# **Supplementary Material**

#### S1 The Urban Climate Modelling System

We used the Advanced Research WRF (ARW) modelling system coupled with Noah LSM/UCM Model (Noah Land Surface Model/Urban Canopy Model) developed by National Center of Atmospheric Research in this study for the urban climate simulation.
It is a limited-area, non-hydrostatic and meso-scale atmospheric modelling system with the terrain-following mass vertical coordinate, designed for atmospheric research applications (Skamarock et al., 2005, 2008; Lo et al., 2008). The ARW model is a typical atmospheric model integrating with a set of five interacting physical components (Microphysics, Cumulus Parameterization, Radiation, Planetary Boundary Layer/Vertical Diffusion and Surface) (Skamarock et al., 2005, 2008).

- 10 The Noah LSM model is coupled with the ARW model by the surface component. The in-homogeneity of the surface affects energy and mass redistribution in the atmosphere. The Noah LSM model utilizes the following parameters in the representation of the inhomogeneous texture of the surface to simulate the land surface process.
  - Land use
  - Land covers (vegetation)
- 15 Soil texture
  - · Secondary parameters related to the above three primary parameters

#### S2 The 2010 PRD Urban Land Surface Dataset

The 2010 PRD Urban Land Surface Dataset includes the land cover data, vegetation coverage data, urban morphology data, and anthropogenic heat data, for which the spatial resolution is 1-km<sup>2</sup>. The vegetation coverage includes 12 monthly vegetation coverage

20 maps. The urban morphology data includes the urban fraction, the fraction of building area, the mean building height area weighted, the building surface area to plan area ratio, the mean building height, the standard deviation of mean building height area weighted, and the frontal area index. The anthropogenic heat data includes the anthropogenic sensible heat and the anthropogenic latent heat.

## S3 Design of the Four-days Simulation Segment

An atmosphere model initially needs to run for a period of time in order to stabilizing its own condition. Modelling results during this period is frustrating. Normally, to reduce the negative effect of model instability in the initial model run, the model result data is discarded. This procedure is called model spin-up. However, there is no statistical report told the modellers how long the spin-up

- 5 for running a model is the best (Kleczek et al. 2014). Nevertheless, a minimum spin-up time of 12 hours is necessary for balancing the NWP model (Jankov et al. 2007; Skamarock and Klemp, 2008; Kleczek et al. 2014). Moreover, practically in the atmosphere modeller community that the longer a simulation period is, the longer of the spin-up time is required. Similarly, if the period of a weather simulation case is too long, the results of the last few days might be distorted. Therefore, the appropriate simulation and spin-up periods would improve the quality of the result in a weather simulation case. To sum up, the period of a simulation segment
- 10 was set to 4 days and the first day was used for the spin-up period.

In this study, one-year urban climate simulation case was divided into a series of sequent simulation segments. The first day of the next simulation segment overlaps with the last day of the previous simulation segment. The sequence of simulation segments for an urban climate simulation case is shown in Figure S1.





## S4 Schemes Choosing for Physics Components of WRF ARW/Noah LSM/SLUCM

There are 7 physical components in the model, and each component has different candidate schemes.

- (1) Cumulus Parameterization
- (2) Microphysics
- 5 (3) Radiation
  - (4) Planetary Boundary Layer
  - (5) Surface layer
  - (6) Land Surface Model
  - (7) Urban Canopy Model
- 10

First, Cumulus Parameterization directly outputs the effects of physics process rather than simulates the physics process itself (Chen, 2011). The New Simplified Arakawa-Schubert scheme was chosen for Cumulus Parameterization, which supports deep and shallow convection and momentum transport for the ARW core.

15 Second, the microphysics component is responsible for the processes of resolved water, cloud and precipitation (Skamarock et al., 2005, 2008). Based on the sophistication ranking of the schemes, the WDM5 scheme was chosen for all domains in this study.

Third, the Radiation component simulates the atmospheric radiation processes in a vertical column of a horizontal grid. It consists of longwave and shortwave modules and uses the precipitation, water vapour and cloud-related variables as the inputs. It also

20 exchanges the radiation fluxes related variables with the surface component and updates the potential temperature-related variables. The RRTMG scheme also was chosen as the shortwave and longwave radiation scheme because it supports the climatological ozone and aerosol data input which interacts with microphysics and cumulus parameterization components by Qc, Qr, Qi, and Qs.

