

# 1 SWAT application in intensive irrigation systems: model modification, calibration and

## 2 validation

Farida Dechmi<sup>1\*</sup>, Javier Burguete<sup>2</sup> and Ahmed Skhiri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup> Soil and Irrigation Department (EEAD-CSIC Associated Unit), Agrifood Research and  
<sup>6</sup> Technology Centre of Aragón, Avenida Montañana 930, 50059-Zaragoza, Spain.

<sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup> Soil and Water Department, Aula Dei Experimental Station, CSIC. Avenida Montañana  
<sup>8</sup> 1005, 50059-Zaragoza, Spain.

9 Corresponding author: Farida Dechmi

10 Telephone: +34 976716802

11 Fax: +34 976716335

12 E-mail: fdechmi@aragon.es

13

14 Abstract

The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is a well established, distributed, eco-hydrologic model. However, using the study case of an agricultural intensive irrigated watershed, it was shown that all the model versions are not able to appropriately reproduce the total streamflow in such system when the irrigation source is outside the watershed. The objective of this study was to modify the SWAT2005 version for correctly simulating the main hydrological processes. Crop yield, total streamflow, total suspended sediment (TSS) losses and phosphorus load calibration and validation were performed using field survey information and water quantity and quality data recorded during 2008 and 2009 years in Del Reguero irrigated watershed in Spain. The goodness of the calibration and validation results was assessed using five statistical measures, including the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE). Results indicated that the average annual crop yield and actual evapotranspiration estimations

1 were quite satisfactory. On a monthly basis, the values of NSE were 0.90 (calibration) and  
2 0.80 (validation) indicating that the modified model could reproduce accurately the observed  
3 streamflow. The TSS losses were also satisfactorily estimated (NSE = 0.72 and 0.52 for the  
4 calibration and validation steps). The monthly temporal patterns and all the statistical  
5 parameters indicated that the modified SWAT-IRRIG model adequately predicted the total  
6 phosphorus (TP) loading. Therefore, the model could be used to assess the impacts of  
7 different best management practices on non-point phosphorus losses in irrigated systems.

8

9 **Keywords:** calibration; irrigation systems; phosphorus; sediments; validation; watershed

10

11 **Abbreviations:** BMPs (best management practices), DRW (Del Reguero watershed), ET<sub>a</sub>  
12 (actual evapotranspiration), GWQ (baseflow), HRUs (hydrologic response units), LATQ  
13 (lateral flow), NSE (Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency), ORG\_P (organic phosphorus), PBIAS  
14 (percent bias), PP (particulate phosphorus), RMSE (root mean square error), RSR (RMSE  
15 observation standard deviation ratio), SOL\_P (soluble phosphorus), SWAT (Soil and Water  
16 Assessment Tool), SYLD (sediments yield), TDP (total dissolved phosphorus), TLSS  
17 (transmission losses), TP (total phosphorus), WYLD (total water yield)

18

## 19 **1. Introduction**

20 Excess land application of nutrients can result in the impairment of nearby water resources  
21 (Green and Griensven, 2008). In irrigated agricultural systems, the irrigation returns flows  
22 (IRF) are the major nonpoint source pollution of surface and groundwater bodies (Aragües  
23 and Tanji, 2003). For that reason, a widespread control of contaminant inputs is an effective  
24 solution to prevent further deterioration and to enhance the status of water resources. Hence,  
25 the Water Framework Directive (EU, 2000) establishes a framework for the protection of

1 groundwater, surface, estuarine, and coastal waters. For that reason, this European Directive  
2 requires Member States to assess the ecological quality status of water bodies setting as a final  
3 objective the achievement of a “good water status” for all waters by 2015 (Borja, 2005).

4 The evaluation of the ecological status of water requires the establishment of a control  
5 network in the receiving bodies. In the case of agricultural watersheds, a continuous  
6 monitoring of drainage waters (quantity and quality) is indispensable to better understand the  
7 pollutants dynamics. Monitoring studies permit the identification of the actual trophic status  
8 of waters and the assessment of the effectiveness of post-implementation of best management  
9 practices (BMPs). However, conducting field experiments and collection of long-term data is  
10 very expensive (cost of instrumentation and operation) and time consuming (Santhi et al.,  
11 2006). There are uncertainties/errors associated with the measured data and also difficulty in  
12 repeating the monitoring process without additional resources and time when corrections are  
13 necessary (Santhi et al., 2006). In addition, with nonpoint source pollution emerging from  
14 large watersheds, such as the Ebro River watershed with mixed land uses and soils, it is quite  
15 difficult to associate water improvements to specific BMPs using monitoring data (Santhi et  
16 al., 2006).

17 The application of watershed simulation models is indispensable when pollution is generated  
18 by a non-point source. These models should be able to simulate large complex watersheds  
19 with varying soils, land use and management conditions over long periods of time. A wide  
20 range of watershed models are available to predict the impact of land management practices  
21 on water, sediment and agricultural chemical yields. Examples of these models are: the  
22 physically based event model ANSWERS (Beasley, 1991), the empirically based  
23 SWATCATCH model (Holman et al., 2001), the physically based DWSM model (Borah and  
24 Bera, 2003) and the semi-empirical SWAT model (Arnold et al., 1998; Arnold and Fohrer,

1 2005; Gassman et al., 2007). One common characteristic between all these models is the  
2 reproduction of the water and nutrients movement at the watershed scale.

