Predicting Daily Reference Evapotranspiration in a Humid Region of China by the Locally Calibrated Hargreaves-Samani Equation Using Weather Forecast Data
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ABSTRACT

The Hargreaves-Samani (HS) equation, which estimates reference evapotranspiration ($ET_0$) using only temperature as input, should be most suitable for $ET_0$ prediction based on weather forecasting data. In the current study, the HS equation is calibrated with daily $ET_0$ by the Penman-Monteith equation, and is evaluated to check the possibility of predicting daily $ET_0$ based on weather forecast data. The HS equation is likely to overestimate daily $ET_0$ in the humid regions of China. Coefficients $a$ and $c$ are calculated as 0.00138 and 0.5736 according to local calibration. The calibrated HS equation performs considerably better than the original one. The proposed equation could be an alternative and effective solution for predicting daily $ET_0$ using public weather forecast data as inputs. The error of daily $ET_0$ prediction increases with the increase in the error of daily temperature range (TR) or daily mean temperature ($T_{\text{mean}}$). This error is likely to be more sensitive to the error in TR than in the $T_{\text{mean}}$. Ensuring that TR errors are less than 2°C is necessary for perfect estimations of $ET_0$ based on public weather forecast data using the calibrated HS equation.
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INTRODUCTION

The prediction of daily crop evapotranspiration ($ET_c$) is the basis for real-time irrigation forecasting. The estimation of $ET_c$ often involves calculating the reference evapotranspiration ($ET_0$), which is defined as the evapotranspiration rate from a hypothetical crop with an assumed height of 0.12 m, a fixed surface resistance of 70 s m\textsuperscript{-1}, and an albedo of 0.23 (Allen\textit{ et al.}, 1998). Subsequently, a suitable crop coefficient ($K_c$) is applied. The prediction of daily $ET_0$, which is the basis for estimating the daily $ET_c$ and determining crop irrigation requirements, is essential for real-time irrigation forecasting.

The prediction of $ET_0$ is always realized based on either the weather forecast data (Duce\textit{ et al.}, 1999; Xu\textit{ et al.}, 2006; Cai\textit{ et al.}, 2007; Er-Raki\textit{ et al.}, 2010) or time series analysis (Mariño\textit{ et al.}, 1993; Mao, 1994; Mohan and Arumugam, 1995; Gu\textit{ et al.}, 1998; Trajković, 1998; Luo\textit{ et al.}, 2005; Landeras\textit{ et al.}, 2009). Duce\textit{ et al.} (1999) calculated the hourly $ET_0$ using the modified Penman-Monteith (PM) equation, with outputs of a mesoscale weather forecast model as inputs. Xu\textit{ et al.} (2006) established a back propagation neural network model (BP-ANN) for the real-time prediction of $ET_0$ based on daily public weather forecast data. Cai\textit{ et al.} (2007) presented a complex analytical method for the estimation of $ET_0$.
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by the FAO-56 PM equation using daily weather forecast messages, by which weather forecast messages were firstly transformed into data required before \( ET_0 \) was calculated by FAO-56 PM equation. Er-Raki et al. (2010) used the Hargreaves method to predict the daily \( ET_0 \) in semi-arid regions in the Tensift basin with climatic data generated by numerical weather prediction models as inputs. Thus, weather forecasting data are useful for the real prediction of \( ET_0 \) with different methods.

