Author's Response on "REDCAPP (v1.0): Parameterizing valley inversions in air temperature data downscaled from re-analyses"

Bin Cao[1,2], Stephan Gruber[2], and Tingjun Zhang[1]

[1]Key Laboratory of Western China's Environmental Systems (MOE), College of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China
[2]Department of Geography & Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, K1S 5B6, Canada

Correspondence to: Bin Cao (caob08@lzu.edu.cn)

The authors would like to thank Dr. Patrick Jöckel and two anonymous referees for the constructive feedback, and the thorough assessment of the manuscript. Below we provide a point-to-point response to each comment, reviewer comments are given in black, responses are given in blue. Additionally, we have included details of how we address these changes in a revised submission.

5

1   Response to Anonymous Referee #1

1.1   General comments

I am missing a discussion of how the method that the authors developed in the present manuscript differs from other downscaling approaches that already exist for complex or mountainous terrain. There needs to be more discussion of how the

10   authors' method improves upon and is better than pre-existing downscaling techniques that also use variable lapse rates and incorporate information about the land surface and topographical characteristics, e.g. the Parameter-elevation Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) (Daly et al., 2000; Daly et al., 2002), the Daily Surface Weather and Climatological Summary (DAYMET) (e.g., Thornton et al., 1997), and the techniques used in Hijmans et al. (2005).

15   We added a detailed discussion (see below) of comparisons of REDCAPP and existing methods (e.g. PRISM, DAYMET and other approaches) as a new Section 6.1 "Comparison with other downscaling techniques."

6.1 Comparison with other downscaling techniques
Besides the lapse rate correction methods referenced in this study, many existing downscaling approaches for mountainous ter-

20   *rain focus on deriving fine-scale T through interpolation (e.g. truncated Gaussian weighting filter, Inverse Distance Weighting, or Kriging) of surrounding observations, and adjustments are then made based on fine-scale topography. PRISM (Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model) (Daly et al., 2000, 2002), for example, derives a weighing function to represent the relationship of T with geographic (e.g. slopes, coastal) and meteorological (e.g. atmosphere boundary-layer)*

1

factors . Similarly, the approach by Thornton et al. (1997) calculates interpolation weights for the stations nearby, and corrected the downscaled results based on an empirical relationship of T to elevation, and Hijmans et al. (2005) conducted a second-order spline interpolation using latitude, longitude and elevation as independent variables. As observations are usually sparse in mountains, especially at higher elevation, these methods are expected to have significant uncertainty caused by inadequately sampling of elevation and hence lapse rate. In comparison, REDCAPP relies on reanalysis data for air temperature and uses station data only for calibration of the LSCF related to CAP. REDCAPP derives lapse rates from multi layers of upper air temperature encompassing the entire elevation range of study area. Thus, REDCAPP results are expected to be robust because both the T_{sa} and T_{pl} from reanalysis are used.

The temperature lapse rate is defined as decreasing with height and thus a negative lapse rate implies a temperature increase with height. This change needs to be implemented throughout the manuscript.

Thank you for pointing this out. We corrected throughout the manuscript, changes are listed below:

1. *"For example, Lewkowicz and Bonnaventure (2011) reported that average lapse rates could be positive in mountains due to strong winter inversion and result in lower T in valleys than at higher locations."*
   is changed to
   "For example, Lewkowicz and Bonnaventure (2011) reported that T in valleys was lower than at higher locations in mountains due to strong winter inversion."

2. *"This is because the lapse rates are expected to decrease owing to the presence of CAPs."*
   is changed to
   *"This is because the lapse rates are expected to **increase** owing to the presence of CAPs."*

In Section 3.2, more discussion is required about the meteorological stations that the authors used, e.g., instrument type, completeness of the data sets at these stations within the two study regions, etc. Also, the authors mention in line 3 of page 5 that mean daily temperatures in 1980 or after are used. The total time period of the study needs to be indicated. I am also not sure what the authors mean by "obviously wrong values" on pages 4-5 in this section. More description is necessary here too.

Yes, we agree the discussion of observations will benefit from more detail. We reformulated this part by adding the instrument type and accuracy (see below). Additionally, a figure showing observation completeness is added in Figure 2.

The "obviously wrong values" means the value out of the range of -60 to 60 °C or not consistent by comparing values with the day before and after the checking day.

Figure 2. Elevation distribution of observation station (a), number of observation stations (N) used in different years (b).

The temperature from MeteoSwiss is observed using the Thygan instrument which has an accuracy of ± 0.01 °C, and temperatures from IMIS are measured by several different sensors (including Rotronic MP100H, Rotronic MP102H/HC2, Rotronic MP103A, Campbell Scientific CS215), with sensor accuracies ranging from ± 0.1 to ± 0.9 °C. In the Qilian Mountains, temperature sensor HMP155 with a typical accuracy of ± 0.2 °C are used. The 395 stations used cover an elevation range of

5 *250–4150 m as well as different topographic positions including peaks, slopes, plains and deep valleys (Figure 2a).*
   All temperature observations were filtered using a threshold (plausible values from -60 to 60 °C), and the outliers of temperature time series were removed by visually check. Time offsets between observations and ERA-Interim are avoided by conducting all analyses in UTC time. When using mean daily temperature, days with missing data were removed before further analysis. Though there are in total 395 stations used here, not all of them are available in a single year (Figure 2b). In total, there are

10 2.5×10^6 *observations of mean daily temperature in or after 1980 used here.*

In Section 5.3.1, the authors note that the bias in the Swiss Alps increases with the implementation of the REDCAPP technique, but no explanation is offered as to why this is.

15 To clarify, we added

This is because REF3 resulted in air temperatures being too low at high elevation, while the influence of CAP was underestimated in valleys by applying a fixed LSCF of 1 to the entire area. As a result, the BIAS of REF3 is very close to 0 due differing biases cancelling out each other.

20

3

The quality of many of the figures needs to be improved. Figure 1 would benefit from a zoomed out map showing the relative locations of the study areas in the Swiss Alps and Qilian Mountains. In Figures 4, 10, and 11, are these means or medians shown with the red dots? Please include this information in the legends for these respective figures. In Figure 5 and in Figure 11, what time period is being shown for each of the stations? This information should to be included either in a separate table or in the figure captions. Finally, the latitude and longitude should be included directly on Figure 8, Figure 13, and Figure 2, rather than in the caption, in order to improve the figures' readability.

Please note that the number of plots are changed. The number used below are new ones.

1. Figure 1: A figure with the relative locations of the Swiss Alps and Qilian Mountains is added.

2. Figure 2: The elevation distribution from previous Figure 1 and a new plot of station used in different years are set as Figure 2.

3. Figure 5, 11 and 12: the red dots are median values, and this information is added in the respective captions in a revised submission.

4. Figure 6 and 13: the observation periods are provided in Table 3.

5. Figure 9, 13 and A2: latitude and longitude are added.

Figure 1. Location of experimental region (a), observation stations in the Swiss Alps (b) and the Qilian Mountains (c).


Figure 9. Spatial variation of elevation (a), hypsometric position (b), normalized MRVBF (c) and $LSCF$ (d) in selected slope terrain.

Figure 10. Fine-scale of land-surface influence (ΔT^f) for the test area.


Figure A3. Original MRVBF in the test area, Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains by using slope threshold of 50% and 16%.

Table 3. Comparison of observations against reference methods of REF2 and REF3.

Station	Location				Observation period	REF2		REF3	
	Lat (°)	Lon (°)	Ele (m)	Topography		RMSE	BIAS	RMSE	BIAS
COV	46.4180	9.8212	3351	Peak	01/1998–12/2015	1.01	0.24	1.63	-0.41
DDS	38.0142	100.2421	4147	Peak	10/2007–10/2009	1.34	0.56	2.38	-1.05
BEV1	46.5487	9.8538	2490	Peak	09/1997–12/2015	1.22	0.54	1.41	0.04
EBO	37.9492	100.9151	3294	Slope	06/2013–12/2014	3.31	2.41	1.87	0.43
SIA	46.4323	9.7623	1853	Valley	01/1980–12/2015	2.44	1.14	1.65	0.50
SAM	46.5263	9.8789	1756	Valley	01/1980–12/2015	3.85	1.95	2.81	1.39

1.2 Specific comments

Page 1, Line 18: Change "oder" to order.

We corrected the typo.

5 Page 6, Line 7: Include citation for "degree of valleyness."

Should it be Line 11? We named "degree of valleyness" (V) and descried by the normalized multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness (MRVBF) (Gallant and Dowling, 2003). In this case, we added the citation of Gallant and Dowling (2003) before Eq. 10 rather than here. We hope you agree.

10 Page 13: Many of the references are missing doi numbers. Please include these.

Thank you for pointing this. The doi numbers are added in a revised submission.

Page 25: I am unsure what you mean by "a quality of points visual."

Sorry for the typo, it should be "a quantity of points visual".

15

2 Response to Referee #2

2.1 General Comments

(1) Air temperature downscaling is important for the mountain regions. This manuscript described a down scaling tools (maybe a software), which were validated by ground observed data in Alps and Qilian mountain.I have several concerns:

20

What is new? REDCAPP is a new one, or come from Fiddes and Gruber 2014; Gupta and Tarboton 2016, and Gao et. al. 2012? You should make a declaration clearly.