3 Of all the models mentioned previously, the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is the  
4 most capable model for long-term simulations in watersheds dominated by agricultural land  
5 uses. This model is designed to assess the impact of land use and management practices on  
6 water, sediments and agricultural chemicals in IRF. The model has proven to be an effective  
7 tool for assessing nonpoint source pollution for a wide range of scales and environmental  
8 conditions (Gassman et al., 2007). SWAT has been widely applied across the United States  
9 (FitzHugh and Mackay, 2000; Arabi et al., 2006); Europe (Conan et al., 2003a, b; Plus et al.,  
10 2006; Nasr et al., 2007; Galván et al., 2009; Panagopoulos et al., 2011a, b) and other parts of  
11 the world (Bouraoui et al., 2005; Watson et al., 2005; Cheng et al., 2006).

12 SWAT has been modified and adapted to provide improved simulations of specific processes  
13 for specific watersheds (Gassman et al., 2007). Lenhart et al. (2002; 2003; 2005) modified  
14 SWAT99.2 to provide improved flow predictions (percolation, hydraulic conductivity, and  
15 interflow) for typical conditions in low mountain ranges in Germany. This SWAT-G modified  
16 version was also used to simulate sediments and phosphorus in the Dill catchment (Hessen,  
17 Germany) (Lenhart et al., 2003). The Extended SWAT (ESWAT) incorporated several  
18 modifications relative to the original SWAT model to simulate runoff and in stream processes  
19 at hourly time steps (van Griensven and Bauwens, 2003, 2005). Van Liew (2009) modified  
20 SWAT2005 to consider losses of organic nitrogen and phosphorus from bank erosion from  
21 top soil layers in three drainage areas located in the Bitterroot watershed. The Soil and Water  
22 Integrated Model (SWIM) based on the hydrological components of SWAT was designed to  
23 simulate “mesoscale” watersheds (Krysanova et al., 1998, 2005). A recent groundwater  
24 dynamics sub-model has been integrated to SWIM (Hatterman et al., 2004) to improve its  
25 simulating capability in forest systems (Wattenbach et al., 2005). Baffaut and Benson (2009)

1 modified the SWAT code (SWAT-B&B) to simulate faster percolation in karst basins. They  
2 used transmission losses from tributary channels to represent sinking streams and ponds to  
3 depict sinkholes. Other SWAT studies described irrigations applications using an optimum  
4 irrigation management where the irrigation supply was specified by the water requirements of  
5 crops, so that IRF were not important (Cau and Paniconi, 2007; Jie et al., 2010; Kannan et al.,  
6 2011). In contrast, the application of SWAT to intensive irrigation systems where IRF are the  
7 major component of the hydrologic balance could not satisfactorily reproduce the total  
8 streamflow because of its limitations in applying maximum irrigation doses in an irrigation  
9 event when the irrigation source is outside the watershed. In this case, both SWAT versions  
10 (SWAT2005 and 2009) used irrigation doses that filled the soil layers up to field capacity. If  
11 the input irrigation doses exceeded field capacity, the excess water between soil saturation and  
12 field capacity limits returned to the source and was not considered in the daily soil water  
13 balance calculation. Thus, for the application of SWAT in such intensive irrigated systems,  
14 the irrigation subroutine source code should be modified to consider the excess irrigation  
15 water in the daily soil water balance.

16 The objectives of this work were to modify SWAT for its improved performance in intensive  
17 irrigated systems and to evaluate its prediction capabilities in modelling water flow and  
18 sediment and phosphorus loads. The SWAT2005 modification, calibration and validation  
19 using the Del Reguero stream watershed (NE, Spain) 2008 and 2009 data are presented in this  
20 paper.

21

## 22 **2. Materials and methods**

### 23 **2.1. Study area**

24 The Del Reguero watershed (DRW) belongs to the Alto Aragon Irrigation Scheme area  
25 located in the left bank of the middle Ebro River Basin in Spain (Fig. 1). It has a total

1 drainage area of 18.65 km<sup>2</sup> with elevations ranging from 208 to 502 m and an average land  
2 surface slope of 4.4‰. The irrigation water supply is conveyed by the Pertusa Canal, itself a  
3 diversion of the Cinca Canal, the latter originating in El Grado reservoir located on the Cinca  
4 River, to the North East of the irrigation scheme. The main cultivated crops in the two studied  
5 years (2008 and 2009) were corn (41%), barley (19%), alfalfa (15%), and sunflower (9%) and  
6 represent more than 84% of the watershed irrigated area.

7 The climate is semiarid with an average annual precipitation and reference evapotranspiration  
8 of 391 mm and 1,294 mm, respectively. The mean annual temperature is 13.1 °C, with a large  
9 temperature difference between winter and summer. Irrigation practices began in 1982 using  
10 sprinkler irrigation systems (mainly solid-set sprinklers). Two geomorphologic units are  
11 distinguished in the study area. The first unit corresponds to platform soils (locally called  
12 “sasos”) that cover 38% of the total area. These soils are shallow, present calcareous horizons,  
13 and a high content of stones. The second unit covers the remaining of the watershed and  
14 corresponds to alluvial soils that are mostly stone-free and with soil depths varying from 0.6  
15 m to more than 1.20 m. The soil P-Olsen concentrations were very heterogeneous ranging  
16 from 5 to 137 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in the surface layer (0 – 30 cm) with an average of 28 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and an  
17 standard deviation of 19.32 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. The drainage waters were characterized by an annual  
18 average total phosphorus concentration of 0.112 mg L<sup>-1</sup>.