A number of methods have been developed for the estimation of \( ET_0 \) based on either (i) aerodynamic principles; (ii) energy budget; (iii) a combination of (i) and (ii); or (iv) empirical principles. The FAO PM combination equation (FAO-56 PM) has been proposed as the only standard method for calculating \( ET_0 \) and other equations (Allen et al., 1998). It is accepted worldwide as the optimum method and the standard for evaluating other methods (e.g., Jacquides and Kontonyiannis, 1995; Antonio, 2004; Hossein et al., 2004; Xu and Chen, 2005; López-Urrea et al., 2006; Trajkovic, 2007; Meshram et al., 2010; da Silva et al., 2011; Mohawesh, 2011). An issue that confronts us is that weather forecast data cannot meet the requirements for \( ET_0 \) calculation in many complex methods. The Hargreaves-Samani (HS) equation (Hargreaves and Samani, 1985), proposed as an alternative by Allen et al. (1998), may be most suitable for \( ET_0 \) prediction using weather forecast data because its estimated \( ET_0 \) merely uses temperature as input. However, debates continue regarding the HS equation. Several studies have reported that this equation may provide reasonable estimates of \( ET_0 \) (Hargreaves, 1994; Martínez-Cob and Tejero-Juste, 2004; Xu and Singh, 2002; Dinpasioh, 2006; Er-Raki et al., 2011); however, others argue that this equation tends to overestimate \( ET_0 \) in humid regions but underestimate \( ET_0 \) in very dry and windy regions (Samani, 2000; Droogers and Allen, 2002; Bakhtiari et al., 2011). Local calibration is strongly recommended prior to its application (Temessgen et al., 2005; Gavilan et al., 2006; Fooladmand and Haghighat, 2007; Er-Raki et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2011).

The objectives of the current study include providing an improved local calibration of the HS equation using the daily \( ET_0 \) by the FAO-56 PM equation in a humid region of China and evaluating its potential to use weather forecast data as inputs in the daily \( ET_0 \) prediction by the calibrated HS equation.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Site Description and Data Collection**

The Nanjing climate station (31°15′15″N, 120°57′43″E) was selected as the typical climate station in humid region in East China. The study area has a subtropical monsoon climate with an average annual air temperature of 16.3°C and a mean annual precipitation of 1,062.4 mm. Historical observed meteorological data (1995–2007) and public weather forecast data (2004–2005) were collected. The observed data set used in the current study was collected from the Chinese Meteorological Data Sharing Service System (http://cdc.cma.gov.cn). The data set is composed of daily values of the maximum air temperature (\( T_{max} \)), minimum air temperature (\( T_{min} \)), average temperature (\( T_a \)), atmospheric pressure (P), air humidity (RH), solar radiation (\( R_s \)), net radiation (\( R_n \)), and 24 hours wind speed at a height of 2 m (\( u_2 \)). The data were measured following the Surface Meteorological Observation Standard of China Meteorological Administration (CMA, 2003) over a “25×25 m²”, well-watered, uniform height (less than 20 cm)” surface. Data quality was checked according to Quality Control of Surface Meteorological Observational Data (CMA, 2010) before it was published on the Chinese Meteorological Data Sharing Service System. The meteorological data have good quality and integrity. Statistics of the historical observed meteorological data from 1995 to
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2007 are listed in Table 1. The observed meteorological data are divided into two
groups. Data from 1995 to 2005 were used
for the local calibration of the HS equation,
and the remaining data (2006 to 2007) were
set apart for validation. Before the data were
used for daily $ET_0$ calculation using the
FAO-56 PM equation (Allen et al., 1998),
they were checked according to Allen
(1996) by comparing the clear sky radiation
($R_{so}$) with solar radiation ($R_s$), as indicated in
Figure 1.

Daily public weather forecast data,
collected from Nanjing Daily, were
composed of daily values of the $T_{\text{max}}$ and
$T_{\text{min}}$. Prediction errors of the forecast $T_{\text{max}}$
and $T_{\text{min}}$ are plotted in Figure 2, compared
with the observed meteorological data.
Errors of the daily $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ ranged from
-3.3 to 3.0°C and -3.2 to 2.8°C, with an
average of -0.244 and -0.242°C,
respectively. Statistical analysis revealed
that 51.3% of the forecast daily $T_{\text{max}}$
and 51.3% of the forecast daily $T_{\text{min}}$
had an error of no more than 1°C, and that 89.9% of the
forecast daily $T_{\text{max}}$ and 91.8% of the forecast
daily $T_{\text{min}}$ had an error no more than 2°C.