Though the upper-air temperatures (T_{pl}^f and T_{pl}^c) are obtained by following Fiddes and Gruber (2014) (as we described in first part of Section 4.1), REDCAPP is a new method extending previous work. This is because REDCAPP disaggregates the difference of upper-air and near-surface temperatures (ΔT) as a proxy of surface effects. In the reference methods, surface effects are either ignored (REF2) or treated as spatially invariant at the fine scale (REF1 and REF3). But in REDCAPP, a fine-scale DEM-based land surface correction factor (LSCF) is simulated to derive the fine-scale surface effects caused by cold air pooling and topography influences (e.g. hypsometric position described in Section 2.2). In the revised manuscript, we made a clear declaration of new issues of REDCAPP by comparing with the methods used by Fiddes and Gruber (2014); Gao et al. (2012); Gupta and Tarboton (2016), as the first paragraph of new Section of 6.1 "Comparison with other downscaling techniques" (see below). Furthermore, the manuscript title "Parameterizing valley inversions in air temperature data downscaled from re-analyses" points to the key difference with respect to earlier work.

Though the upper-air temperatures (T_{pl}^f and T_{pl}^c) are obtained following Fiddes and Gruber (2014), disaggregating the difference of upper-air and near-surface temperatures as a proxy of surface effects (ΔT) makes REDCAPP a new method. Additionally, the ΔT in REDCAPP is adjusted to fine scale responding to spatially heterogeneity of surface effect based on LSCF derived from DEM and observations, rather than ignored (REF2) or treated as spatial invariant (REF1 and REF3).

(2) Data introduction is weak. specially, the description of DEM process is too short. I can not understand what you did on the DEM data.

    1. We reformulated the Section of "Observations and quality control" (see below) to give a more detailed introduction of observations (Please also see our response to Referee #1)

The temperature from MeteoSwiss is observed using the Thygan instrument which has an accuracy of ± 0.01 °C, and temperatures from IMIS are measured by several different sensors (including Rotronic MP100H, Rotronic MP102H/HC2, Rotronic MP103A, Campbell Scientific CS215), with sensor accuracies ranging from ± 0.1 to ± 0.9 °C. In the Qilian Mountains, temperature sensor HMP155 with a typical accuracy of ± 0.2 °C are used. The 395 stations used cover an elevation range of 250–4150 m as well as different topographic positions including peaks, slopes, plains and deep valleys (Figure 2a).

All temperature observations were filtered using a threshold (plausible values from -60 to 60 °C), and the outliers of temperature time series were removed by visually check. Time offsets between observations and ERA-Interim are avoided by conducting all analyses in UTC time. When using mean daily temperature, days with missing data were

3270	3014	3465	3386	2810	4237	2210	2796	3147
2066	2783	2356	2699	3979	2556	4431	3736	3873
2844	3166	3864	4011	2517	3009	3421	4048	4206
2927	2104	2594	4016	2010	4054	3948	2345	3519
3532	3936	3555	2093	2478	2684	2877	2245	2837
2428	4095	2689	2655	4098	3374	3670	4224	2286
3894	4500	2923	2203	2782	2205	2846	2350	2912
2614	4451	2181	2468	4244	2954	4188	2172	4002
2026	2221	4449	4211	3203	4251	3716	3187	4446

DEM of 1 arc-second

2980	3244	3540
3095	3051	3105
3251	3169	3313

DEM of 3 arc-second

Figure A1. Schematic illustration of DEM aggregation from a grid spacing of 1 arc-second to 3 arc-second by averaging. Numbers in the pixels are elevations in meter. In hypsometric simulation, the DEM with a grid spacing of 15 arc-second is derived using the same method.

removed before further analysis. Though there are in total 395 stations used here, not all of them are available in a single year (Figure 2b). In total, there are $2.5 times 10^6$ observations of mean daily temperature in or after 1980 used here.

2. About the DEM noise I simply copied part of the ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model Version 2–Summary of Validation Results (Meyer et al., 2011) here

"the addition of higher-frequency topographic signal in GDEM2 as compared to GDEM1 came at the cost of added, nearly ubiquitous, high frequency noise, as is visually apparent and as indicated by the higher standard deviation of differences from benchmark elevations (USGS) and from SRTM postings (NGA) despite the general reduction of artifacts such as pits and spikes."

In this case, we aggregated the original ASTER DEM with a spatial resolution of 1 arc-second by averaging to a spacing of 3 arc-second to avoid the noise. We added a new figure in appendix as Figure A1 to support the introduction of DEM aggregation.

(3) Discussion is weak.

1. Section 6.1 Comparison with other downscaling techniques

   We highlighted the new things of REDCAPP by comparing the reference methods used in this study in a new Section 6.1 "Comparison with the other downscaling techniques" (see below). Please also see the responses to comment (1). As mentioned by the Referee #1, a detailed discussion of comparisons of REDCAPP and exiting other methods, such as the Parameter-elevation Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) (Daly et al., 2000, 2002), the Daily Surface Weather and Climatological Summary (DAYMET) Thornton et al. (1997), and the techniques used in Hijmans et al. (2005) is needed to highlight the advantages of REDCAPP. In this case, we added a detailed discussion (see below) in the Section 6.1.

   6.1 Comparison with other downscaling techniques

   Though the upper-air temperatures (T_{pl}^{f} and T_{pl}^{c}) are obtained following Fiddes and Gruber (2014), disaggregating the difference of upper-air and near-surface temperatures as a proxy of surface effects (ΔT) makes REDCAPP a new method. Additionally, the ΔT in REDCAPP is adjusted to fine scale responding to spatially heterogeneity of surface effect based on LSCF derived from DEM and observations, rather than ignored (REF2) or treated as spatial invariant (REF1 and REF3).

   Besides the lapse rate correction methods referenced in this study, many existing downscaling approaches for mountainous terrain focus on deriving fine-scale T through interpolation (e.g. truncated Gaussian weighting filter, Inverse Distance Weighting, or Kriging) of surrounding observations, and adjustments are then made based on fine-scale topography. PRISM (Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model) (Daly et al., 2000, 2002), for example, derives a weighing function to represent the relationship of T with geographic (e.g. slopes, coastal) and meteorological (e.g. atmosphere boundary-layer) factors . Similarly, the approach by Thornton et al. (1997) calculates interpolation weights for the stations nearby, and corrected the downscaled results based on an empirical relationship of T to elevation, and Hijmans et al. (2005) conducted a second-order spline interpolation using latitude, longitude and elevation as independent variables. As observations are usually sparse in mountains, especially at higher elevation, these methods are expected to have significant uncertainty caused by inadequately sampling of elevation and hence lapse rate. In comparison, REDCAPP relies on reanalysis data for air temperature and uses station data only for calibration of the LSCF related to CAP. REDCAPP derives lapse rates from multi layers of upper air temperature encompassing the entire elevation range of study area. Thus, REDCAPP results are expected to be robust because both the T_{sa} and T_{pl} from reanalysis are used.

2. Section 6.3 Transferability

   The discussion of model transferability is reinforced by clarifying the differences of transferring parameters of $LSCF$ and applying REDCAPP in other mountains. Details please see our response to comment (4).

(4) In general, REDCAPP can not be transferred to different regions. It is a big shortage of this method. So, you should give more work on this issue. otherwise, others can not use your version 1.0.

In section 6.3 Transferability, we give a discussion of transferability of parameter values (α, β and γ in Eq. 6 and 7) of establishing land surface correction factor ($LSCF$). The parameters of land surface correction factor ($LSCF$) is different between Alps and Qilian Mountains, and hence hard to be directly transferred from the tested two mountains to other regions. But for REDCAPP, it could be applied in other mountains. This is because the establishment of $LSCF$ is derived from fine-scale DEM and observations, this fundamental concept is physically sensible and could be used in different mountains.

We reformulated the sentence of

"The difference in estimated parameter values limits the transferability of REDCAPP as it requires tests new mountain regions to investigate suitability."
to

"The difference in estimated parameter values of $LSCF$ limits the directly transferability of REDCAPP parameters from the mountain regions tested here to others as it requires new calibration in other mountain regions." to clarify.

Additionally, we added

"REDCAPP can be applied to other mountains once the parameters (α, β and γ in Eq. 6 and 7) of $LSCF$ are derived based on observations and a fine-scale DEM."

at the end of Section 6.3 Transferability to clarify the difference of parameter transferability and applying models in other regions.

11

References

Daly, C., Taylor, G. H., Gibson, W. P., Parzybok, T. W., Johnson, G. L., Pasteris, P. A., and Others: High-quality spatial climate data sets for the United States and beyond, Transactions of the ASAE-American Society of Agricultural Engineers, 43, 1957–1962, 2000.

Daly, C., Gibson, W., Taylor, G., Johnson, G., and Pasteris, P.: A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate, Climate Research, 22, 99–113, doi:10.3354/cr022099, 2002.

Fiddes, J. and Gruber, S.: TopoSCALE v.1.0: downscaling gridded climate data in complex terrain, Geoscientific Model Development, 7, 387–405, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-387-2014, 2014.

Gallant, J. C. and Dowling, T. I.: A multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness for mapping depositional areas, Water Resources Research, 39, doi:10.1029/2002WR001426, 1347, 2003.

Gao, L., Bernhardt, M., and Schulz, K.: Elevation correction of ERA-Interim temperature data in complex terrain, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, 4661–4673, doi:10.5194/hess-16-4661-2012, 2012.