19 The seasonal average irrigation depths were 830 mm (corn), 898 mm (alfalfa), 473 mm  
20 (sunflower) and 202 mm (barley). The differences in irrigation depths between soil types and  
21 plot sizes were not significant ( $P < 0.1$ ), indicating that farmers did not take into account these  
22 variables when irrigating. The average irrigation depth was 13 mm for all types of soils, lower  
23 than the total available water of the platform soils. The irrigation interval ranged between 1  
24 and 3 days with an average value of 2 days in corn and alfalfa. These intervals increased at the  
25 beginning of the irrigation season and decreased during the summer to meet its high water

1 demand during these months. Some farmers irrigated corn at night to reduce the wind drift  
2 and evaporation losses. The same behavior was observed in sunflower, with high irrigation  
3 intervals at the beginning of the irrigation season that were further reduced during the summer  
4 months. The irrigation intervals in barley ranged between 15 and 20 days with a mean value  
5 of 18 days. A more detailed study area characterisation can be found in Skhiri and Dechmi  
6 (2012).

7

## 8 **2.2. Model Description**

9 SWAT is a continuous time, spatially semi-distributed, physically based model (Arnold et al.,  
10 1998). The watershed is divided into multiple sub-watersheds, which are then further  
11 subdivided into specific soil/land use characteristic units that are called hydrologic response  
12 units (HRUs). The water balance of each HRU is represented by four storage volumes: snow,  
13 soil profile (0-2 m), shallow aquifer (typically 2-20 m), and deep aquifer (> 20 m). Flow  
14 generation, sediment yield, and chemical loadings from each HRU in a subwatershed are  
15 summed, and the resulting loads are routed through channels, ponds, and/or reservoirs to the  
16 watershed outlet. The soil profile is subdivided into multiple layers that consider several soil  
17 water processes including infiltration, evaporation, plant uptake, lateral flow, and percolation.  
18 The soil percolation component of SWAT uses a storage routing technique to simulate flow  
19 through each soil layer in the root zone. Crop evapotranspiration is simulated as a linear  
20 function of potential evapotranspiration, leaf area index and root depth. Sediment yield is  
21 estimated for each HRU with the Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation (Williams et al.,  
22 1984). The Phosphorus processes are handled using a similar approach to that in the Erosion  
23 Productivity Impact Calculator (EPIC) model (Williams, 1990, 1995).  
24 In this work, the surface runoff from daily rainfall was estimated using the modified SCS  
25 curve number (USDA-SCS, 1972) and the potential evapotranspiration (PET) was determined

1 using the modified Penman-Monteith approach. The default values provided by the SWAT  
2 crop database were used for the crop phosphorus uptake and the optimal plant concentrations  
3 (Arnold et al., 1998).

4 Phosphorus can be lost in both particulate and dissolved forms (Arnold et al., 1998). The loss  
5 of dissolved phosphorus in surface runoff is estimated based on the concept of partitioning  
6 phosphorus into the solution and sediment phases as described by Leonard and Wauchope  
7 (1980) for pesticides. The amount of soluble P removed in runoff is predicted using solution P  
8 concentration in the soil top 10 mm, the runoff volume and a partitioning factor. Sediment  
9 transport of phosphorus (particulate phosphorus) is calculated with a loading function  
10 developed by McElroy et al. (1976) and modified by Williams and Hann (1978). The loading  
11 function estimates the daily organic P runoff loss based on the concentration of organic P in  
12 the top soil layer, the sediment yield, and the enrichment ratio.

13

### 14 **2.3. SWAT input data**

15 Three basic files were required for delineating the basin into subbasins and HRUs: a digital  
16 elevation model (DEM), a soil map, and a land use/land cover (LULC) map. The topographic  
17 parameters (slope, slope length, drainage network, watershed delimitation and number of sub-  
18 basins) were obtained from the digital elevation model (DEM) of the Ebro River Basin (20 x  
19 20 m grid size). The land use and soil data were obtained from the special crop and soil  
20 distribution maps prepared during the study years. A total of 9 subbasins and 239 HRUs were  
21 delineated in the study area. The unique source of irrigation is from outside the watershed.  
22 The weather input data, including maximum and minimum daily air temperature, solar  
23 radiation, wind speed and relative humidity, were obtained from the Huerto meteorological  
24 station, located at a North latitude of 41°56'59'', a West longitude of 00°08'09'' and an

1 altitude of 390 m. Parameters of farmers' current management operations as tillage, planting  
2 dates, fertilization, irrigation and harvesting were provided as inputs to the model.

3 The amounts of organic and inorganic fertilizers applied to each crop grown in DRW were  
4 determined through farmer's interviews performed during the 2008 and 2009 agricultural  
5 seasons. For each crop, the dates of application and the type of fertilizers were determined.  
6 Regarding irrigation management, dates and amounts of water applied to each crop during  
7 each irrigation event were obtained from the databases facilitated by the Alconadre Irrigation  
8 District.