**HS Equation: Calibration and Validation**

The HS equation (Hargreaves and Samani,
1985) is as follows:

$$ET_0 = 0.408 \times a \times (T_{\text{mean}} + b) \times TR \times R_s$$ (1)

Where, $T_{\text{mean}}$ and $TR$ are the daily mean air
temperature and daily temperature range (°C),
respectively. Here, $T_{\text{mean}}$ and $TR$ are calculated
based on the daily $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ with $T_{\text{mean}} = (T_{\text{max}}+T_{\text{min}})/2$ and $TR = (T_{\text{max}} - T_{\text{min}})$. The parameter $R_s$
is the extraterrestrial radiation (MJ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) that depends on the day of the
year and the latitude. It can be computed
according to the method described by Allen et
al. (1998). The coefficient $b=17.8$ is used to
convert the temperature $F$ into °C. However,
the coefficients $a$ and $c$, with the original
values of 0.0023 and 0.5, respectively, should
be determined according to the local
 calibration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>$T_{\text{max}}$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{\text{min}}$ (°C)</th>
<th>$T_a$ (°C)</th>
<th>$P$ (Kpa)</th>
<th>$RH_a$ (%)</th>
<th>$R_a$ (MJ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$R_s$ (MJ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$u_2$ (m s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibration data (1995 - 2005) Maximum</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation data (2006 - 2007) Maximum</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Comparison between daily solar radiation ($R_s$) and clear sky radiation ($R_{so}$).*
Based on historical observed meteorological data from 1995 to 2005, local calibration was performed to determine the values of coefficients $a$ and $c$ through nonlinear multiple regression between the $ET_0$ calculated using the FAO-56 PM equation and $T_{\text{mean}}$, $T_{\text{max}}$, $T_{\text{min}}$, and $R_a$. The nonlinear multiple regressions were realized by the 1stOPT software with Levenberg-Marquart (LM) algorithm. The locally calibrated HS equation was validated for the data from 2006 to 2007 by comparing the results with those using the FAO-56 PM equation.

Performance of Calibrated HS Equation Based on Weather Forecast Data

The $ET_0$ was predicted based on public weather forecast data (2004 to 2005) using Equation (1), with the locally calibrated coefficients of $a$ and $c$. The prediction results with the calibrated HS equation were evaluated by comparing them with those calculated using the FAO-56 PM equation based on the historical observed climatic data.

Sensitivity Analysis of $ET_0$ Prediction to Weather Forecast Error

Errors on the weather forecast data and its influence on the accuracy of $ET_0$ prediction must be discussed before they are used as inputs of the locally calibrated HS equation. Eighteen combinations of errors in the $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ were designed (Table 2), and the polluted data groups were acquired by imposing combinations of errors in the $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ of the historical observed climatic data (2004 to 2005). The $ET_0$ was then calculated using the calibrated HS equation with the polluted data groups as inputs, and

Table 2. Eighteen combinations of errors in $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ for sensitivity analysis of $ET_0$ prediction to weather forecast error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error in $TR(T_{\text{mean}})$</th>
<th>Error in $T_{\text{max}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2°C</td>
<td>-1°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2°C</td>
<td>0(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1°C</td>
<td>-1(-0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0°C</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1°C</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2°C</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OM means omitted, because those combinations of error in $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ are likely to lead to contradiction.
compared with those calculated by the FAO-56 PM equation based on historical observed climatic data.

**Statistical Analysis**

For the comparison of the $ET_0$ calculated by different equations or different input data sets, linear regressions with zero interception were made, and slopes and determination coefficients ($R^2$) were calculated. The average absolute errors (AE) and root mean square error (RMSE) were also calculated using the following expressions:

$$AE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |P_i - O_i| \quad (2)$$

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (P_i - O_i)^2} \quad (3)$$

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Calibration and Validation of HS Equation**

