehensive lesson that one can learn in extreme risk management and water resource management in most intermediate complexity 645 catchments. Similarly, it helps to fix the problem of uncertainty estimation and consideration in practical exercises 646 647 and natural resource management. The influence of uncertainty on the simulated flow is not uniform across all the 648 selected catchments. Unsurprisingly, the uncertainty in modeling of extreme high flow frequency mainly comes 649 from the quality of the input data, while in the modeling of low flow frequency, the main contributor to the total uncertainty is model parameter sets uncertainty. This result is also confirmed using ANOVA that adds additional 650 651 information about the interaction of the main factors. The total uncertainty of QT90 quantile shows that the 652 interaction of input data and extreme frequency models has significant influence on the total uncertainty. In the 653 QT10 estimation, the hydrological models and hydrological parameters have a significant impact on the total 654 uncertainty. In general, input data and its interaction with extreme distribution models are the main factors in modeling of extreme peak flow frequency for water resource management and flood risk management. 655 656 Hydrological parameters and hydrological model structures are the most influential factors in low flow frequency 657 estimation for environmental flow modeling and reservoir regulation. This implies that four of the main factors 658 and their interaction may cause significant risk in water resource management and flood and drought risk 659 management. Neglecting these four factors and their interactions may lead to underestimation of risk.

660 The methodology framework enhanced in the procedure for estimation of uncertainty and identification by giving 661 a compressive overview and treat of possible sources of uncertainty in extreme (flood and drought) frequency 662 magnitude. The results confirm that the framework is sufficient for flood risk managers and modelers, water 663 resource managers, drought disaster risk managers, decision makers and ecologists; and it gives an outstanding 664 overview and alarm what people should consider and follow.

665

666 Acknowledgements

667 This study is supported by the CAS Pioneer Talents Program and the National Natural Science Foundation of 668 China (Grant No. 41971032). We thank anonymous reviewers and editors for their critical but constructive 669 comments on this paper. We acknowledged the National Meteorological Agency (NMA) and Ethiopian Water 670 Irrigation and electric city minister in Ethiopia for kindly providing the hydro-meteorological data of Ethiopia. 671 Similarly, Institute of Meteorology and water resource management (IMWM) office for hydro-meteorological 672 data of Poland. We extend our thanks to Jinkai Luan for kindly providing the hydro-meteorological data of China.

673 The data used in this study is available at https://github.com/hkmhkm/HKdata.

674	Declaration	of com	peting	interest
-----	-------------	--------	--------	----------

675 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

- 676
- 677

- Ajami, N.K., Duan, Q., Sorooshian, S., 2007. An integrated hydrologic Bayesian multimodel combination
 framework : Confronting input , parameter , and model structural uncertainty in hydrologic prediction 43, 1–
 19. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005WR004745
- Bae, D.H., Trinh, H.L., Nguyen, H.M., 2018. Uncertainty estimation of the SURR model parameters and input
 data for the Imjin River basin using the GLUE method. J. Hydro-Environment Res. 20, 52–62.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jher.2018.05.001
- 1004 https://doi.org/10.1010/j.jnei.2018.05.001
- Bergstrom, S., 1976. Development and application of a conceptual runoff model for Scandinavian catchments.
 SMHI RHO 7. Norrkoping, 134. Beven, K., 2007. Towards integrated environmental models of
 everywhere : uncertainty , data and modelling as a learning process 11, 460–467.
- 688 Beven, K., Binley, A., 2014. GLUE : 20 years on 5918, 5897–5918. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10082
- Beven, K., Binley, A., 1992. The future of distributed models : model calibration and uncerainty prediction 6,
 279–298.
- Blöschl, G., et al., 2019. Twenty-three unsolved problems in hydrology (UPH) a community perspective 6667.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2019.1620507
- Breinl, K., Di, G., Girons, M., Hagenlocher, M., Vico, G., Rutgersson, A., 2017. Can weather generation capture
 precipitation patterns across different climates , spatial scales and under data scarcity ? 1–12.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-05822-y
- Butts, M.B., Payne, J.T., Kristensen, M., Madsen, H., 2004. An evaluation of the impact of model structure on
 hydrological modelling uncertainty for streamflow simulation 298, 242–266.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.03.042
- Chen, X., Yang, T., Wang, X., Xu, C.Y., Yu, Z., 2013. Uncertainty Intercomparison of Different Hydrological
 Models in Simulating Extreme Flows. Water Resour. Manag. 27, 1393–1409.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-012-0244-5
- Dams, J., Nossent, J., Senbeta, T.B., Willems, P., Batelaan, O., 2015. Multi-model approach to assess the impact
 of climate change on runoff. J. Hydrol. 529, 1601–1616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.08.023
- Emam, A.R., Kappas, M., Fassnacht, S., Hoang, N., Linh, K., 2018. Uncertainty analysis of hydrological
 modeling in a tropical area using different algorithms 12, 661–671.