9 The crop parameter values for corn used in this study were the same as those used by Cavero  
10 et al. (2000) under meteorological conditions similar to DRW. For barley and sunflower, the  
11 crop parameter values were set according to those proposed by Cabelguenne et al. (1999) for  
12 southwestern France. In regard to alfalfa, parameter values were set according to Confalonieri  
13 and Bechini (2004).

14

#### 15 **2.4. Model modification**

16 The application of the original SWAT2005 version in semiarid irrigated DRW using actual  
17 farmer's irrigation practices was not possible because as previously indicated the excess  
18 irrigation depths are returned to the irrigation source instead of taking them into account in the  
19 daily soil water balance calculations (Neitsch et al., 2005). Therefore the following  
20 modifications in the source code were performed in the new SWAT-IRRIG version to include  
21 the above mentioned excess water in the soil water balance calculations:

22

23 1- The maximum amount of water to be applied corresponds to the depth of irrigation water  
24 applied to each HRU as specified by the user in the irrigation operation instead of the amount

1 of water held in the soil profile at field capacity. This modification is included in the “irrsub”  
2 subroutine as following:

3 Original version:  $vmm = sol\_sumfc$

4 Modified version:  $vmm = irr\_amt$

5 where  $vmm$  is the maximum amount of water to be applied (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $sol\_sumfc$  is the  
6 amount of water held in the soil profile at field capacity (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $irr\_amt$  is the depth of  
7 irrigation water applied to each HRU (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) as specified by the user.

8

9 2- As the original percolation calculation subroutine (percmain subroutine) included only the  
10 excess precipitation, the water excess arising from irrigation practices when the amount of  
11 irrigation exceeds field capacity was added in the percolation subroutine as follows:.

12 Original version:  $sepbtm = sepbtm + sepday$

13  $sepday = inflpcp$

14 Modified version:  $sepday = inflpcp + inflirr$

15 where  $sepbtm$  is the water percolating from the bottom of the soil profile (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $sepday$  is  
16 the micropore percolation from soil layer (mm H<sub>2</sub>O),  $inflpcp$  is the amount of precipitation  
17 that infiltrates the soil (mm H<sub>2</sub>O) and  $inflirr$  is the amount of irrigation that infiltrates the soil  
18 (mm H<sub>2</sub>O).

19

20 3- In the SWAT2005 source code, the subroutine “*subbasin*” that controls the simulation of  
21 the land phase of the hydrologic cycle performs the soil water balance before considering the  
22 irrigation operations from sources outside the watershed. This order doesn’t impair a change  
23 in the soil water balance since there is no excess water generated by irrigation. After making  
24 the changes in the subroutines “*irrsub*” and “*percmain*”, an excess water will be generated  
25 each time the depth of irrigation water applied is higher than field capacity. So, the simulation

1 order of the land phase of the hydrologic cycle was changed so that the “*subbasin*” subroutine  
2 will perform the irrigation operations before the soil water balance calculations.

3

4 **2.5. SWAT-IRRIG calibration and validation**

5 Simulations were carried out from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009 using the  
6 standard split sample calibration-validation procedure (Klemeš, 1986). The period from  
7 January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 to January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008 served as the warm up period for the model in order to  
8 take for granted realistic initial values for the calibration period. Data from January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008  
9 to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2008 were used for the calibration and the remaining data for validation.

10 For every SWAT simulation, the summary input file (input.std), the summary output file  
11 (output.std), the HRU output file (output.hru), the subbasin output file (output.sub), and the  
12 main channel or reach output file (output.rch) (Neitsch et al., 2005) were generated. The  
13 output.rch file contains the summary for each routing reach in the watershed and its data were  
14 used for the calibration and validation processes.

15 For the hydrological model calibration and validation, the observed streamflow values were  
16 compared with the FLOW\_OUT values. The simulated sediments yields (SED\_OUT) were  
17 compared with the total suspended sediments measured at the DRW outlet. The simulated  
18 mineral phosphorus (MIN\_P) was compared with the measured total dissolved phosphorus  
19 (TDP), while the simulated organic phosphorus (ORG\_P) was compared with the measured  
20 particulate phosphorus (PP). Nevertheless particulate P does not necessarily coincide with the  
21 total organic P. However, for the P calibration process, the model parameters that give the  
22 best adjustment between total simulated (MIN\_P + ORG\_P) and observed phosphorus were  
23 considered.

24 The standard output file (.std) provides information about the average crop yields represented  
25 by the parameter YLD ( $Mg\ ha^{-1}$ ). Therefore, the observed crop yields ( $Mg\ ha^{-1}$ ) were

1 compared with the YLD values. The .std file also gives the actual simulated  
2 evapotranspiration (ETa) for each crop (represented by the parameter ET). These estimates  
3 were compared with the ETa values calculated using the Irrigation Land Environmental  
4 Evaluation Tool daily soil water balance (Causapé and Pérez, 2008). These values were used  
5 for a simple comparison with those calculated by SWAT-IRRIG.

6 The model was run first to calibrate and validate SWAT-IRRIG crop model. In this case, only  
7 the crop parameters were adjusted. For the rest of model parameters, default values were  
8 considered. In total, seven crop parameters were adjusted to get crop yields similar to those  
9 measured in the study area (biomass energy ratio, harvest index, maximum leaf area index,  
10 optimum air temperature, base temperature, maximum root depth and light extinction factor).  
11 The observed crop yields were gathered from field surveys performed in 2008 (model  
12 calibration) and 2009 (model validation).