The HS equation is likely to overestimate daily $ET_0$ in a humid region in China, compared with the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation. Approximately 88.7% of all the results overestimated daily $ET_0$. The average overestimation is 1.12 mm d$^{-1}$. Thus, local calibration was carried out with the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation as a standard. The coefficients $a$ and $c$ were calculated as 0.00138 and 0.5736. Coefficient $a$ in the current study is much lower than the original value suggested by Hargreaves and Samani (1985) and results of Gavilan et al. (2006), but falls within the range suggested by Moges et al. (2003) and Hu et al. (2011). The coefficient $c$ in the current study is higher than the original value suggested by Hargreaves and Samani (1985) and by Trajkovic et al. (2007), but lower than the results of Hu et al. (2011). The daily $ET_0$ calculated by the HS equation and the locally calibrated equation were compared with those obtained by the FAO-56 PM equation (Figure 3). The results show the slopes to be 1.2738 and 0.9323, and the $R^2$ to be 0.5211 and 0.6234 for the original and locally calibrated HS equations, respectively. The average AE$s$ are 1.05 and 0.56 mm d$^{-1}$, and the RMSE$s$ are 1.26 and 0.71 mm d$^{-1}$ for the original and locally calibrated HS equations, respectively. The locally calibrated HS equation was validated with data from 2006 to 2007.

![Figure 3](image-url)
Figure 4. Comparison between the daily $ET_0$ calculated by the FAO-56 Penman-Montieth equation and the Hargreaves-Samani equation with the original and locally calibrated parameters for validation data (2006-2007, N= 729).

(Figure 4), by comparing with the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation. The slope and $R^2$ of the linear regression between the $ET_0$ by the locally calibrated $HS$ equation and the FAO-56 PM equation are 1.096 and 0.618, respectively. However, the slope and $R^2$ of the linear regression between the $ET_0$ by the original $HS$ equation and the FAO-56 PM equation are 1.300 and 0.570, respectively. The $AE$ and $RMSE$ between the $ET_0$ by the locally calibrated $HS$ equation and the FAO-56 PM equation are 0.61 and 0.77 mm d$^{-1}$, lower than the $AE$ (0.97 mm d$^{-1}$) and $RMSE$ (1.22 mm d$^{-1}$) between the $ET_0$ by the original $HS$ equation and the FAO-56 PM equation. The locally calibrated $HS$ equation performs considerably better than the original $HS$ equation. The locally calibrated $HS$ equation performs much better than the original $HS$ equation for $ET_0$ calculation in the humid regions of East China.

For validation data sets, 66 and 171 data groups underestimate the $ET_0$ by the $HS$ and the calibrated $HS$ equations, respectively, compared with the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation. However, 662 and 557 data groups overestimate $ET_0$. The underestimated $ET_0$ most likely occurred during windy days. The average wind speeds are 2.9 and 2.7 m s$^{-1}$ for the underestimated cases, but 1.8 and 1.7 m s$^{-1}$ for the overestimated cases. More than 80% of the underestimated cases have a wind speed higher than 2.5 m s$^{-1}$, and more than 80% have a wind speed lower than 2.0 m s$^{-1}$. These findings are consistent with the conclusion that the $HS$ equation underestimates the $ET_0$ in very dry and windy regions (Samani, 2000; Droogers and Allen, 2002; Bakhtiari et al., 2011). This can be ascribed to the advection phenomena related to the high aerodynamic term during windy days, which has been omitted in the $HS$ equation.

**Performance of Calibrated HS Equation Based on Weather Forecast Data**

The $ET_0$s were predicted using the original and calibrated $HS$ equations (Equation 1) based on the weather forecast data (2004 to 2005). The results plotted in Figure 5 were compared with the $ET_0$ calculated using the FAO-56 PM equation based on measured climatic data (2004 to 2005). The total predicted $ET_0$s by the original and calibrated $HS$ equations during from 2004 to 2005 are 2262.1 and 1576.5 mm, 45.2 and 1.1% higher than the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation. The slope for linear regressions between the predicted $ET_0$ by the calibrated $HS$ equation and the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation ($R^2= 0.6497$) is 0.9247, and 1.267
for linear regressions between the predicted $ET_0$ by the original HS equations and the $ET_0$ by the FAO-56 PM equation ($R^2 = 0.4810$). The average AE are 1.09 and 0.61 mm d$^{-1}$, and the RMSE are 1.33 and 0.79 mm d$^{-1}$. The average values of the RMSE are larger than the results by the analytical method in humid and semi-humid regions in China (Cai et al., 2007). This result is near to that by the neural network model (Xu et al., 2006) in humid regions in China and by the HS method (Er-Raki et al., 2010) in semi-arid regions in Morocco. Thus, the HS equation always overestimates the $ET_0$ based on weather forecast data, compared with those calculated by the FAO-56 PM equation. Moreover, the calibrated HS equation performs considerably better than the original one in humid regions in China.

