

Short Paper

R. Willem Vervoort^{*,a,1}, Eliana Nervi^b, Jimena Alonso^{**,c}

^a*School of Life and Environmental Sciences, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*

^b*INIA, Uruguay*

^c*Institute of Fluid Mechanics and Environmental Engineering, School of Engineering, Universidad de la República, 11200 Montevideo, Departamento de Montevideo, Uruguay*

Abstract

This is the abstract.

It consists of two paragraphs.

Text based on elsarticle sample manuscript, see <http://www.elsevier.com/author-schemas/latex-instructions#elsarticle>

Introduction

Introduction

There has been an long and on-going discussion in the hydrological literature around the impact of forests on streamflow (Andréassian, 2004; Brown et al., 2013, 2005; Jackson et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2017). The historic work highlights provides a general consensus that if forest areas increase, streamflow decreases and vice-versa. The most dramatic result in relation to this, is Figure 5 in Zhang et al. (2011) indicating (or Australian watersheds) a 100% decrease in stream flow for watersheds with 100% forest cover. However, on the other end of the spectrum, in a series of French watersheds (Cosandey et al., 2005), there was no change in streamflow characteristics in 2 of the three watersheds studied in relation to deforestation.

There have been several review papers aiming to summarize different studies across the globe, in relation to paired watershed studies (Bosch and Hewlett, 1982; Brown et al., 2005) and more generally (Jackson et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2017). These studies are aiming to generalize the individual findings and to identify if there are global trends or relationships that can be developed. The most recent review (Zhang et al., 2017) developed an impressive database of watershed studies in relation to changes in streamflow due to changes in forest cover based on a global data set. This dataset, that covers over 250 studies are described in terms of the change in streamflow as a result of the change in forest cover, where studies related to both forestation (increase in forest cover) and deforestation (decrease in forest cover) were included.

The conclusions of the paper (Zhang et al., 2017) suggest that there is a distinct difference in the change in flow as a result of forestation or deforestation between small watersheds, defined as $< 1000 \text{ km}^2$ and large watersheds > 1000

*Corresponding Author

^{**}Equal contribution

Prepared for submission to *Journal of Hydrology*
Email addresses: willem.vervoort@sydney.edu.au (R. Willem Vervoort),
eliananervi@gmail.com (Eliana Nervi), jalonso@fing.edu.uy (Jimena Alonso)

May 27, 2021

38 km². While for small watersheds there was no real change in runoff with changes
39 in cover, for large watersheds there was a clear trend showing a decrease in runoff
40 with and increase in forest cover. Their main conclusion was that the response
41 in annual runoff to forest cover was scale dependent and appeared to be more
42 sensitive to forest cover change in water limited watersheds relative to energy
43 limited watershed (Zhang et al., 2017).

44 Encouraged by the work presented by Zhang et al. (2017) and the fantastic
45 database of studies presented by these authors, we believe we can add to the
46 discussion by presenting further analysis of the data and by adding further
47 watersheds and enhancements to the data base.

48 In particular, the main method in the work by Zhang et al. (2017) is using
49 simple linear regression. And the main assumption is that the threshold at 1000
50 km² is a distinct separation between “small” and “large” watersheds. Given
51 the fantastic data set collected, the analysis can be easily expanded to look at
52 interactions between the terms and to test the assumption of a distinct threshold
53 at 1000 km².

54 In particular, the objective of this paper is to 1) enhance the data set from
55 (???) with further watersheds and spatial coordinates and 2) to analyse the
56 possibility of non-linear and partial effects of the different factors and variables
57 in the data base using generalised linear (GLM) and generalised additive models
58 (GAM Wood (2006)). Finally we hope to point to further research that can
59 expand our work and that outlined Zhang et al. (2017) to better understand
60 the impact of forest cover change on streamflow.

61 Front matter

62 The author names and affiliations could be formatted in two ways:

- 63 (1) Group the authors per affiliation.
- 64 (2) Use footnotes to indicate the affiliations.

65 See the front matter of this document for examples. You are recommended
66 to conform your choice to the journal you are submitting to.

67 References

- 68 Andréassian, V., 2004. Waters and forests: From historical controversy to
69 scientific debate. *Journal of Hydrology* 291, 1–27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.12.015>
- 70 Bosch, J.M., Hewlett, J.D., 1982. A review of catchment experiments to de-
71 termine the effect of vegetation changes on water yield and evapotranspiration.
72 *Journal of Hydrology* 55, 3–23.
- 73 Brown, A.E., Western, A.W., McMahon, T.A., Zhang, L., 2013. Impact of
74 forest cover changes on annual streamflow and flow duration curves. *Journal of*
75 *Hydrology* 483, 39–50. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.12.031>
- 76 Brown, A.E., Zhang, L., McMahon, T.A., Western, A.W., Vertessy, R.A.,
77 2005. A review of paired catchment studies for determining changes in water
78 yield resulting from alterations in vegetation. *Journal of Hydrology* 310, 28–61.

79 Cosandey, C., Andréassian, V., Martin, C., Didon-Lescot, J.F., Lavabre,
80 J., Folton, N., Mathys, N., Richard, D., 2005. The hydrological impact of the
81 mediterranean forest: A review of french research. *Journal of Hydrology* 301,
82 235–249. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.06.040>

83 Jackson, R.B., Jobbagy, E.G., Avissar, R., Roy, S.B., Barrett, D.J., Cook,
84 C.W., Farley, K.A., Maitre, D.C. le, McCarl, B.A., Murray, B.C., 2005. Trading
85 water for carbon with biological carbon sequestration. *Science* 310, 1944–1947.
86 doi:10.1126/science.1119282

87 Wood, S., 2006. Generalized additive models: An introduction with r. CRC
88 Press, Boca Raton, FL.

89 Zhang, L., Zhao, F., Chen, Y., Dixon, R.N.M., 2011. Estimating effects of
90 plantation expansion and climate variability on streamflow for catchments in
91 australia. *Water Resources Research* 47, W12539. doi:10.1029/2011wr010711

92 Zhang, M., Liu, N., Harper, R., Li, Q., Liu, K., Wei, X., Ning, D., Hou, Y.,
93 Liu, S., 2017. A global review on hydrological responses to forest change across
94 multiple spatial scales: Importance of scale, climate, forest type and hydrological
95 regime. *Journal of Hydrology* 546, 44–59. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.12.040>