13 The separation of the measured streamflow at the DWR outlet between direct runoff and  
14 baseflow was performed because SWAT simulates separately these streamflow components.  
15 The baseflow separation technique detailed in Arnold and Allen (1999) was used to separate  
16 the simulated baseflow values from the total simulated streamflow values. This technique has  
17 been also used to estimate baseflows in several SWAT studies (Kalin and Hantush, 2006; Jha  
18 et al., 2007). In this study, the electrical conductivity (EC) of the drainage waters measured at  
19 the DWR outlet was used to separate the total streamflow into its components (Matsubayashi  
20 et al., 1993), based on the principle of water dilution during periods of high discharge.

21 As SWAT includes several parameters related to the site and management characteristic, a  
22 sensitivity analysis was carried out to detect the most relevant parameters in the hydrology  
23 calibration process. A parameter sensitivity analysis provides insights on which parameters  
24 contribute most to the output variance due to input variability. The sensitivity analysis method  
25 used in this study was the Latin Hypercube One-factor-At-a-Time (LH-OAT) (van Griensven

1 et al., 2003) that combines the precision of the One-factor-At-a-Time (OAT) design (Morris,  
2 1991) and the robustness of the Latin Hypercube (LH) sampling (McKay, 1988). A total of 27  
3 parameters (10 intervals of LH samplings and 280 iterations) that may influence the DWR  
4 streamflow were considered (data not shown). The ranges of variation of these parameters are  
5 based on a listing provided in the SWAT manual (Neitsch et al., 2005). The analysis was  
6 performed on the daily average streamflow, for the period between January 2007 and  
7 December 2009. Sensitivity analysis was first performed without the use of observed data and  
8 next using observed data. The most sensitive ranking corresponds to the parameter that  
9 individually produced the highest average percentage of change in the objective function  
10 value of the model. The Global effect ( $S$ ) produced by each parameter is classified in one of  
11 four previously defined classes according to Koskiaho et al. (2007):  $S \geq 1.0$  “very high  
12 sensitivity”;  $1.0 < S \geq 0.2$  “high sensitivity”;  $0.2 < S \geq 0.06$  “medium sensitivity”;  $S < 0.06$   
13 “low sensitivity”.

14

## 15 **2.6. Model performance**

16 Time series plots and five statistical methods were used to evaluate the SWAT-IRRIG  
17 performance based on the measured data. The five statistical criteria to evaluate the goodness  
18 of the calibration and validation results were: (i) the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), (ii) the  
19 Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970), (iii) the root mean square error  
20 (RMSE), (iv) the percent bias (PBIAS) (Gupta et al., 1999), and (v) the RMSE-observation  
21 standard deviation ratio (RSR) (Moriassi et al., 2007). The  $R^2$  represents the percentage of the  
22 variance in the measured data explained by the simulated data. The NSE indicates how close  
23 are the plots of the observed versus the simulated data to the 1:1 line. The RMSE is equal to  
24 the sum of the variance of the modelled values and the square of the bias, and the smaller the  
25 RMSE the better the performance of the model. Thus, a RMSE value of 0.0 represents a

1 perfect simulation of the observed sediments and phosphorus loadings. The PBIAS measures  
2 the average tendency of the simulated data to be larger or smaller than their observed  
3 counterparts. The RSR is defined as the ratio of the RMSE to the standard deviation of the  
4 measured data (Moriasi et al., 2007). The optimal value of RSR is 0.0, which indicates zero  
5 RMSE or residual variation and therefore perfect model simulation.

6 The calibration objectives for streamflows and sediments and phosphorus loads were to  
7 maximize NSE and  $R^2$ , and to minimize the absolute value of PBIAS, RMSE, and RSR.  
8 Based on the guidelines proposed by Moriasi et al. (2007), the model performance can be  
9 evaluated as satisfactory if  $NSE > 0.5$ ,  $RSR \leq 0.70$ , and  $PBIAS < \pm 25\%$  for streamflow,  $< \pm$   
10  $55\%$  for sediments and  $< \pm 70\%$  for phosphorus loads.

11

### 12 **3. Results and discussion**

#### 13 **3.1. Crop model calibration and validation**

14 Table 1 shows the final values of the parameters used to calibrate the yields of corn, alfalfa,  
15 barley and sunflower. The optimum air temperature is the same for corn, alfalfa, and  
16 sunflower ( $25\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ ) which are summer crops; whereas for barley the optimum air temperature is  
17 set at  $15.0\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  since it is winter crop. For the same reasons, the base temperatures for corn,  
18 alfalfa and sunflower are above zero, whereas the base temperature for barley is set at  $0.0\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ .  
19 The results indicate a good adjustment between the simulated and the observed mean crop  
20 yields obtained during the calibration and validation periods (Fig. 2). The mean simulated  
21 alfalfa yield was about  $15.1\text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  and the mean measured yield was  $14.0\text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ ,  
22 indicating that SWAT-IRRIG over-estimated the alfalfa yield by 7.8%. The variability of the  
23 measured alfalfa yield ( $CV = 13\%$ ) was higher than the variability of the estimated alfalfa  
24 yield ( $CV = 5\%$ ). SWAT-IRRIG also over-estimated the mean barley yield by 9.6% ( $5.8\text{ Mg}$   
25  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  vs.  $6.3\text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ ), and the simulated yield was less variable ( $CV = 3\%$ ) than the observed

1 yield ( $CV = 15\%$ ). In contrast, SWAT-IRRIG under-estimated the mean corn and sunflower  
2 yield by 4.5% and 6.7%, respectively. The variability of the observed and simulated corn  
3 yields were similar ( $CV = 10\%$  and 9%, respectively).