- Feng, X., Cheng, W., Fu, B., Lü, Y., 2016. Science of the Total Environment The role of climatic and
- anthropogenic stresses on long-term runoff reduction from the Loess Plateau , China. Sci. Total Environ.

708 571, 688–698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.038

- 709 Griffis, V.W., Stedinger, J.R., 2007. Evolution of Flood Frequency Analysis with Bulletin 17 283–297.
- Hamon, W.R., 1963. Computation of direct runoff amounts from storm rainfall. internaltional association of
 hydrology publication, 63, 52-62.
- He, S., Guo, S., Liu, Z., Yin, J., Chen, K., and Wu, X., 2018b. Uncertainty analysis of hydrological multimodel ensembles based on CBP-BMA method Shaokun He, Shenglian Guo, Zhangjun Liu, Jiabo Yin,
 Kebing Chen 1636–1651. https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2018.160
- Her, Y., Yoo, S.H., Cho, J., Hwang, S., Jeong, J., Seong, C., 2019. Uncertainty in hydrological analysis of climate
 change: multi-parameter vs. multi-GCM ensemble predictions. Sci. Rep. 9, 1–22.
- 717 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41334-7
- Hu, Y., Liang, Z., Li, B., Yu, Z., 2013. Uncertainty Assessment of Hydrological Frequency Analysis Using
 Bootstrap Method 2013.
- Jiang, S., Ren, L., Xu, C., Liu, S., Yuan, F., and Yang, X., 2018a. Quantifying multi-source uncertainties in multi model predictions using the Bayesian model averaging scheme Shanhu Jiang , Liliang Ren , Chong-Yu Xu ,
 Shuya Liu , Fei Yuan 954–970. https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2017.272
- Jin, X., Xu, C.Y., Zhang, Q., Singh, V.P., 2010. Parameter and modeling uncertainty simulated by GLUE and a
 formal Bayesian method for a conceptual hydrological model. J. Hydrol. 383, 147–155.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.12.028
- Jones, P.D., Harpham, C., Briffa, K.R., 2013. Lamb weather types derived from reanalysis products 1139, 1129–
 1139. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3498
- Karakoram, C., 2016. Predictive Uncertainty Estimation on a Precipitation and Temperature Reanalysis Ensemble
 for Shigar. https://doi.org/10.3390/w8060263
- Kavetski, D., Kuczera, G., Franks, S.W., 2006. Bayesian analysis of input uncertainty in hydrological modeling :
 1. Theory 42, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005WR004368
- Khazaei, M.R., Ahmadi, S., 2013. A new daily weather generator to preserve extremes and low-frequency
 variability 631–645. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0740-5
- Kiang, J.E., Gazoorian, C., Mcmillan, H., Coxon, G., Coz, J. Le, 2018. A Comparison of Methods for Stream fl
 ow Uncertainty Estimation. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR022708
- Kidd, C., Huffman, G., 2011. Review Global precipitation measurement 353, 334–353.
- 737 https://doi.org/10.1002/met.284