Gupta, A. S. and Tarboton, D. G.: A tool for downscaling weather data from large-grid reanalysis products to finer spatial scales for distributed hydrological applications, Environmental Modelling and Software, 84, 50 – 69, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.06.014, 2016.

Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., and Jarvis, A.: Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas, International Journal of Climatology, 25, 1965–1978, doi:10.1002/joc.1276, 2005.

Meyer, D., Tachikawa, T., Kaku, M., Iwasaki, A., Gesch, D., Oimoen, M., Zheng, Z., Danielson, J., Krieger, T., Curtis, W., et al.: ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model Version 2–Summary of Validation Results, Japan-US ASTER Science Team, pp. 1–26, 2011.

Thornton, P. E., Running, S. W., and White, M. A.: Generating surfaces of daily meteorological variables over large regions of complex terrain, Journal of Hydrology, 190, 214–251, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(96)03128-9, 1997.

REDCAPP (v1.0): Parameterizing valley inversions in air temperature data downscaled from re-analyses

Bin Cao[1,2], Stephan Gruber[2], and Tingjun Zhang[1]

[1]Key Laboratory of Western China's Environmental Systems (MOE), College of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China
[2]Department of Geography & Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, K1S 5B6, Canada

Correspondence to: Bin Cao (caob08@lzu.edu.cn)

Abstract. In mountain areas, the use of coarse-grid re-analysis data for driving fine-scale models requires downscaling of near-surface (e.g. 2 m high) air temperature. Existing approaches describe lapse rates well but differ in how they include surface effects, i.e. the difference between the simulated 2 m and upper-air temperatures. We show that different treatment of surface effects result in some methods making better predictions in valleys while others are better in summit areas. We propose the downscaling method REDCAPP (REanalysis Downscaling Cold Air Pooling Parameterization) with a spatially variable magnitude of surface effects. Results are evaluated with observations (395 stations) from two mountain regions and compared with three reference methods. Our findings suggest that the difference between near-surface air temperature and pressure-level temperature (ΔT) is a good proxy of surface effects. It can be used with a spatially-variable Land-Surface Correction-Factor ($LSCF$) for improving downscaling results, especially in valleys with strong surface effects and cold air pooling during winter. While $LSCF$ can be parameterized from a fine-scale digital elevation model (DEM), the transfer of model parameters between mountain ranges needs further investigation.

1 Introduction

Air temperature (T) controls a variety of environmental processes (Jones and Kelly, 1983). Predicting T at fine-scale, however, is challenging in hilly and mountainous terrain because the lateral variability of T is larger and subject to a greater diversity of processes than in gentle terrain. Direct observations of T are usually sparse in mountains (Daly, 2006; Minder et al., 2010) and correspondingly, their interpolation is often not a reliable basis for estimating T over larger areas. Atmospheric reanalyses, which are produced by assimilating observational data into numerical weather prediction model runs (Kistler et al., 2001; Dee et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2014), are a valuable alternative as their output is available on regular grids. In ~~oder~~ order to make predictions at the fine scale (∼10–100 m) required for representing topography, the coarse-scale (∼10–100 km) reanalysis data need to be downscaled (Bürger et al., 2012). Previous studies (Fiddes and Gruber, 2014; Gupta and Tarboton, 2016; Gao et al., 2012) have reported how reanalysis data can be used to represent the elevation dependency of T in downscaling. This study investigates how to further refine corresponding predictions and outlines a REanalysis Downscaling Cold Air Pooling Parameterization (REDCAPP).

Approaches for downscaling can be classified as: (1) dynamical, using physically-based models; and (2) statistical, using

empirical-statistical relationships (Bürger et al., 2012). Typically, regional climate models (RCMs) are used for dynamical downscaling aimed at deriving fine-scale data consistent with large-scale climate fields. As RCMs are computationally expensive, their spatial resolution is often restricted to ∼1–10 km (Hay and Clark, 2003; Maraun et al., 2010; Hagemann et al., 2004). Additionally, the lack of appropriate parameterizations or numerical methods often restricts how finely resolved RCMs can be
5 run in mountains (Kiefer and Zhong, 2015). Statistical methods make fine-scale predictions based on statistical or empirical relationships between observations and coarse-scale fields (Yang et al., 2012). Statistical downscaling usually is computationally efficient (Chu et al., 2010; Hofer et al., 2010; Souvignet et al., 2010) but the requirement for observations inherent in many methods limits their applicability to mountains and remote areas.

A number of downscaling methods have been proposed that rely on physically-based empirical-statistical relationships and
10 thus do not require local station data (Fiddes and Gruber, 2014; Gao et al., 2012). The basic assumption of these methods is that vertical gradients imposed by topography are more important than horizontal ones. The simplest method, here referred to as REF1 (reference method 1), uses a fixed lapse rate, usually $-6.5\,°C\,km^{-1}$ (Dimri, 2009; Giorgi et al., 2003), for describing the elevation dependence of T. Lapse rates are reported to be variable (Blandford et al., 2008; Lundquist and Cayan, 2007b, a) and many of the drivers of this variability are represented in reanalysis models. Upper-air temperature, described at differ-
15 ent pressure levels (T_{pl}) in reanalyses, has been used to derive average lapse rates over large areas through linear regression against geopotential or elevation (Mokhov and Akperov, 2006; Gruber, 2012). Recently, Fiddes and Gruber (2014) presented T downscaling through direct interpolation of T_{pl} (REF2), and Gao et al. (2012) obtained fine-scale T by adding a lapse rate derived from T_{pl} to surface air temperature (T_{sa}) (REF3).

While REF2 and REF3 have achieved some successes owing to the strong and well-described influence of elevation on T,
20 they differ in their treatment of surface effects. The ground surface warms or cools near-surface air with respect to the upper-air temperature. For this reason, reanalyses provide separate variables for T_{sa} (surface air temperature) and T_{pl} (upper-air temperature at several pressure levels). Surface effects in mountains, however, are spatially heterogeneous. It is obvious that a peak, having only a small area of ground surfaces in proximity, will on average be subject to much weaker surface effects than a valley. Additionally, during periods of strong radiative cooling, the lateral drainage of cold air can lead to cold air pooling
25 (CAP) in valley bottoms, further differentiating surface effects spatially. For example, Lewkowicz and Bonnaventure (2011) reported that ~~average lapse rates could be positive in mountains due to strong winter inversion and result in lower~~ T in valleys is lower than at higher locations in mountains due to strong winter inversion. In the reference methods, surface effects on T are either ignored (REF2) or treated as spatially invariant at the fine scale (REF1 and REF3). It is thus desirable to find a way to describe the spatial and temporal patterns of surface effects in mountainous terrain and to incorporate it into downscaling
30 parameterization schemes.

In this study, we describe and test a method (REDCAPP) for parameterizing the temporal and spatial differentiation of surface effects and cold air pooling when downscaling reanalysis data in mountainous areas. The method is based on deriving a proxy of surface effects (ΔT) from reanalysis data and then adding it, in spatially varying amounts, to the fine-scale air temperature derived from pressure levels. This is accomplished with a "land surface correction factor" ($LSCF$) estimated based on
35 terrain morphometry. Specifically, we address four research questions: (1) Is ΔT suitable for parameterizing CAP and surface

effects? (2) How well can we estimate $LSCF$ from a fine-scale digital elevation model (DEM)? (3) How much does REDCAPP improve downscaling when compared with reference methods? (4) Can REDCAPP parameters easily be transferred between different mountain ranges? In this study, we describe REDCAPP and its application with ERA-Interim data. We investigate patterns of ΔT spatially and in time series using differing topographic locations, such as deep valleys, slopes and peaks. We

5   then compare $LSCF$ fitted to station data with estimates derived from fine-scale DEMs. The performance and transferability of REDCAPP are evaluated using a large number of observations from the Swiss Alps and the Chinese Qilian Mountains in the north-east of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau.

2   Background

2.1   Near-surface and upper-air temperature

10   In this study, the difference between near-surface air temperature T_{sa} and upper-air temperature T_{pl} is important. Upper-air refers to the portion of atmosphere well above the Earth's surface, which is gently stirred towards the large-scale forcing field and in which the effects of the land surface friction on the air motion is negligible (Van De Berg and Medley, 2016). In reanalyses, upper-air variables are typically available at discrete vertical levels defined in terms of air pressure and ranging from near sea level to tens of kilometres height. This makes T_{pl} a four-dimensional variable (longitude, latitude, pressure level,

15   time) and it is given also at pressure levels corresponding to elevations lower than the model topography. The near-surface air temperature T_{sa} is directly influenced by the land surface via its energy balance and roughness. Reanalysis data is produced by coupled atmosphere-land-ocean models, which usually represent upper air temperature and land-surface conditions rather well (Compo et al., 2011). Since T_{sa} and T_{pl} are available in reanalysis products, the strength of the simulated land-surface effects on T_{sa} can be quantified by their difference (ΔT).

20   Fiddes and Gruber (2014) interpolate values from pressure levels to obtain the upper-air temperature at the elevation of the fine-scale topography T_{pl}^{f}. Assuming that in each time step only the magnitude of land surface effects varies at the fine scale (Jones and Kelly, 1983), ΔT can be added back to T_{pl}^{f} after multiplication with the land surface correction factor $LSCF$. The following Sections 2.2 and 2.3 describe the rationale of predicting $LSCF$ from DEM-derived geomorphometric variables.