4 In regard to crop's actual evapotranspirations (Fig. 2), the results indicate that the mean  
5 annual ET<sub>a</sub> values simulated by SWAT-IRRIG (736, 730, 515, and 696 mm, for alfalfa, corn,  
6 barley, and sunflower, respectively) were quite similar to those calculated with the soil water  
7 balance. The differences between the simulated and calculated ET<sub>a</sub> values for corn, barley and  
8 sunflower ranged from 3.7 to 7.0%. In the case of alfalfa, the soil water balance over-  
9 estimated the value of ET<sub>a</sub> by almost 17.4%.

10 For all crops, the lowest values of average simulated yields and ET<sub>a</sub> were obtained in the  
11 platform soils, whereas the highest values were found in the deep alluvial soils (Fig. 3).  
12 Intermediate simulated values of crop yields and ET<sub>a</sub> were obtained in the shallow alluvial  
13 soils. Average yields of corn and alfalfa obtained in deep alluvial soils were found to be 19%  
14 and 6% higher than those obtained in platform and shallow alluvial soils, respectively. Also,  
15 higher mean sunflower yields were obtained in the deep alluvial soils than in the platform  
16 soils ( $3.2 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  vs.  $2.4 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , respectively). The mean barley yields obtained in the deep  
17 and shallow alluvial soils were similar, whereas the yields in the platform soils were 7%  
18 lower. These results were expected and could be for the most part driven by the variability of  
19 the soil types characteristics. Moreover, a Duncan's multiple comparison analysis indicated  
20 that differences in irrigation water use between soil types were not significant ( $P < 0.1$ ) for  
21 both calibration and validation periods.

22 The small depth (0.6 m on average), the existence of a petrocalcic horizon limiting rooting  
23 depths, and the small average value of the soil total available water (TAW = 70 mm) of  
24 platform soils resulted in the lowest average simulated values of yields and ET<sub>a</sub>. Platform  
25 soils are stony (20% on average) so that the applied irrigation water quickly percolates

1 through the soil profile. This explains the highest annual volumes of baseflow (GWQ)  
2 generated during the calibration and validation periods (Fig. 3). The opposite occurred in the  
3 deep alluvial soils that have a high TAW average of 179.1 mm. The mean annual GWQ  
4 values for all crops were 75.2 mm in the platform soils, and 45.9 mm in the deep and shallow  
5 alluvial soils. The soils occupied by corn and sunflower presented the highest GWQ mean  
6 annual values.

7

### 8 **3.2. SWAT2005 vs. SWAT-IRRIG**

9 Comparisons between the monthly streamflows measured and estimated using SWAT2005  
10 and SWAT-IRRIG indicated very large differences between the observed and the SWAT2005  
11 simulated data (Fig. 4). These differences were most important during the months where  
12 irrigation is intensive (Jun to September). The SWAT2005 predictions for the lateral flow  
13 (LATQ), baseflow (GWQ) and transmission losses (TLSS), which are the main SWAT model  
14 processes that affect the total water yield at the outlet of the system, were underestimated by  
15 74.0, 341.1, and 6.7%, respectively (Table 2) in comparison with the SWAT-IRRIG  
16 predictions. These differences were due to the fact that during some irrigation events, the  
17 irrigation depths were higher than those needed to fill the soils up to field capacity and  
18 therefore the remaining amounts of water applied were lost and not used in the daily soil  
19 water balance calculation. As a result, the total water yield (WYLD) at the outlet of DRW was  
20 underestimated by 117.6% (Table 2). The Nash and Sutcliffe (NSE) increased from -0.50  
21 using SWAT2005 to 0.90 using SWAT\_IRRIG.

### 22 **3.3. Sensitivity analysis**

23 The sensitivity analysis performed with the observed data indicated that the effective  
24 hydraulic conductivity in main channel alluvium (CH\_K2) was the highest sensitive  
25 parameter ( $S = 0.43$ ). ALPHA\_BF (baseflow alpha factor), SURLAG (surface runoff lag

1 coefficient) and CN2 (curve number) have a medium sensitivity ( $S =$  from 0.06 to 0.20) and  
2 the remaining parameters were classified as low ( $S < 0.06$ ). Without the use of observed data,  
3 the sensitivity of the parameters that govern groundwater and surface water flows increased  
4 and more parameters were in the “high” and “medium” sensitive classes.. The threshold depth  
5 water in the shallow aquifer for “revap” and percolation (REVAPMN) was ranked as the most  
6 sensitive parameter ( $S = 0.91$ ), followed by the deep aquifer percolation (RCHRG\_DP) and  
7 the soil evaporation compensation factor (ESCO) with  $S$  values of 0.74 and 0.43, respectively.  
8 The sensitivities obtained for REVAPMN, RCHRG\_DP and ESCO were classified as high.  
9 These parameters were followed by six parameters with medium sensitivities, (CN2,  
10 SOL\_AWC (soil available water capacity), SOL\_Z (soil depth), GW\_DELAY (groundwater  
11 delay time), BLAI (maximum potential leaf area index) and ALPHA\_BF). The sensitivities of  
12 the remaining parameters were classified as low ( $S < 0.06$ ).