Fourth, the land-surface models (LSMs) requires the input of the atmospheric data from surface layer component, the downward radiative fluxes from radiation component and the precipitation data from microphysics and cumulus parameterization components. It outputs the heat and moisture fluxes data to PBL component and the upward radiative fluxes to radiation component over land and sea-ice points (Skamarock et al., 2008). The Noah LSM was chosen as the scheme of land-surface model for the inner-most horizontal domain because the urban canopy model can only be coupled with Noah LSM.

30 Fifth, the Urban Canopy Model component is responsible for the physical processes of land surface in urban environment. The Single Layer Urban Canopy Model was chosen as the scheme of the Urban Canopy Model because of its sophistication.

Sixth, the Planetary Boundary Layer component simulates the vertical heat, moisture and momentum fluxes vertical diffusion which are caused by the turbulence exchanges in a whole column of a grid (Wang, 2014, 2015). The Bougeault–Lacarrere scheme was chosen for all domains because it supports the NUDAPT format data that used in this study for taking the urban morphology into account.

5

Seventh, in the WRF model, the Surface Layer component is responsible for providing the friction stress, the surface fluxes of heat and moisture to PBL (Skamarock et al., 2008). As a result of a comparison, the revised MM5 surface layer scheme was chosen for all horizontal domains in this study.

## **S5** Guideline for Model Evaluation

- 10 We used four statistic figures (Table S1) in the practice of model evaluation. We first conducted a data processing operation (run by a program) on each pair of the raw observation dataset and its corresponding modelled result to produce an evaluation 3D-matrix which consisted of a one-year temporal series of 2D-matrixes. Each non-empty element of the 2D-matrixes geographically corresponded with a pair of observation data and its corresponding modelled one at a time point. A location map of meteorological observations was also produced if the raw observation dataset was a meteorological observation dataset. Secondly, we conducted
- 15 the figure plotting operations (using the programs) on each evaluation 3D-matrix step by step to produce a series of statistic figures. Specially, we designed a guideline (Table S2) for specifying the intervals in the PDFD figure, which were used for measuring the accuracy. Finally, we conducted grading or checking operations on these statistic figures artificially based on the guidelines for grading (Table S3) or checking (Table S4).

Methods		
Statistic Figures	Usage	
TemporalComparisonofSpatial Variation (TCSV)	It was used to temporally compare two variables' spatial variation ranges and median in the whole year.	
Diurnal Variation (DV)	It was used to temporally compare the diurnal variations of two variables' spatial variation ranges and median in the whole year.	
Probability Density Function	It was used to show the probability density of difference between the	
of Difference (PDFD)	modelled variable and its corresponding observed one.	
Perkins Skill Score (PSS)	It was used for revealing quantifiably the extent of overlap between the observed and modelled variables' Probability Density Function (PDF).	
	Statistic FiguresTemporalComparisonofSpatial Variation (TCSV)Diurnal Variation (DV)Diurnal Variation (DV)Probability Density Functionof Difference (PDFD)Perkins Skill Score (PSS)	

Table S1: The Statistic Figures for Model Evaluation.

	A value of 1 indicated a perfect modelling of the observation. On the
	contrary, a value of 0 meant the worst simulation.

## Table S2: The Guideline for Specifying the Interval in a PDFD Figure.

No.	The Range of Coefficient (A)	Intervals
1	0.1 – 0.2	
2	0.2 - 0.4	$[-A\sigma, A\sigma]$
3	0.4 - 0.6	

Remark: σ is the annual mean value of the monthly standard deviation of the modelled variable

## 5 Table S3: The Guideline for Grading.

Range		Grading
PSS	Accuracy(a)	oruung
$0.7 \le PSS \le 1$	$70\% \le a \le 100\%$	Good
$0.7 > PSS \ge 0.5$	$70\% > a \ge 50\%$	Acceptable
PSS < 0.5	a < 50%	Unacceptable

Remark: Accuracy is the PDFD value of interval 2 or interval 3.