2.2   Land surface effects and hypsometric position

25   With increasing altitude, the influence of local circulation is gradually transferred to regional circulation. By consequence, T is more strongly controlled by land-surface effects in low areas such as valley bottoms and almost exclusively by the upper air at high elevations such as mountain peaks (Tabony, 1985). This means hypsometric position can be used as a geomorphometric proxy for the relative strength of land-surface effects. The hypsometric position $[0, 1]$ refers to the cumulative density of fine-scale elevation being higher than a given location within a defined surrounding area.

3

2.3 Cold air pooling

CAPs, also known as "valley inversion" or "temperature inversion", occur in topographic depressions and often, the air near the surface is colder there than the air above (Lareau et al., 2013). CAP is caused by downslope flow and accumulation of cold air (Kiefer and Zhong, 2015), usually during periods of strong radiative cooling (Lareau et al., 2013). The temperature inversion can vary from 1 °C to more than 10 °C depending on the surrounding terrain (e.g. land cover and valley geometry) and weather situation (Kiefer and Zhong, 2015; Whiteman et al., 2001). CAPs are common in almost all sizes of basins and valleys (Kiefer and Zhong, 2015; Mahrt et al., 2001), and their strength is expected to be related to how low and sheltered valleys are (Lareau et al., 2013). In order to predict CAPs at the fine scale based on ΔT, a geomorphometric variable is needed for identifying valleys and for comparing the "degree of valleyness".

3 Data

3.1 ERA-Interim

ERA-Interim is a global reanalysis product produced by the European Center for Medium-range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) using a fully coupled atmosphere-ocean-land model and four-dimensional variational assimilation (Berrisford et al., 2011). It has 60 pressure levels in the vertical, with the top level at 1 mb. A reduced Gaussian grid with approximately uniform 79 km spacing for surface and other grid-point fields is used. ERA-Interim data covers the period from 1 January 1979 onward and are extended with current observations with little delay (Dee et al., 2011). ERA-Interim produces four analyses per day at 00:00, 06:00, 12:00 and 18:00 UTC for the surface and 60 pressure levels in the upper atmosphere. ERA-Interim has been evaluated for various mountain regions via field measurements and proved to resolve large-scale climate well (Bao and Zhang, 2013; Mugford et al., 2012; Fiddes et al., 2015; Hodges et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2014). In this study, 2-meter temperature and air temperatures of the lowermost sixteen pressure levels covering 1000–500 mb (with respect to an elevation range of $\sim$100–6000 m a.s.l) are used as T_{sa}^c and T_{pl}^c (see Appendix A for subscript/superscript conventions).

3.2 Observations and quality control

The observational mean daily air temperatures (T_{obs}) from the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains are used for deriving model parameters and for evaluating results (Table 1, Figure 1). Observation datasets from the Swiss Alps were obtained from the MeteoSwiss automatic monitoring network (184 stations) and from the Inter-cantonal Measurement and Information System (IMIS) at the WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF (178 stations). In the Qilian Mountains, there are 30 stations from the Heihe Watershed Allied Telemetry Experimental Research (HIWATER) and 3 stations from the Third Pole Environment Database (TPED) (Li et al., 2013). Temperatures are observed by automatic meteorological stations using intervals from 10 to 30 minutes. ~~These~~ The temperature from MeteoSwiss is observed using the Thygan instrument which has an accuracy of ± 0.01 °C, and temperatures from IMIS are measured by several different sensors (including Rotronic MP100H, Rotronic MP102H/HC2, Rotronic MP103A and Campbell Scientific CS215), with sensor accuracies ranging from ± 0.1 to ±

0.9 °C. In the Qilian Mountains, temperature sensor HMP155 with a typical accuracy of $\pm$ 0.2 °C are used. The 395 stations ~~cover the~~ used cover an elevation range of ~250–4150 m as well as different topographic positions including peaks, slopes, plains and deep valleys (Figure 2a).

All temperature observations were filtered ~~by threshold (ranges~~ using a threshold (plausible values from -60 to 60 °C)~~and visually checked to screen obviously wrong values~~, and the outliers of temperature time series were removed by visually check. Time offsets between observations and ERA-Interim are avoided by conducting all analyses in UTC time. When using mean daily temperature, days with missing data were removed before further analysis. ~~As a result~~Though there are in total 395 stations used here, not all of them are available in a single year (Figure 2b). In total, there are $\sim 2.5 \times 10^{6}$ observations of mean daily temperature in or after 1980 used here.

3.3 DEM

The fine-scale topography was represented using a DEM with a resolution of 3 arc-second (~90 m). To avoid the noise in the original dataset, the DEM used in this study was aggregated from the original Global Digital Elevation Model version 2 (GDEM2) with a grid spacing of 1 arc-second (Tachikawa et al., 2011; Meyer et al., 2011) to a spacing of 3 arc-second by averaging (Figure A1).

4 Methods

Figure ~~2~~3 shows a flowchart (a) and schematic illustration (b) of REDCAPP. The main steps can be summarized as: (1) obtain T_{sa} and interpolate T_{pl}^{c} and T_{pl}^{f} from the pressure level data (described in Section 4.1); (2) derive $\Delta T^{c} = T_{sa} - T_{pl}^{c}$ (described in Section 4.2); (3) estimate $LSCF$ and hence ΔT^{f} from the fine-scale DEM (described in Section 4.2); (4) obtain fine-scale T by adding ΔT^{f} to T_{pl}^{f}.

The fundamental of REDCAPP is coupling the ΔT to the T_{pl} at each site and could be given by

$$T = T_{pl} + \Delta T \tag{1}$$

where T_{pl} is the air temperature of pressure level from ERA-Interim, and ΔT is the influences of land surface. In responding to the required fine scale of T, Eq. (1) could be changed to

$$T = T_{pl}^{f} + \Delta T^{f} \tag{2}$$

where T_{pl}^{f} and ΔT^{f} is the T_{pl} and ΔT at the elevation of fine-scale topography.

4.1 Interpolation of air temperature

By following Fiddes and Gruber (2014), T_{pl}^{f} and T_{pl}^{c} at a given site are obtained by 3D interpolation of T_{pl}. This is achieved in two steps: (1) 2D interpolation: derive the elevation of each pressure level by normalizing geopotential height (Eq. 3), and

then conduct horizontal 2D interpolation of temperature and elevation for each pressure level; (2) 1D interpolation: vertically interpolate T_{pl} at different heights over one location to the required elevation.

$$Elevation = \frac{\phi}{g_0} \tag{3}$$

where ϕ is the geopotential height and g_0 is the acceleration due to gravity of 9.80665 ms^{-2}. The geopotential and T_{pl} are
5 extrapolated in the area where the pressure is greater than that of lowest level of ERA-Interim (∼1000 mb) by using values of the lowest two pressure levels. The coarse-scale topography and T_{sa} are bi-linearly interpolated to the resolution of the fine-scale grid in order to avoid blocky artefacts introduced by sudden changes of ΔT at the boundary of ERA-Interim cells.

4.2 Land surface correction factor

The land-surface effect ΔT^c on simulated near-surface air temperature is given by

10 $$\Delta T^c = T_{sa} - T_{pl}^c \tag{4}$$

$LSCF$ is introduced here as a scale factor to obtain ΔT^f from ΔT^c. Therefore, Eq. (2) becomes

$$T^f = T_{pl}^f + LSCF * \Delta T^c \tag{5}$$

where $LSCF$ describes the effect of fine-scale topography on the relative magnitude of land-surface effects. It is parameterized as

15 $$LSCF = \alpha * h + \beta * v, \tag{6}$$

where α, β are positive numbers obtained from fitting with observations, and h and v [0,1] are factors derived heuristically from geomorphology on the fine-scale topography. The lower-case variables of h and v are derived by scaling hypsometric position (H) and the "degree of valleyness" (V) with a scaling factor

$$S = exp(\frac{-R}{\gamma}), \tag{7}$$

20 where R is the elevation range in a prescribed neighbourhood of analysis and γ is a fitting parameter. This scaling reflects the fact that stronger topographic effects on air temperature are to be expected with increasing elevation range. S is equal to one for $R = 0$ and zero for very large R (Figure 3a4a).

Hypsometric position H, the basis for h, is the ratio of the number of cells with higher elevation than a given site to the total number of cells in a prescribed neighbourhood of analysis. It ranges from 1 (deepest valley) to 0 (highest peak). The prescribed
25 neighbourhood of analysis for both H and R is taken as 30 km×30 km. For computational efficiency, H is derived based on a DEM aggregated to 15 arc-second (∼450 m) by averaging and the results are nearly identical (Appendix B1). Then, H is scaled to obtain:

$$h = H * (1 - S) + S. \tag{8}$$

6

The lowest point in the landscape thus always receives a weight of 1 in h (Figure ~~3b~~4b).

The factor v is based on scaling a measure of the "degree of valleyness" [0,1]:

$$v = V * (1 - S), \tag{9}$$

where v becomes larger with increasing elevation range (Figure ~~3c~~4c) and V is described by the normalized MultiResolution index of Valley Bottom Flatness (MRVBF) (Gallant and Dowling, 2003):

$$V = \frac{MRVBF}{MRVBF_{max}}, \tag{10}$$

where $MRVBF$ identifies valley bottoms occurring at a range of scales (Gallant and Dowling, 2003), and $MRVBF_{max}$ is a constant value of 8 based on the maximum $MRVBF$. The original slope threshold used to scale flatness of topography, is increased to 50% in this study, so that the MRVBF is smoother (Appendix B2).