### 13 **3.4. Streamflow calibration and validation**

14 Only those parameters with high and medium sensitivities were considered in the calibration  
15 process except for SOL\_Z (Depth from soil surface to bottom of layer) and BLAI (maximum  
16 potential leaf area index for the plant). For SOL\_Z the measured values were considered and  
17 BLAI was already adjusted in the process of crop parameters adjustment. The default values  
18 and the adjusted values for each parameter considered in the calibration process are presented  
19 in Table 3.

20 SWAT-IRRIG was manually calibrated and the daily simulated and observed streamflows at  
21 the DRW outlet were compared considering the calibration (Fig. 5A) and the validation (Fig.  
22 5B) periods. Minor discrepancies between the observed and simulated stream discharges can  
23 be observed. During the calibration period, the calculated  $R^2$  on a daily scale was about 0.55,  
24 which can be considered as acceptable. However the NSE value was very low (NSE = -0.23),  
25 mainly driven by the two very high stream discharges recorded on 28/10/08 and 02/11/08

1 (Fig. 5A). It seems that this problem in simulating high peaks flows is typical in SWAT model  
2 when implemented in particular climatic conditions as the Mediterranean ones (Panagopoulos  
3 et al., 2011b). In addition, the SWAT-IRRIG over-estimation of streamflows during high  
4 discharges might result from an underestimation of the daily precipitations (especially those  
5 events corresponding to peak stream discharges) arising from an inadequate sampling of  
6 subbasin precipitations. In fact, a comparison between the monthly precipitations recorded at  
7 the weather station located at 6 km from the study area and those measured with a  
8 pluviometer installed in the middle of the study area indicated that they were quite different in  
9 those months with high rainfall events. , If these high stream discharges were not considered,  
10 the NSE value increased to 0.47. A similar tendency was observed in the validation process.  
11 On a daily basis, the  $R^2$  values were high (about 0.86), but the NSE was very low (-0.64) due  
12 mainly to two very high stream discharges recorded on 11/04/09 and 09/08/09 (Fig. 5B).  
13 A good agreement between the monthly observed and simulated stream discharges was  
14 observed in the calibration and validation processes (Fig. 6B and 6D), with very high  $R^2$  and  
15 NSE values of 0.90. The monthly RMSE and RSR were  $26.38 \cdot 10^3 \text{ m}^3$  and 0.33, respectively,  
16 and the absolute value of the PBIAS for the 2008 calibration year was 1.10%. Hence,  
17 according to the model evaluation guidelines proposed by Moriasi et al. (2007), SWAT-  
18 IRRIG simulation was “very good” for the Del Reguero stream discharge.  
19 Values of  $R^2$  and NSE greater than 0.8 were also found in several SWAT hydrological  
20 calibration studies (Hao et al., 2004; Kalin and Hantush, 2006; Wang and Melesse, 2006;  
21 Wang et al., 2006; Jha et al., 2007). Kalin and Hantush (2006) reported accurate surface  
22 runoff and streamflow results for the Pocono Creek watershed in eastern Pennsylvania ( $R^2$   
23 and NSE = 0.87). Accurate streamflow predictions were also achieved by Wang and Melesse  
24 (2006) in the Elm River North Dakota watershed ( $R^2$  and NSE = 0.89 and 0.88, respectively).

1 However, NSE values obtained in other Mediterranean country were lower than 0.8  
2 (Panagopoulos et al., 2011a).

3 The Baseflow calibration results at the DRW outlet also showed a good agreement with the  
4 observed baseflows. The baseflow fraction was about 0.80 of the total streamflow simulated  
5 by SWAT-IRRIG and about 0.77 for the observed data using the EC approach. A good  
6 agreement between the measured and simulated baseflows was also found by Tolson and  
7 Shoemaker (2007) in the Connonsville Reservoir watershed using the same technique of  
8 baseflow separation described by Arnold and Allen (1999).

9 For the validation process, the  $R^2$  value calculated using daily data was 0.74, indicating a good  
10 agreement between observed and simulated daily streamflows. The slight discrepancy  
11 between observed and simulated data was also mainly driven by the two extreme discharge  
12 values recorded on dates of 11/04/09 and 09/08/09. The value of NSE obtained using the daily  
13 data was -0.64, and increased to 0.22 when the two high discharge values were eliminated.  
14 The SWAT-IRRIG estimations of the monthly stream discharges were classified as “very  
15 good” according to Moriasi et al. (2007):  $R^2 = 0.82$ ,  $NSE = 0.80$ ,  $RMSE = 46.31 \text{ } 10^3 \text{ m}^3$ ,  $RSR$   
16  $= 0.45$  and  $PBIAS = 3.16\%$ .