- Krysanova, V., Vetter, Tobias, Eisner, S., Portmann, F.T., Döll, P., Hattermann, F.F., Vetter, T, Breuer, L., Su, B.,
 Daggupati, P., Donnelly, C., Fekete, B., Fl, F., n.d. Sources of uncertainty in hydrological climate impact
 assessment : a cross-scale study OPEN ACCESS Sources of uncertainty in hydrological climate impact
 assessment : a cross-scale study.
- Kusangaya, S., Warburton, M.L., Archer, E., Garderen, V., 2018. Evaluation of uncertainty in capturing the
 spatial variability and magnitudes of extreme hydrological events for the uMngeni catchment, South Africa.
 J. Hydrol. 557, 931–946. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.01.017
- Li, L., Xu, C., Xia, J., Engeland, K., Reggiani, P., 2011. Uncertainty estimates by Bayesian method with
 likelihood of AR (1) plus Normal model and AR (1) plus Multi-Normal model in different time-scales
 hydrological models 406, 54–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.05.052
- 748 Madsen, H., Lawrence, D., Lang, M., Martinkova, M., and Kjeldsen, R., 2013. A review of applied methods in
- Europe for flood-frequency analysis in a changing environment. NERC/Centre for Ecology & Hydrology,
- 750 180pp. (ESSEM COST Action ES0901). Marton, D., Paseka, S., 2017. Uncertainty Impact on Water
- 751 Management Analysis of Open Water Reservoir. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments4010010
- Mathevet, T., Michel, C., Andréassian, V., Perrin, C., 2006. A bounded version of the Nash-Sutcliffe criterion for
 better model assessment on large sets of basins 211–219.
- 754 Mcmillan, H., Jackson, B., Clark, M., Kavetski, D., Woods, R., 2011. Rainfall uncertainty in hydrological

modelling : An evaluation of multiplicative error models. J. Hydrol. 400, 83–94.

- 756 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.01.026
- Meresa, H.K., 2019. River flow characteristics and changes under the influence of varying climate conditions.
 Nat. Resour. Model. https://doi.org/10.1111/nrm.12242
- Meresa, H.K., Gatachew, M.T., 2018. Climate change impact on river flow extremes in the Upper Blue Nile River
 basin. J. Water Clim. Chang. jwc2018154. https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2018.154
- Meresa, H.K., Romanowicz, R.J., 2017. The critical role of uncertainty in projections of hydrological extremes.
 Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 21. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-4245-2017
- Meresa, H.K., Romanowicz, R.J., Napiorkowski, J.J., 2017. Understanding changes and trends in projected
 hydroclimatic indices in selected Norwegian and Polish catchments. Acta Geophys. 65, 829–848.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-017-0062-5
- 766 Mockler, E M, Chun, K.P., Sapriza-azuri, G., Bruen, M., Wheater, H.S., 2016. Advances in Water Resources
- Assessing the relative importance of parameter and forcing uncertainty and their interactions in conceptual

hydrological model simulations. Adv. Water Resour. 97, 299–313.

- 769 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.10.008
- 770 Mockler, Eva M., O'Loughlin, F.E., Bruen, M., 2016. Understanding hydrological flow paths in conceptual