The main parameters for REDCAPP, denoted by the greek letters α, β, and γ, are derived from fitting with observational data. For this, values for $LSCF$ were fitted where observations exist. Then, model parameters for predicting these $LSCF$ were derived using global optimization function $differential\_evolution$ of the Python package SciPy (Storn and Price, 1997).

4.3 Reference methods

Three reference methods using different sources of air temperature and lapse rate are used to compare with the new downscaling scheme (Table 2, Figure ~~2~~3). T_{sa} is extrapolated by using a fixed lapse rate of -6.5 °C km $^{-1}$ (REF1) and by using variable lapse rate modeled from T_{pl} (REF3) (Blandford et al., 2008; Gao et al., 2012). Linearly interpolated T_{pl} is referenced as REF2 (Fiddes and Gruber, 2014; Gupta and Tarboton, 2016). Since only the upper-air temperatures are used in REF2, this is equivalent to setting $LSCF$ uniformly to 0 (no land-surface influence), while $LSCF$ is uniformly considered to be 1 in REF1 and REF3, which use T_{sa} as their base temperature. To evaluate the performance of REDCAPP against the three reference methods, the coefficient of determination (R^2), root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean bias (BIAS), were computed here.

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{N}(OBS_t - MOD_t)^2}{N}} \tag{11}$$

$$BIAS = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{t=1}^{N}(MOD_t - OBS_t) \tag{12}$$

5 Results

In this section, results are presented in the order of research questions outlined in the introduction. We first investigate ΔT and whether it can be used for parameterizing cold air pooling and surface effects. Then, we investigate $LSCF$ and its estimation based on a fine-scale DEM. Finally, the performance of REDCAPP is evaluated.

5.1 Properties of ΔT

Figure 4 5 presents seasonal variations of daily ΔT^c. In general, ΔT^c is close to 0 °C in warm seasons with the median value sightly above 0 °C in the Swiss Alps from March to June and greater than -0.8 °C in the Qilian Mountains from April to June. In winter, lower median ΔT^c values are found in both the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains. Furthermore, a larger range
5 of ΔT^c in winter is caused by lower minima of ΔT^c, likely related to radiative cooling.

Figure 5 6 shows one year of daily ΔT^c as well as T derived from observation and downscaling at selected sites. The downscaled series are either ignoring ΔT^c (REF2) or adding it uniformly (REF3) to all stations. Daily ΔT^c shows a similar pattern as Figure 4. 5. At the mountain sites (COV, BEV1, DDS; see Table 3), T_{pl}^f describes T_{obs} well without accounting for ΔT^c (REF2), and the RMSEs were less than 1.4 °C (Table 3). By contrast, REF2 does not describe T_{obs} well at valley
10 locations, especially in winter, and RMSEs are markedly higher. In comparison, the results of REF3, through adding ΔT^c to T_{pl}^f, follow T_{obs} better at valley sites (SAM, SIA, EBO) and worse at mountain sites. Although REF3 improves predictions in deep valleys (e.g. SAM), results in winter are still higher than the observations because winter inversions here are stronger than predicted by ΔT^c.

These results highlight the spatial and temporal variability of land-surface effects on T. As the full incorporation of ΔT^c in
15 downscaling improves predictions in valley locations and degrades them in mountain sites, a spatially-variable $LSCF$ appears to be a promising means for better predicting land-surface effects on T at the fine scale.

5.2 Land Surface Correction Factor

At the example of selected stations (Table 3), Figure 6 7 shows that ΔT^c correlates with the difference of observed temperature and a prediction involving pressure levels, only ($T_{obs} - T_{pl}^f$). Therefore, ΔT^c can be used to correct for some of the difference
20 found between them. The fitted $LSCF$ is related to the topography and increases from near 0 at mountain peaks to almost 2 in deep valleys. This indicates the possibility of predicting $LSCF$ based on a DEM. Furthermore, fitted $LSCF > 0$ hint at the possibility of representing CAPs by using a $LSCF$ and ΔT^c.

To assess the performance of DEM-derived $LSCF$ (based on Eq. 5), we conducted a ten-fold cross-validation, separately for the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains (Figure 7 8). Each time, ~90 % of the observations are randomly selected for
25 deriving model parameters and the remaining 10 % are used for evaluation. Results show an RMSE of 0.29 and 0.26, a BIAS of 0 and 0.03 as well as a R^2 of 0.69 and 0.60 in the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains. These results indicate that $LSCF$ can be estimated from a DEM based on geomorphometry and that results will be useful in improving downscaling.

Model parameters for estimating $LSCF$ were derived by using all stations but separately for the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains (Table 4). Figure 8 9 shows the spatial fields of topographic factors in selected area based on the modeled factors.
30 Hypsometric position and normalized MRVBF, and therefore $LSCF$, vary strongly with topography. In the test area shown, $LSCF$ ranges from near 0 on mountain peaks to about 1.67 in deep valleys.

5.3 Performance of REDCAPP

5.3.1 Comparison with station data

Figure ~~9~~10 shows plots of T_{obs} against results of REF1, REF2, REF3 and REDCAPP (MOD) and indicates that REDCAPP improves the prediction of T over reference methods. ~~Nearly all measures of agreement or deviance improve with REDCAPP when compared to reference methods, with the exception of an increased BIAS in the Swiss Alps when compared to~~ The downscaled results achieve better measures of agreements or reduce deviance by comparing the references methods. This is because REF3 resulted in air temperatures being too low at high elevation, while the influence of CAP was underestimated in valleys by applying a fixed $LSCF$ of 1 to the entire area. As a result, the BIAS of REF3 is very close to 0 due to differing biases cancelling out each other.

Figure ~~10~~11 shows the seasonal deviance of downscaled daily results (MOD - OBS) for different methods. Similar to the detailed comparison of typical stations showed in Figure ~~5~~6, REF2 captures temperatures in summer well but has a warm bias in winter. By contrast, REF1 predicts T too low in winter. This is because the lapse rates are expected to ~~decrease~~ increase owing to the presence of CAPs. There is no obvious seasonal trend in the median deviation of REF3. However, the minimum of deviation is smaller than REF2 in winter. REDCAPP captures T well in both winter and summer. The median deviation for each month was within $\pm$ 0.50 °C (from -0.06 to 0.48 °C) in the Swiss Alps and within $\pm$ 0.55 °C (from -0.53 to 0.45 °C) in the Qilian Mountains.

Figure ~~11~~12 shows the deviances of downscaled results by elevation. REF2 performs well at high elevation areas with the median deviance close to 0, but has a warm bias with decreasing elevation. By contrast, REF1 and REF3 tend to have a cold bias at high elevation and often an increasing range of deviance with elevation. REDCAPP captures T well across elevations. The median deviance was within $\pm$ 0.70 (from -0.24 to 0.68) °C in the Swiss Alps and within $\pm$ 1.25 (from -0.76 to 1.22) °C in the Qilian Mountains.

Figure ~~12~~13 shows a comparison of REF2, REF3 and REDCAPP with time series at selected sites. Similar to the fitted LSCFs, DEM-derived LSCFs are spatially variable and increase from near 0 near mountain peaks to more than 1 in some slopes and deep valleys. REDCAPP improves the prediction of T at all the topographic positions by comparing with reference methods. In summer, REDCAPP captures T well, in winter, the BIAS is decreased through adding the influences of CAPs, especially by using the DEM-derived LSCF larger than 1.

5.3.2 Spatial signature of REDCAPP

Figure ~~13~~14 shows the spatial variation of mean annual ΔT^f for the year 2015. In valleys, downscaled T can be up to -2.1 °C lower than T_{pl}^f. With increasing elevation, the simulated land-surface effect decreased to almost 0 °C. This gives a clear picture on the topography-related spatial variability of ΔT^f and indicates REDCAPP can capture the variations well.

6 Discussion

In this section, we discuss advantages and limitations of the model, and how it could be further refined in the future. We have demonstrated that information from coarse-scale models (ΔT^c) can be used as a proxy of land-surface effects and with a disaggregation factor ($LSCF$) estimated from a fine-scale DEM can improve air-temperature downscaling in mountains. At the same time, this finding needs to be put into perspective: a full simulation of the atmospheric physics and land surface at high resolution will likely outperform this parameterization but at a cost that is orders of magnitude higher (Fowler et al., 2007). Ultimately, the choice of method (or combination of several methods) depends on the problem at hand. It is likely that the parameterization put forward here can be further improved in its ability to predict fine-scale patterns and its suitability for transferring parameters between areas and thus, the suitability for application in data-sparse regions. Nevertheless, REDCAPP and similar methods (Fiddes et al., 2015; Gupta and Tarboton, 2016) demonstrate that coarse-scale information on atmospheric variables can contribute to better prediction at finer scales without the need for increased resolution in the atmospheric model.

6.1 Comparison with other downscaling techniques

Though the upper-air temperatures (T_{pl}^f and T_{pl}^c) are obtained following Fiddes and Gruber (2014), disaggregating the difference of upper-air and near-surface temperatures as a proxy of surface effects (ΔT) makes REDCAPP a new method. Additionally, the ΔT in REDCAPP is adjusted to fine scale responding to spatially heterogeneity of surface effect based on $LSCF$ derived from DEM and observations, rather than ignored (REF2) or treated as spatial invariant (REF1 and REF3).