#### Table S4: The Guideline for Checking.

Statistic	Temporal Perspectives for Checking		
Figures	Annual	Monthly	Daily
TCSV	Annual Pattern	Monthly Pattern	
DV	Annual Pattern		Diurnal pattern

## **S6 Observation Datasets**

10 A quality control had been applied to all meteorological observation datasets by the data provider. Table S1 shows the total number of observations and the numbers of observations in urban area and non-urban area. Moreover, Figures S2, S3, S4 and S5 show the locations of the meteorological observations.

#### **Table S1: The Numbers of Meteorological Observations**

Туре	Number in urban area	Number in non-urban area	Total number
2-meters temperature	34	23	57

10-meters wind speed	37	26	62
Precipitation	31	33	64
Relative humidity	15	9	24



Figure S2: Temperature Observations in Domain 4.



Figure S3: The 10-Meters Wind Observations in Domain 4.



Figure S4: Precipitation Observations in domain 4.



Figure S5: Relative Humidity Observations in domain 4.

5 The MODIS/Aqua Land Surface Temperature and Emissivity (LST/E) product (Short name: MYD11A1) provided by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) was used for the evaluation. This product includes a grid surface temperature with 1-km horizontal resolution at around 2:00 and 14:00 (Beijing time) per day. It also has a quality control attribute for each surface temperature record

to identify the level of data quality. Such quality control attribute was used for filtering the poor-quality records that was at least 5 degrees' different from the corresponding modelled value.



S7 Figures for Comparisons in Surface Temperature, 10-Meters Wind Speed, Precipitation and Relative Humidity

5 Figure S6: Comparison of Modelled and MODIS Surface Temperatures at 2:00 and 14:00.



Figure S7: Comparison of MODIS Surface Temperatures (at 2:00 and 14:00) in Urban and Non-Urban Areas.



Figure S8: Comparison of Modelled and Observed Surface Temperatures (at 2:00 and 14:00) in Urban Area and the Non-Urban area.



Figure S9: Monthly PSS of Surface Temperature at 2:00.



Figure S10: Monthly PSS of Surface Temperature at 14:00.



Figure S11: Monthly PDF of 2:00 Surface Temperature Difference.



Figure S12: Monthly PDF of 14:00 Surface Temperature Difference.







Figure S13: Comparisons of Modelled and Observed 10-Meters Wind Speed at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00.







Figure S14: Comparison of Observed 10-Meters Wind (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban Area and in the Non-Urban area.



Comparasion of WRF 10-m Wind at 08:00 12 10 10m Wind [m/s] 0 L Jan Jul Month Aug Feb Mar Apr May Jun Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan



Figure S15: Comparison of WRF 10-meters Wind (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban Area and in the Non-Urban area.



5 Figure S16: Monthly PSS of 10-Meters Wind Speed.



Figure S17: Monthly PDF of 10-Meters Wind Speed Difference.







Figure S18: Comparison of Modelled and Observed Precipitations at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00, and 20:00.







Figure S19: Comparison of Observed Precipitation (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban Area and in the Non-Urban area.







Figure S20: Comparison of WRF Precipitation (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban Area and in the Non-Urban area.



Figure S21: Monthly PSS of Precipitation.



Figure S22: Monthly PDF of Precipitation Difference.







Figure S23: Comparison of Modelled and Observed Relative Humidity at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00, and 20:00.







Figure S24: Comparison of Observed Humidity (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban and in Non-Urban Areas.







Figure S25: Comparison of Modelled Relative Humidity (at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00) in Urban and Non-Urban Areas.



Figure S26: Monthly PSS of Relative Humidity.



Figure S27: Monthly PDF of Humidity Difference.





Figure S28: Monthly PSS of 2-Meters Air Temperature in Urban (a) and Non-Urban (b) Area.

(a)

**(b)** 



Figure S29: Monthly PSS of Surface Temperature in Urban (a) and Non-Urban (b) Area.



5 Figure S30: Monthly PSS of 10-Meters Wind Speed in Urban (a) and Non-Urban (b) Area.

(a)





Figure S31: Monthly PSS of Precipitation in Urban (a) and Non-Urban (b) Area.

