

EGU General Assembly 2023

Supplementary material for

A multivariate bias correction algorithm for climate model predictions and projections



Carlos H. R. Lima¹ and Hyun-Han Kwon²

¹University of Brasília, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Brasilia, Brazil (<u>chrlima@unb.br</u>)

²Sejong University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Seoul, South Korea (<u>hkwon@sejong.ac.kr</u>)

https://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU23/EGU23-10505.html

Contents of this file

Figures S1 to S21 and References.

Introduction

This supporting information provides some figures that show i) schematic diagram of the different possibilities of model output statistics; ii) complete set of results for Brazil; iii) complete set of results for South Korea and iv) some references.





Figure S1 – Schematic diagram of the different possibilities of model output statistics. Here, X is the predictor variable matrix (in our case, the GCM forecasts) at some lead time t, with size n (number of observations) and dimension dx (number of grid points), Y is the response variable matrix (reference rainfall) with size n (number of observations) and dimension dy (number of grid points). Path 1 indicates a canonical correlation transformation with coefficients U and V from the original data space formed by X and Y to the canonical variate space XC and YC. Path 2 highlights the principal component (or sparse principal component) transformation with coefficients WX and WY from the original data space of X and Y to the principal component space of XP and YP. Finally, path 3 shows the canonical correlation transformation presently from the principal component space of XP and YP to the canonical variate space of XC and YC. The colored double sided arrows indicate the associations between the different data spaces in which canonical correlation analysis can be applied to obtain the canonical coefficients U and V. Adapted from Lima et al. (2022), available at https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-21-0233.1.











Figure S3: As in Figure S2, but for the testing period (2017-2021).



Figure S4: Distribution (across grid points) of the energy distance skill score (ESS, see Cannon, 2016 for details) for Brazil during the training (1993-2016) period. The ESS score is relative to the reference UBC model, so values greater than zero (dashed line) indicate a superior performance of the tested model over UBC.



ESS Testing Period



Figure S5: As in Figure S4, but for the testing period (2017-2021).





Figure S6: Distribution (across days) of S1 skill score (see Lima et al., 2022 for details) for Brazil during the training (1993-2016) period for rainfall (top row), temperature (middle row) and net solar radiation (bottom row). The lowest the values, the better the skill in reproducing the spatial variability of the gradient of the reference field. The dashed lines show the value of the UBC model (left hand panels).





Figure S7: As in Figure S6, but for the testing period (2017-2021).



Figure S8: Distribution (across days) of the energy distance skill score (ESS, see Cannon, 2016 for details) applied for the multivariate distribution (of precipitation, temperature and solar radiation) of a single day for Brazil during the training (1993-2016) period. The ESS score is relative to the reference UBC model, so values greater than zero indicate a superior performance of the tested model over UBC.





Figure S9: As in Figure S8, but for the testing period (2017-2021).



Figure S10: Distribution (across days) of the Moran's I skill score (see Cannon, 2018 for details) for Brazil during the training (1993-2016) period. The dashed lines show the median values of the reference (OBS) data (left hand panels).





Figure S11 – As in Figure S10, but for the testing period (2017-2021).



Figure S12 – As in Figure S2, but for South Korea.





ESS Training Period



Figure S14 – As in Figure S4, but for South Korea.



ESS Testing Period







Figure S16 – As in Figure S6, but for South Korea.





Figure S17 – As in Figure S7, but for South Korea.



Figure S18 – As in Figure S8, but for South Korea.





Figure S19 – As in Figure S9, but for South Korea.



Figure S20 – As in Figure S10, but for South Korea.





Figure S21 – As in Figure S11, but for South Korea.

REFERENCES

Bürger, G., J. Schulla, and A. Werner, 2011: Estimates of future flow, including extremes, of the Columbia River headwaters. Water Resour. Res., 47, W10520, doi:10.1029/2010WR009716.

Cannon, A. J., 2016: Multivariate Bias Correction of Climate Model Output: Matching Marginal Distributions and Intervariable Dependence Structure. Journal of Climate, 29 (19), 7045–7064, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-15-0679.1</u>.

Cannon, A. J., 2018: Multivariate quantile mapping bias correction: an N-dimensional probability density function transform for climate model simulations of multiple variables. Climate Dynamics, 50 (1-2), 31–49, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-017-3580-6</u>.

Lima, C. H. R., H. Kwon, and H. J. Kim, 2022: Sparse Canonical Correlation Analysis Postprocessing Algorithms for GCM Daily Rainfall Forecasts. J. Hydrometeor., 23, 1705–1718, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-21-0233.1</u>.