Besides the lapse rate correction methods referenced in this study, many existing downscaling approaches for mountainous terrain focus on deriving fine-scale T through interpolation (e.g. truncated Gaussian weighting filter, Inverse Distance Weighting, or Kriging) of surrounding observations, and adjustments are then made based on fine-scale topography. PRISM (Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model) (Daly et al., 2000, 2002), for example, derives a weighing function to represent the relationship of T with geographic (e.g. slopes, coastal) and meteorological (e.g. atmosphere boundary-layer) factors . Similarly, the approach by Thornton et al. (1997) calculates interpolation weights for the stations nearby, and corrected the downscaled results based on an empirical relationship of T to elevation, and Hijmans et al. (2005) conducted a second-order spline interpolation using latitude, longitude and elevation as independent variables. As observations are usually sparse in mountains, especially at higher elevation, these methods are expected to have significant uncertainty caused by inadequately sampling of elevation and hence lapse rate. In comparison, REDCAPP relies on reanalysis data for air temperature and uses station data only for calibration of the LSCF related to CAP. REDCAPP derives lapse rates from multi layers of upper air temperature encompassing the entire elevation range of study area. Thus, REDCAPP results are expected to be robust because both the T_{sa} and T_{pl} from reanalysis are used.

6.2 Land surface correction factor

For simplicity, we model the influence of CAP and other land-surface effects on T with one $LSCF$ that varies spatially but is constant over time. This lumped nature of $LSCF$ is imperfect because the presence of strong valley inversion in winter and

their absence in the warm season would suggest a seasonally variable $LSCF$. In other words, $LSCF$ is expected to be greater in winter than in summer as the fractional influence of CAP (the part of β in Eq. 56) should be removed from $LSCF$. In REDCAPP, applying the same $LSCF$ year-round to ΔT^c will make downscaled T higher in winter and lower in summer. A potential avenue for addressing this problem is simulating the likelihood for CAPs based on surface net radiation or Richardson number based on the reanalysis data.

6.3 Transferability

Based on the ten-fold cross-validation, $LSCF$ is modeled well in both the Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains. The resulting parameter values, however, are different (Table 4). The reasons for this can be speculated to include differences in topography (e.g. valley shape), the numbers and distribution of stations used, climate (continentality, effect of lumping two processes into one $LSCF$), or differences in land-surface characteristics (e.g. canopy and snow cover). The difference in estimated parameter values ~~limits the~~ of $LSCF$ limits the directly transferability of REDCAPP parameters from the mountains tested here to others as it requires ~~tests new mountain regions to investigate suitability~~new calibration in other mountain regions. This is a significant drawback and we hope that over time, application in many mountain ranges will help to establish correlations of trusted parameter values with environmental conditions. REDCAPP can be applied to other mountains once the parameters (α, β and γ in Eq. 6 and 7) of $LSCF$ are derived based on observations and a fine-scale DEM.

6.4 Input data

Although we only apply and test our method with ERA-Interim here, it can be used with other reanalyses such as CFSR, NCEP, MERRA or 20CRV2. Besides global reanalyses, regional high-resolution assimilations produced by RCMs (e.g. E-OBS, Chinese Academy of Sciences forcing data, ASR) (Chen et al., 2011), and upper-air temperature reanalyses (e.g. ASR) may be suitable alternatives in some regions. These regional assimilations often capture surface air temperature better by assimilating more observations and by using finer grids than global reanalyses. Since upper-air temperature and ΔT are treated separately in REDCAPP, they can also be derived from different data sources.

6.5 Future development

After lapse-rate correction, the key issue for T downscaling (not only in mountain regions) is resolving variations caused by the variable land surface (e.g. elevation, heating/cooling, CAP). This method proposed here allows predicting land surface influences on T as a function of topography (like we did here) and it can potentially be extended to include other surface conditions (e.g. snow, canopy, soil moisture), which are considered important (Lin et al., 2016; Liston and Elder, 2006).

7 Conclusions

We describe and test a downscaling method for near-surface air temperature. It derives ΔT from coarse-scale atmospheric model data as a proxy of the effect that the land-surface has on near-surface air temperature. The magnitude of this effect is

adjusted at the fine scale based on geomorphometric characteristics derived from a fine scale of DEM. The results from the new method are evaluated with 395 stations in two mountain ranges, leading to these conclusions: (1) The proxy ΔT is suitable for parameterizing CAP and surface effects. (2) The land surface correction factor $LSCF$ can be predicted from a fine-scale DEM where $\sim 70\%$ of the variance in directly fitted $LSCF$ could be explained by the parameterization. (3) REDCAPP improves downscaling when compared with reference methods. This is primarily because the advantages of REF2 and REF3 are combined. (4) The transfer of REDCAPP parameters between mountain ranges is difficult and at present, separate fitting parameters in new regions is recommended.

REDCAPP can produce daily, high-resolution (here $\sim$90 m) gridded fields of near-surface air temperature in mountains. This can provide input for other models simulating phenomena related to e.g., hydrology, permafrost, ecology. The input data are not limited to ERA-Interim and could be extended to other reanalyses such as CFST, NCEP, MERRA or 20CRV2.

8 Data and code availability

REDCAPP, written in Python, is available as supplement and updates will be available via GitHub (https://github.com/geocryology/REDCAPP). The observation and reanalysis data used are not openly available online, but for research purposes can be requested from the sources cited.

Appendix A: Nomenclature

In this study, T refers to air temperatures, subscripts identify the source (obs: observation; sa: surface analysis; pl: pressure level), superscripts identify at which elevation this is (c: coarse-scale, f: fine-scale). Coarse-scale elevation refers to the topography used by the re-analysis, fine-scale refers to the DEM used for downscaling. Observations refer to mean daily air temperature and are assumed to be at the elevation of fine-scale topography. The surface analysis fields in the reanalysis are given at the elevation of the coarse scale topography (as obtained from invariant geopotential ERA-Interim file by Eq. 3), pl represents air temperature derived from pressure levels and can be either. Table A1 provides list of symbols.

Appendix B: Topography factors

B1 Hypsometric position

To improve computational effectiveness, hypsometric position is derived by using a lower-resolution DEM (15 arc-second or $\sim$450 m) derived by aggregating the fine-scale DEM (Figure A1). Figure A2 presents the comparison of hypsometric position obtained from original fine-scale (3 arc-second or $\sim$90 m) and aggregated DEMs in the Swiss Alps and in the Qilian Mountains.

B2 Multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness index

The choice of suitable parameters for MRVBF is affected by the resolution of the input DEM as well as different landscape characteristics and applications (Gallant and Dowling, 2003). In responding the cold air pooling movement, the slope threshold is here adjusted from the original value of 16% to 50% in this study. Figure A2 A3 compares MRVBF using slope threshold of 50% and 16% (original paper) in the Alps and the Qilian Mountains. The results indicate that MRVBF is smoother when using the larger threshold and hence likely describes cold air movement better. The threshold value of 50 was chosen after considerable tests and comparisons but ultimately remains a subjective choice at this time.

References

Bao, X. and Zhang, F.: Evaluation of NCEP–CFSR, NCEP–NCAR, ERA-Interim, and ERA-40 Reanalysis Datasets against Independent Sounding Observations over the Tibetan Plateau, Journal of Climate, 26, 206–214, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00056.1, 2013.

Berrisford, P., Dee, D., Poli, P., Brugge, R., Fielding, K., Fuentes, M., Kallberg, P., Kobayashi, S., Uppala, S., and Simmons, A.: The ERA-Interim archive, version 2.0, Technical report, ECMWF, 2011.

Blandford, T. R., Humes, K. S., Harshburger, B. J., Moore, B. C., Walden, V. P., and Ye, H.: Seasonal and Synoptic Variations in Near-Surface Air Temperature Lapse Rates in a Mountainous Basin, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 47, 249–261, doi:10.1175/2007JAMC1565.1, 2008.

Bürger, G., Murdock, T. Q., Werner, A. T., Sobie, S. R., and Cannon, A. J.: Downscaling Extremes—An Intercomparison of Multiple Statistical Methods for Present Climate, Journal of Climate, 25, 4366–4388, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00408.1, 2012.

Chen, G., Iwasaki, T., Qin, H., and Sha, W.: Evaluation of the Warm-Season Diurnal Variability over East Asia in Recent Reanalyses JRA-55, ERA-Interim, NCEP CFSR, and NASA MERRA, Journal of Climate, 27, 5517–5537, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00005.1, 2014.

Chen, Y., Yang, K., He, J., Qin, J., Shi, J., Du, J., and He, Q.: Improving land surface temperature modeling for dry land of China, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 116, doi:10.1029/2011JD015921, d20104, 2011.

Chu, J. T., Xia, J., Xu, C.-Y., and Singh, V. P.: Statistical downscaling of daily mean temperature, pan evaporation and precipitation for climate change scenarios in Haihe River, China, Theoretical and Applied Climatology, 99, 149–161, doi:10.1007/s00704-009-0129-6, 2010.

Compo, G. P., Whitaker, J. S., Sardeshmukh, P. D., Matsui, N., Allan, R. J., Yin, X., Gleason, B. E., Vose, R. S., Rutledge, G., Bessemoulin, P., Brönnimann, S., Brunet, M., Crouthamel, R. I., Grant, A. N., Groisman, P. Y., Jones, P. D., Kruk, M. C., Kruger, A. C., Marshall, G. J., Maugeri, M., Mok, H. Y., Nordli, ., Ross, T. F., Trigo, R. M., Wang, X. L., Woodruff, S. D., and Worley, S. J.: The Twentieth Century Reanalysis Project, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 137, 1–28, doi:10.1002/qj.776, 2011.