(a)



**(b)** 

5 Figure S32: Monthly PSS of Relative Humidity in Urban (a) and Non-Urban (b) Area.

## S9 The Capabilities of WRF ARW/Noah LSM/SLUCM in Simulating Meteorological Phenomena

This paper aims to present a standardized methodological framework that can be used in all regions to evaluate the modelling performance rather than to examine the capabilities of the model in simulating meteorological phenomena in a specified region. Therefore, we proposed model evaluation methods for the comparison between modelled variables and its corresponding observed

10 ones rather than investigating the meteorological phenomena in the modelled results. Nevertheless, the capabilities of a model in simulating meteorological phenomena are an important research direction but beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, we would

like to contribute some opinions about the capabilities of WRF ARW/Noah LSM/SLUCM in simulating meteorological phenomena to urban climate modellers for their reference.

Firstly, a reasonable temporal variation of the height of PBL can be seen in the modelled results but it cannot be examined by the observation because of unavailability of its corresponding observed ones. Secondly, the land-sea breeze should be observed in our

- 5 study area because it is a coastal area. However, we didn't find out this phenomenon in the modelled results due to the temporal resolution of 6 hours wasn't enough fine for supporting the investigation of it (only four modelled variables of 10-meters wind speed at 2:00, 8:00, 14:00 and 20:00 on each day). Thirdly, the annual climatological variation in our study area was associated with the monsoon flow, especially the annual variations of 2-meters air temperature, 10-meters wind speed and precipitation. Figures 2, 13 and 16 demonstrated that the modelled 2-meters air temperature, 10-meters wind speed and precipitation had the same annual
- 10 variation behaviour as its corresponding observed ones, which indicated that the model can simulate these climatological features in a study area affected by the monsoon flows. However, the model cannot reach the extreme value of these variables, especially the precipitation. Finally, the spatial distribution of temperature was strongly associated with the local land surface attributes. The model can simulate the temperature difference between in urban and non-urban area.

#### S10 The Examples in Previous Studies which Model Evaluation is Omitted or not Sufficient

- 15 Among existing literatures, researchers mostly conducted some simple comparisons between modelled variables and its corresponding observed ones by drawing its short-term time-history plots. For example, Jiang et al. (2008) conducted a simple comparison between observed and WRF simulated 2m-temperature in a diurnal circle during August 2001–2003 to establish the trustworthiness of a dramatic prediction of a 2°C increase in near-surface temperature in future (2051–2053) years in the Houston where had be an over-developed area. Meng et al. (2011) concluded some seemingly serious results in modelling performance of
- 20 the simulated 2m-temperature and heat island intensity among three experimental schemes with only a 3-days-comparison of the observed temperatures with its corresponding modelled ones of three experimental schemes was provided. According to a simple model evaluation that the diurnal variation lines of 3-months-WRF-modelled 2-m surface temperature, special humidity and relative humidity were compared with the diurnal variation lines of its corresponding observed ones, Yang et al. (2012) asserted that the WRF model is able to reconstruct the urban climate features at high resolution of 1-km and has a good performance in modelled
- 25 surface air temperature and relative humidity in Nanjing area. Although the afore-mentioned efforts partially addressed the evaluation issue, major challenges remain in establishing the trustworthiness of the model: Even if an exact match between a match between a modelled variable at some grids and its corresponding observed one in a period of time cannot conclude that the model simulates urban climate successfully, not to mention a non-exact match. These model evaluations are not convincing, or even reckless. That kind of modelling practices without a model evaluation or without a convincing model evaluation still is extremely
- 30 common in climate modelling community even if the most recent literatures, such as the papers of Gu and Yim (2016), Wang et al. (2016) and Bhati and Mohan (2016). Just according to the simulated results of WRF-CMAQ model without any model evaluation,

Gu and Yim (2016) declared a sensationalized statement that "22% of Taiwan premature mortalities due to air pollution are caused by TBI (trans-boundary impacts) from China" (Gu and Yim, 2016). Wang et al. (2016) only provided a simple model evaluation which includes the 2-months (January and July) temporal variation comparing lines of modelled variables (surface temperature and wind) and its corresponding observed ones and a comparison table of RMSE and AE between observed air temperature and

- 5
- simulated 2-m temperature for 19 meteorological stations. Bhati and Mohan (2016) provided some time series of 2-m temperature in March 2010 and a comparing table of statistical indicators of MB, MAE, RMSE, CC, IoA, and hit rate of WRF and WRF/UCM one-month simulated UHI. Moreover, even if these unconvincing model evaluation, these previous literature also didn't provide an analysis of the interval between simulated variable and its corresponding observed one.