Both average AE and RMSE of the $ET_0$ prediction by the calibrated HS equation are relatively high, with 0.61 and 0.79 mm d$^{-1}$ for the one using weather forecast data as input, and 0.61 and 0.77 mm d$^{-1}$ for the one using observed meteorological data. Thus, both the original and locally calibrated HS equations are not good solutions for $ET_0$ calculation in humid regions in East China. However, assuming the simplicity and minimum data requirements of the HS equation, as well as the fact that public daily weather forecast data are always composed of limited information for the maximum temperature, minimum temperature, wind scale, and climate conditions, the locally calibrated HS equation could be an alternative and effective solution for predicting daily $ET_0$ using public weather forecast data as inputs. The proposed method may be useful for real-time irrigation forecasting. Nevertheless, further efforts should be made to improve the calibration of the HS equation and the accuracy of the weather forecast.

Sensitivity of $ET_0$ Prediction to Weather Forecast Error

Slopes, determination coefficients ($R^2$), average AE, and RMSE were calculated by comparing the $ET_0$ by the calibrated HS equation based on polluted data groups (see Table 2) and the results by the FAO-56 PM equation based on historical observed climatic data (Figure 6). The slopes range...
Figure 6. Average absolute errors (AE) and root mean square errors (RMSE) between $ET_0$ calculated by the calibrated Hargreaves-Samani equation based on polluted data groups and by the FAO-56 Penman-Monteith equation based on historical observed climatic data. (O on the column means the case with zero error in temperature prediction. # on the column indicates the AE less than 0.85 mm d$^{-1}$ or RMSE less than 0.65 mm d$^{-1}$).

Table 3. Slopes and determination coefficients of regressions between $ET_0$ by the calibrated Hargreaves-Samani equation based on polluted data groups and that by the FAO-56 Penman-Monteith equation based on historical observed climatic data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope ($R^2$)</th>
<th>Error in $T_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>Error in $T_{\text{min}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2°C</td>
<td>0.8496(0.6346)</td>
<td>0.8043(0.6416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1°C</td>
<td>0.9207(0.6196)</td>
<td>0.8784(0.6272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0°C</td>
<td>0.9912(0.6041)</td>
<td>0.9514(0.6115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1°C</td>
<td>1.0612(0.5887)</td>
<td>1.0237(0.5953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2°C</td>
<td>1.1311(0.5735)</td>
<td>1.0954(0.5972)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OM means omitted, because those combinations of error in $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ are likely to lead to contradiction. Shaded cell indicates that the polluted data group results in increased slope.

from 0.8043 ($T_{\text{max}}$+2°C, $T_{\text{min}}$ -1°C) to 1.131 ($T_{\text{max}}$+2°C, $T_{\text{min}}$ -2°C). The shaded cell in Table 3 indicates that the polluted data group results in the increased slope. The slope increases with the increase in the daily maximum temperature or the reduction in the daily minimum temperature. The error in $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ is converted into the change in temperature range $TR$ and daily mean temperature $T_{\text{mean}}$ (as listed in Table 2). Clearly, the slope increases with the increase in error in $TR$ or $T_{\text{mean}}$ and the slope is likely to be more sensitive to error in $TR$ than $T_{\text{mean}}$. The RMSE ranges from 0.827 ($T_{\text{max}}$+1°C, $T_{\text{min}}$-1°C) to 1.057 mm d$^{-1}$ ($T_{\text{max}}$+2°C, $T_{\text{min}}$-2°C), and average AE ranges from 0.612 ($T_{\text{max}}$+1°C, $T_{\text{min}}$+2°C) to 0.833 mm d$^{-1}$ ($T_{\text{max}}$+2°C, $T_{\text{min}}$-2°C). RMSE and AE also increase with the increase in the errors of the $TR$ or $T_{\text{mean}}$, and are more sensitive to errors in $TR$ than those in $T_{\text{mean}}$. If the setting for $AE$ that is less than 0.65 mm d$^{-1}$ and RMSE that is less than 0.85 mm d$^{-1}$ are permissible in the $ET_0$ prediction based on weather forecast data, acceptable polluted data groups are likely to fall in a narrow range with errors in $TR$ of no more than 1°C along the diagonal line ($TR$ error equals 0°C) in Table 2. If the setting for $AE$ that is less than 0.70 mm d$^{-1}$ and RMSE that is less than 0.90 mm d$^{-1}$ are permissible, the acceptable polluted data groups are likely to fall in the range in which the error in $TR$ is no higher than 2°C. In fact, approximately 70 and 90%
of the weather forecast fall in this range, with a TR error within -1 to 1°C and -2 to 2°C, respectively (see Figure 7).