Daly, C.: Guidelines for assessing the suitability of spatial climate data sets, International Journal of Climatology, 26, 707–721, doi:10.1002/joc.1322, 2006.

Daly, C., Taylor, G. H., Gibson, W. P., Parzybok, T. W., Johnson, G. L., Pasteris, P. A., and Others: High-quality spatial climate data sets for the United States and beyond, Transactions of the ASAE-American Society of Agricultural Engineers, 43, 1957–1962, 2000.

Daly, C., Gibson, W., Taylor, G., Johnson, G., and Pasteris, P.: A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate, Climate Research, 22, 99–113, doi:10.3354/cr022099, 2002.

Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, L., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 137, 553–597, doi:10.1002/qj.828, 2011.

Dimri, A. P.: Impact of subgrid scale scheme on topography and landuse for better regional scale simulation of meteorological variables over the western Himalayas, Climate Dynamics, 32, 565–574, doi:10.1007/s00382-008-0453-z, 2009.

Fiddes, J. and Gruber, S.: TopoSCALE v.1.0: downscaling gridded climate data in complex terrain, Geoscientific Model Development, 7, 387–405, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-387-2014, 2014.

Fiddes, J., Endrizzi, S., and Gruber, S.: Large-area land surface simulations in heterogeneous terrain driven by global data sets: application to mountain permafrost, The Cryosphere, 9, 411–426, doi:10.5194/tc-9-411-2015, 2015.

Fowler, H. J., Blenkinsop, S., and Tebaldi, C.: Linking climate change modelling to impacts studies: recent advances in downscaling techniques for hydrological modelling, International Journal of Climatology, 27, 1547–1578, doi:10.1002/joc.1556, 2007.

5   Gallant, J. C. and Dowling, T. I.: A multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness for mapping depositional areas, Water Resources Research, 39, doi:10.1029/2002WR001426, 1347, 2003.

Gao, L., Bernhardt, M., and Schulz, K.: Elevation correction of ERA-Interim temperature data in complex terrain, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, 4661–4673, doi:10.5194/hess-16-4661-2012, 2012.

Giorgi, F., Francisco, R., and Pal, J.: Effects of a Subgrid-Scale Topography and Land Use Scheme on the Simulation of Surface Climate and
10   Hydrology. Part I: Effects of Temperature and Water Vapor Disaggregation, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 4, 317–333, doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2003)4<317:EOASTA>2.0.CO;2, 2003.

Gruber, S.: Derivation and analysis of a high-resolution estimate of global permafrost zonation, The Cryosphere, 6, 221–233, doi:10.5194/tc-6-221-2012, 2012.

Gupta, A. S. and Tarboton, D. G.: A tool for downscaling weather data from large-grid reanalysis products to finer spatial scales for distributed
15   hydrological applications, Environmental Modelling and Software, 84, 50 – 69, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.06.014, 2016.

Hagemann, S., Machenhauer, B., Jones, R., Christensen, O. B., Déqué, M., Jacob, D., and Vidale, P. L.: Evaluation of water and energy budgets in regional climate models applied over Europe, Climate Dynamics, 23, 547–567, doi:10.1007/s00382-004-0444-7, 2004.

Harris, I., Jones, P., Osborn, T., and Lister, D.: Updated high-resolution grids of monthly climatic observations – the CRU TS3.10 Dataset, International Journal of Climatology, 34, 623–642, doi:10.1002/joc.3711, 2014.

20   Hay, L. and Clark, M.: Use of statistically and dynamically downscaled atmospheric model output for hydrologic simulations in three mountainous basins in the western United States, Journal of Hydrology, 282, 56 – 75, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(03)00252-X, mountain Hydrology and Water Resources, 2003.

Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., and Jarvis, A.: Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas, International Journal of Climatology, 25, 1965–1978, doi:10.1002/joc.1276, 2005.

25   Hodges, K. I., Lee, R. W., and Bengtsson, L.: A Comparison of Extratropical Cyclones in Recent Reanalyses ERA-Interim, NASA MERRA, NCEP CFSR, and JRA-25, Journal of Climate, 24, 4888–4906, doi:10.1175/2011JCLI4097.1, 2011.

Hofer, M., Mölg, T., Marzeion, B., and Kaser, G.: Empirical-statistical downscaling of reanalysis data to high-resolution air temperature and specific humidity above a glacier surface (Cordillera Blanca, Peru), Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2009JD012556, d12120, 2010.

30   Jones, P. and Kelly, P.: The spatial and temporal characteristics of Northern Hemisphere surface air temperature variations, Journal of Climatology, 3, 243–252, 1983.

Kiefer, M. T. and Zhong, S.: The role of forest cover and valley geometry in cold-air pool evolution, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 120, 8693–8711, doi:10.1002/2014JD022998, 2014JD022998, 2015.

Kistler, R., Collins, W., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Kalnay, E., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Kanamitsu, M., Kousky, V., van den Dool,
35   H., Jenne, R., and Fiorino, M.: The NCEP–NCAR 50–Year Reanalysis: Monthly Means CD–ROM and Documentation, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 82, 247–267, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(2001)082<0247:TNNYRM>2.3.CO;2, 2001.

Lareau, N. P., Crosman, E., Whiteman, C. D., Horel, J. D., Hoch, S. W., Brown, W. O. J., and Horst, T. W.: The Persistent Cold-Air Pool Study, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 94, 51–63, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00255.1, 2013.

Lewkowicz, A. G. and Bonnaventure, P. P.: Equivalent Elevation: A New Method to Incorporate Variable Surface Lapse Rates into Mountain Permafrost Modelling, Permafrost and Periglacial Processes, 22, 153–162, doi:10.1002/ppp.720, 2011.

Li, X., Cheng, G., Liu, S., Xiao, Q., Ma, M., Jin, R., Che, T., Liu, Q., Wang, W., Qi, Y., Wen, J., Li, H., Zhu, G., Guo, J., Ran, Y., Wang, S., Zhu, Z., Zhou, J., Hu, X., and Xu, Z.: Heihe Watershed Allied Telemetry Experimental Research (HiWATER): Scientific Objectives and Experimental Design, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 94, 1145–1160, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00154.1, 2013.

Lin, P., Wei, J., Yang, Z.-L., Zhang, Y., and Zhang, K.: Snow data assimilation-constrained land initialization improves seasonal temperature prediction, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 11,423–11,432, doi:10.1002/2016GL070966, 2016GL070966, 2016.

Liston, G. E. and Elder, K.: A Meteorological Distribution System for High-Resolution Terrestrial Modeling (MicroMet), Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7, 217–234, doi:10.1175/JHM486.1, 2006.

Lundquist, J. D. and Cayan, D. R.: Surface temperature patterns in complex terrain: Daily variations and long-term change in the central Sierra Nevada, California, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007561, d11124, 2007a.

Lundquist, J. D. and Cayan, D. R.: Surface temperature patterns in complex terrain: Daily variations and long-term change in the central Sierra Nevada, California, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112, 2007b.

Mahrt, L., Vickers, D., Nakamura, R., Soler, M. R., Sun, J., Burns, S., and Lenschow, D.: Shallow Drainage Flows, Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 101, 243–260, doi:10.1023/A:1019273314378, 2001.

Maraun, D., Wetterhall, F., Ireson, A. M., Chandler, R. E., Kendon, E. J., Widmann, M., Brienen, S., Rust, H. W., Sauter, T., Themeßl, M., Venema, V. K. C., Chun, K. P., Goodess, C. M., Jones, R. G., Onof, C., Vrac, M., and Thiele-Eich, I.: Precipitation downscaling under climate change: Recent developments to bridge the gap between dynamical models and the end user, Reviews of Geophysics, 48, doi:10.1029/2009RG000314, rG3003, 2010.

Meyer, D., Tachikawa, T., Kaku, M., Iwasaki, A., Gesch, D., Oimoen, M., Zheng, Z., Danielson, J., Krieger, T., Curtis, W., et al.: ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model Version 2–Summary of Validation Results, Japan-US ASTER Science Team, pp. 1–26, 2011.

Minder, J. R., Mote, P. W., and Lundquist, J. D.: Surface temperature lapse rates over complex terrain: Lessons from the Cascade Mountains, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115, doi:10.1029/2009JD013493, d14122, 2010.

Mokhov, I. I. and Akperov, M. G.: Tropospheric lapse rate and its relation to surface temperature from reanalysis data, Izvestiya, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics, 42, 430–438, doi:10.1134/S0001433806040037, 2006.

Mugford, R. I., Christoffersen, P., and Dowdeswell, J. A.: Evaluation of the ERA-Interim Reanalysis for Modelling Permafrost on the North Slope of Alaska ERA-Interim Validation, in: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Permafrost, 25–29 June 2012, Salekhard, Russia, 2012.

Souvignet, M., Gaese, H., Ribbe, L., Kretschmer, N., and Oyarzún, R.: Statistical downscaling of precipitation and temperature in north-central Chile: an assessment of possible climate change impacts in an arid Andean watershed, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 55, 41–57, doi:10.1080/02626660903526045, 2010.