- catchment models using uncertainty and sensitivity analysis. Comput. Geosci. 90, 66–77.
- 772 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2015.08.015
- Okoli, K.M., Maurizio, B. Korbinian, and G. Di. Baldassarre., 2019. A systematic comparison of statistical and
 hydrological methods for design fl ood estimation Kenechukwu Okoli , Maurizio Mazzoleni , Korbinian
 Breinl 1665–1678. https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2019.188
- Perrin, C., Michel, C., Andre, V., 2003. Improvement of a parsimonious model for streamflow simulation 279,
 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(03)00225-7
- Prein, A.F., 2019. Can We Constrain Uncertainty in Hydrologic Cycle Projections ? Geophysical Research Letters
 3911–3916. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL081529
- 780 Qi, W., Zhang, C., Fu, G., Zhou, H., 2016a. Quantifying uncertainties in extreme flood predictions under climate
- change for a medium-sized basin in northeast China Quantifying Uncertainties in Extreme Flood Predictions
- vunder Climate Change for a Medium-Sized Basin in Northeastern China. https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-
- 783 0212.1
- Qi, W., Zhang, C., Fu, G., Zhou, H., Liu, J., 2016b. Quantifying uncertainties in extreme flood predictions under
 climate change for a medium-sized basin in Northeastern China. J. Hydrometeorol. 17, 3099–3112.
 https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0212.1
- 787 Ren-jun, Z., 1992. The Xinanjiang model applied in China 135, 371–381.
- Song, X., Zhang, J., Zhan, C., Xuan, Y., Ye, M., Xu, C., 2015. Global sensitivity analysis in hydrological
 modeling : Review of concepts , methods , theoretical framework , and applications. J. Hydrol. 523, 739–
 757. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.02.013
- Sun, H., Jiang, T., Jing, C., Su, B., Wang, G., 2017. Uncertainty analysis of hydrological return period estimation,
 taking the upper Yangtze River as an example. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss. 1–26.
 https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2016-566
- Tian, Y., Xu, Y., Zhang, X., 2013. Assessment of Climate Change Impacts on River High Flows through
 Comparative Use of GR4J, HBV and Xinanjiang Models 2871–2888. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-013 0321-4
- Vesely, F.M., Paleari, L., Movedi, E., Bellocchi, G., Confalonieri, R., 2019. Quantifying Uncertainty Due to
 Stochastic Weather Generators in Climate Change Impact Studies. Sci. Rep. 1–8.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-45745-4
- 800 Vetter, T., Reinhardt, J., Flörke, M., Griensven, A. Van, Hattermann, F., Seidou, O., Su, B., Vervoort, R.W.,
- 2017. Evaluation of sources of uncertainty in projected hydrological changes under climate change in 12
 large-scale river basins 419–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-016-1794-y
- 803 Vrugt, J.A., ter Braak, C.J.F., Clark, M.P., Hyman, J.M., Robinson, B.A., 2008. Treatment of input uncertainty in

- hydrologic modeling: Doing hydrology backward with Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation. Water
 Resour. Res. 44, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1029/2007wr006720
- 806 WG4 : Flood frequency estimation methods and environmental change, n.d.
- Winter, B., 2018. Sources of uncertainty in a probabilistic flood risk model. Nat. Hazards 91, 431–446.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-3135-5
- Wu, L., Seo, D., Demargne, J., Brown, J.D., Cong, S., Schaake, J., 2011. Generation of ensemble precipitation
 forecast from single-valued quantitative precipitation forecast for hydrologic ensemble prediction. J. Hydrol.
 399, 281–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.01.013
- Xu, L.L.C., 2014. The comparison of sensitivity analysis of hydrological uncertainty estimates by GLUE and
 Bayesian method under the impact of precipitation errors 491–504. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-013 0767-1
- Xu, Y.P., Booij, M.J., Tong, Y. Bin, 2010. Uncertainty analysis in statistical modeling of extreme hydrological
 events. Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess. 24, 567–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-009-0337-8
- Yen, H., Wang, R., Feng, Q., Young, C., Chen, S., Tseng, W., Wolfe, J.E., White, M.J., Arnold, G., 2018. Input
 uncertainty on watershed modeling : Evaluation of precipitation and air temperature data by latent variables
 using SWAT 122, 16–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.07.014
- Zhang, C., Yan, H., Takase, K., Oue, H., 2016. Comparison of the Soil Physical Properties and Hydrological
 Processes in Two Different Forest Type Catchments 1 43, 225–237.
- 822 https://doi.org/10.1134/S0097807816120034
- 823
- 824
- 825
- 826