**CONCLUSIONS**

The HS equation was tested and calibrated with the daily $ET_0$ calculated by the FAO-56 PM equation, and its capability to predict the daily $ET_0$ by this equation based on weather forecast data was evaluated. The HS equation is likely to overestimate the daily $ET_0$, as indicated in other studies carried out in humid regions. Local calibration of the HS equation is quite essential for $ET_0$ estimation in humid regions in China. The coefficients of $a$ and $c$ are calculated as 0.00138 and 0.5736, according to the local calibration. The average $AE$ and $RMSE$ of the $ET_0$ by the calibrated HS equation based on either observed climatic data or public weather forecast data are much lower than those by the original HS equation. The locally calibrated HS equation performs much better than the original HS equation. Furthermore, it could be an alternative and effective solution for predicting daily $ET_0$ using public weather forecast data as inputs, especially in real-time irrigation forecasting. The influence of weather forecast accuracy on daily $ET_0$ predication using the locally calibrated HS equation was also discussed. The error in the daily $ET_0$ predication increases with the increase in the error of the daily TR or daily $T_{mean}$. This error is apparently more sensitive to the error in TR than that in the $T_{mean}$. Ensuring a TR error of less than 2°C is necessary for perfect estimation of $ET_0$ based on public weather forecast data using the calibrated HS equation.
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پیش بینی تبخیر و تعرق مرطوب در چین با کالیراسیون محیط معادله هارگریوز-سامانی با استفاده از داده‌های پیش‌بینی آب و هوا

چیکده

معادله هارگریوز-سامانی (HS)، که تبخیر و تعرق مرطوب (ET0) به عنوان ورودی برآورد می‌کند، باید مناسب برای راه برای پراورد ET0 بر اساس اطلاعات پیش‌بینی به‌وجود آمد. در مطالعه حاضر، معادله HS با روزهای به‌دست آمده از معادله پمن-مونیث کالیراسیون شده و ارزیابی شده است تا امکان پیش‌بینی روزهای بر اساس اطلاعات پیش‌بینی وضع هوا بررسی گردد. معادله HS به احتمال زیاد ET0 روزهای در مناطق مرطوب چین را یازد برآورد می‌کند. با
توجه به کالیبراسیون محلی، ضرایب لگاریتمی به میزان ۰/۰۷۳۶ و ۰/۰۷۳۶ محاسبه شدند. معادله کالیبره شده به‌طور قابل توجهی بهتر از معادله اصلی عمل نمود. معادله بیشتری می‌تواند یک راه حل جایگزین و موثر برای پیش‌بینی $ET_0$ روزانه با استفاده از داده‌های پیشین آب و هوای عمومی به عنوان ورودی باشد. خطای پیش‌بینی $ET_0$ روزانه با افزایش خطای دامنه دمایی روزانه (TR) و با درجه حرارت متوسط روزانه (Tmean) افزایش می‌یابد. این خطای به احتمال زیاد نسبت به خطای در $TR$ حساس تر است. برای برآورد صحیح $ET_0$ بر اساس داده‌های عمومی پیش‌بینی هوا با استفاده از معادله $HS$ کالیبره شده، اطمینان از خطای کمتر از ۲ درجه سانتی گراد $TR$ لازم است.