Storn, R. and Price, K.: Differential Evolution – A Simple and Efficient Heuristic for global Optimization over Continuous Spaces, Journal of Global Optimization, 11, 341–359, doi:10.1023/A:1008202821328, 1997.

Tabony, R. C.: Relations between minimum temperature and topography in great britain, Journal of Climatology, 5, 503–520, doi:10.1002/joc.3370050504, 1985.

Tachikawa, T., Hato, M., Kaku, M., and Iwasaki, A.: Characteristics of ASTER GDEM version 2, in: Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), 2011 IEEE International, pp. 3657–3660, IEEE, 2011.

Thornton, P. E., Running, S. W., and White, M. A.: Generating surfaces of daily meteorological variables over large regions of complex terrain, Journal of Hydrology, 190, 214–251, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(96)03128-9, 1997.

Van De Berg, W. J. and Medley, B.: Brief Communication: Upper-air relaxation in RACMO2 significantly improves modelled interannual surface mass balance variability in Antarctica, Cryosphere, 10, 459–463, doi:10.5194/tc-10-459-2016, 2016.

5   Whiteman, C. D., Zhong, S., Shaw, W. J., Hubbe, J. M., Bian, X., and Mittelstadt, J.: Cold Pools in the Columbia Basin, Weather and Forecasting, 16, 432–447, doi:10.1175/1520-0434(2001)016<0432:CPITCB>2.0.CO;2, 2001.

Yang, T., Li, H., Wang, W., Xu, C.-Y., and Yu, Z.: Statistical downscaling of extreme daily precipitation, evaporation, and temperature and construction of future scenarios, Hydrological Processes, 26, 3510–3523, doi:10.1002/hyp.8427, 2012.

Table 1. Summary of observational stations used.

Region	Data Source	Number of ~~sites~~stations
Swiss Alps	MeteoSwiss	184
	IMIS	178
Qilian Mountains	HIWATER	30
	TPED	3

Table 2. Summary of reference methods.

Reference Method	Lapse Rate	Base Temperature	$LSCF$
REF1	$-6.5\,°C\ km^{-1}$ (fixed)	T_{sa}	1
REF2	T_{pl}-based (variable)	T_{pl}	0
REF3	T_{pl}-based (variable)	T_{sa}	1

REF2 is from Fiddes and Gruber (2014), while REF3 is from Gao et al. (2012)

Table 3. Comparison of observations against reference methods of REF2 and REF3.

Station	Location				Observation period	REF2		REF3	
	~~lat~~ Lat (°)	~~lon~~ Lon (°)	~~ele~~ Ele (m)	Topography		RMSE	BIAS	RMSE	BIAS
COV	46.4180	9.8212	3351	Peak	01/1998–12/2015	1.01	0.24	1.63	-0.41
DDS	38.0142	100.2421	4147	Peak	10/2007–10/2009	1.34	0.56	2.38	-1.05
BEV1	46.5487	9.8538	2490	Peak	09/1997–12/2015	1.22	0.54	1.41	0.04
EBO	37.9492	100.9151	3294	Slope	06/2013–12/2014	3.31	2.41	1.87	0.43
SIA	46.4323	9.7623	1853	Valley	01/1980–12/2015	2.44	1.14	1.65	0.50
SAM	46.5263	9.8789	1756	Valley	01/1980–12/2015	3.85	1.95	2.81	1.39

Table 4. Summary of model parameters for estimating $LSCF$ from DEMs.

Area	Model parameters			Evaluation		
	α	β	γ	R^2	RMSE	BIAS
Swiss Alps	0.61 ± 0.03	1.56 ± 0.04	465 ± 50	0.69	0.29	0.00
Qilian Mountains	0.90 ± 0.08	0.34 ± 0.11	138 ± 20	0.68	0.26	0.03

The value after $\pm$ are standard deviation derived from ten-fold cross-validation.

Figure 1. ~~Experimental region~~ Location of ~~and~~ experimental region (a), observation stations in the Swiss Alps (~~a~~b) and the Qilian Mountains (~~b). Elevation distribution of observation station (~~c). ~~N is the number of observation stations.~~

Figure 2. Elevation distribution of observation station (a), number of observation stations (N) used in different years (b).

Figure 3. Model flow chart (a) and schematic illustration of interpolations and reference methods (b). Red squares denote input datasets. Variables at the elevation of coarse-scale topography are marked in yellow while the elevation of fine-scale topography is shown in grey. T_{pl} in blue could be at both coarse and fine scale of elevation. Blue arrows and points are variable lapse rates and temperatures derived from T_{pl}, while yellow point is temperature derived from T_{sa} and yellow arrow is the fixed lapse rate of -6.5 °C km^{-1}. Detailed symbol and variable names can be found in Appendix A. Schematic illustration is revised from Fiddes and Gruber (2014).

24

Figure 4. (a) Scale factor (S) decreases with increasing elevation range (R) by using different γ values. Fraction influence of surface effect on T (h) increases with hypsometric position (H) and strength of CAP (v) increases with normalized MRVBF (V). γ is 500 in figure (b) and (c). The lowest point in the landscape always receive a weight of 1 in h and a weight of 0 in v.

Figure 5. Seasonal changes shown as monthly distributions of average daily ΔT^c derived from ERA-Interim for the locations of all stations. Red dots are median values.

Figure 6. Detailed timeseries of ΔT^c, T_{obs}, REF2 and REF3 at the selected stations from different geomorphometric positions.

Figure 7. Difference of observed temperature and a prediction involving pressure levels (T_{obs}-T_{pl}^{f}) against ΔT^c. The representation is a smoothed color density of a scatter plot to make a ~~quality~~ quantity of points visual. The lines are results of $LSCF * \Delta T^c$ by using $LSCF$ = 1 (black dash) and best-fitted $LSCF$ (blue solid) at the selected stations. The time period of the stations are present in Table 3.

Figure 8. Ten-fold cross-validation of DEM-derived $LSCF$ against fitted values in the Swiss Alps (a) and the Qilian Mountains (b).

Figure 9. Spatial variation of elevation (a), hypsometric position (b), normalized MRVBF (c) and $LSCF$ (d) in selected slope terrain(9.2999 N, 10.3998 W, 46.9999 N, 45.9999 S).

Figure 10. T_{obs} (OBS) against results of REF1, REF2, REF3 and REDCAPP (MOD). LR in subtitle means lapse rate.

Figure 11. Seasonal deviance of downscaled daily results (MOD-OBS) for different methods. Red dots are median values.

Figure 12. Deviances of downscaled results by elevations. The stations are grouped by elevation with an interval of 300 m. Each box may contain multiple stations and the numbers of observation times (days) are given in blue on the right. Red dots are median values.

33

Figure 13. Comparison of REF2, REF3 and REDCAPP with time series at selected stations. The daily temperatures present are averaged based on all available years (Table 3); the shorter time series for EBO explains the larger variation in the plot.

Figure 14. Fine-scale of land-surface influence (ΔT^f) for the test area(9.2999 N, 10.3998 W, 46.9999 N, 45.9999 S).

Table A1. Table of symbol and variables for REDCAPP

Symbol	Name	Unit
T	Near-surface air temperature	°C
T_{obs}	Observational surface air temperature	°C
T_{sa}	2–meter air temperature at the elevation of coarse scale	°C
T_{pl}	Air temperature of pressure level in reanalysis, known as upper-air temperature	°C
T_{pl}^{c}	Air temperature of pressure level at the elevation of coarse scale	°C
T_{pl}^{f}	Air temperature of pressure level at the elevation of fine scale	°C
ΔT	Land-surface influences on surface air temperature	°C
ΔT^{c}	Land-surface influences on surface air temperature at elevation of coarse scale	°C
ΔT^{f}	Land-surface influences on surface air temperature at elevation of fine scale	°C
$LSCF$	Land surface correction factor	–
α	Fractional influence of surface effects on air temperature	–
β	Influences of cold air pooling on air temperature	–
h	Scaled hyposmetric position	–
H	Hypsometric position	–
υ	degree of valleyness	–
$MRVBF$	Multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness	–
V	Normalized multiresolution index of valley bottom flatness	–
R	Elevation range in a prescribed neighbourhood	m

3270	3014	3465	3386	2810	4237	2210	2796	3147
2066	2783	2356	2699	3979	2556	4431	3736	3873
2844	3166	3864	4011	2517	3009	3421	4048	4206
2927	2104	2594	4016	2010	4054	3948	2345	3519
3532	3936	3555	2093	2478	2684	2877	2245	2837
2428	4095	2689	2655	4098	3374	3670	4224	2286
3894	4500	2923	2203	2782	2205	2846	2350	2912
2614	4451	2181	2468	4244	2954	4188	2172	4002
2026	2221	4449	4211	3203	4251	3716	3187	4446

DEM of 1 arc-second

| 2980 | 3244 | 3540 |
| 3095 | 3051 | 3105 |
| 3251 | 3169 | 3313 |

DEM of 3 arc-second

Figure A1. Schematic illustration of DEM aggregation from a grid spacing of 1 arc-second to 3 arc-second by averaging. Numbers in the pixels are DEM elevations in meter. In hypsometric simulation, the DEM with a grid spacing of 15 arc-second is derived using the same method.

Figure A2. Comparison of hypsometric position derived from coarse-scale (15 arc-second) and fine-scale (3 arc-second) DEMs based on a random sample of 1000 points.

Figure A3. Original MRVBF in the test area, Swiss Alps and the Qilian Mountains by using slope threshold of 50% and 16%.