17 The calibration results were better than the validation results. Monthly best results achieved  
18 during the calibration period in comparison with the validation period were also found in  
19 several SWAT hydrological studies (Srinivasan et al., 1998; Arabi et al., 2006; Green et al.,  
20 2006; Kalin and Hantush, 2006). Green et al. (2006) evaluated SWAT performance in  
21 simulating the streamflow in the South Fork of the Iowa River watershed over the 1995-1998  
22 period. The monthly values of  $R^2$  and NSE in the calibration period were 0.9, and decreased to  
23 0.6 and 0.5, respectively, in the validation period (Green et al., 2006). In a study performed by  
24 Srinivasan et al. (1998) for streamflow calibration and validation in the Richland-Chambers  
25 Reservoir watershed, the monthly  $R^2$  and NSE values achieved during the validation and

1 calibration periods were similar ( $R^2$  and NSE monthly values of 0.82 for validation and 0.87  
2 and 0.84, respectively, for calibration).

3 **3.5. Sediments calibration and validation**

4 Large discrepancies between daily observed and simulated total suspended sediment (TSS)  
5 loads were observed in the calibration process (Fig. 7A). The  $R^2$  value was about 0.12  
6 indicating a poor correlation between observed and simulated TSS loads. On a monthly basis  
7 the measured and simulated TSS loads were close, except in June, July and August 2008 (Fig.  
8 7B). The  $R^2$  value was high (0.87) showing a good correlation between simulated and  
9 observed TSS loads (Table 4). Also, the NSE and PBIAS values (0.72 and 15.87%,  
10 respectively) were considered as ‘good’, and the RSR value (0.38) was considered as ‘very  
11 good’ according to Moriasi et al. (2007).

12 On a monthly basis, similar sediment predictions were reported by Hao et al., (2004), and  
13 Santhi et al., (2001). Hao et al. (2004) successfully tested SWAT using sediment data  
14 collected from the Lushi watershed in China. They concluded that the agreement between  
15 observed and SWAT predicted sediment loads was good, with  $R^2$  and NSE values of 0.72 on a  
16 monthly time step. Santhi et al. (2001) evaluated SWAT using two gauging stations located in  
17 the Bosque River watershed (Texas, USA) and found a good agreement between measured  
18 and predicted sediment loads (NSE of about 0.75).

19 A poor relationship between daily observed and simulated TSS loads was observed in the  
20 validation process (Fig. 7C) ( $R^2 = 0.18$ ). On a monthly basis, the agreement between observed  
21 and simulated sediment yields was satisfactory (Fig. 7D). As shown in Table 4, the statistical  
22 results indicate a “satisfactory” SWAT-IRRIG performance in describing monthly sediment  
23 yields. The monthly value of  $R^2$  was 0.93, indicating a “very good” agreement between  
24 monthly observed and simulated sediment yields. The value of NSE was 0.52, considered as

1 “satisfactory” according to Moriasi et al. (2007). The PBIAS (1.39) and RSR (0.27) values for  
2 the validation process were considered “very good”.

3 Monthly values of  $R^2$  and NSE for the validation period were similar or better than other  
4 sediment modelling studies. Chu et al. (2004) found a poor agreement between observed and  
5 simulated sediment during the validation period using observed monthly data for the Warner  
6 Creek watershed. The values of  $R^2$  and NSE were 0.19 and 0.11, respectively. Gikas et al.  
7 (2005) reported that SWAT correctly simulated the transport of sediments within the Vistonis  
8 Lagoon watershed in Greece using data for nine gauging stations. The  $R^2$  values ranged from  
9 0.34 to 0.98 on a monthly basis.

10

### 11 **3.6. Total phosphorus (TP) calibration and validation**

12 The daily observed and simulated TP loads showed a relatively good agreement ( $R^2 = 0.34$ )  
13 during the calibration process. The simulated and measured monthly TP loads were close  
14 (Fig. 8A and B). The NSE, RSR, and PBIAS values (0.66, 0.57, and - 9.75%, respectively)  
15 indicate a “good” simulation of monthly TP loadings during the calibration period (Table 4).  
16 These results are considerably better or similar than the monthly TP calibration reported by  
17 Grunwald and Qi (2006). They found lower NSE values, ranging from -0.89 to 0.07. Hanratty  
18 and Stefan (1998) calibrated SWAT phosphorus predictions using measured data collected in  
19 the Cottonwood watershed in Minnesota, and reported satisfactory TP predictions results  
20 (NSE = 0.54). Using nine gauging stations within the Vistonis Lagoon watershed (Greece),  
21 Gikas et al. (2005) found a good model performance for TP monthly loads with  $R^2$  values  
22 ranging from 0.50 to 0.82.

23 The model TP validation showed a good relationship between observed and simulated TP  
24 loads (Fig. 8 C and D), with an  $R^2$  value of 0.70 for the daily data and of 0.71 for the monthly  
25 data. The statistical results indicate a “satisfactory” SWAT-IRRIG performance in predicting

1 monthly TP loads at the DRW outlet along the validation process (Table 4). The value of NSE  
2 was 0.76, considered as ‘satisfactory’ according to Moriasi et al. (2007). The percent bias  
3 (PBIAS) between simulated and observed TP loads shows that the simulated TP loads were  
4 relatively over-predicted (PBIAS of 20.8%), but the value was considered as ‘very good’. The  
5 RSR measure showed a monthly value of 0.56 which is also considered as “good”. Monthly  
6 values of  $R^2$  and NSE achieved during the validation period were similar or better than those  
7 reported in other SWAT modelling studies. Saleh and Du (2004) achieved a monthly NSE  
8 value of 0.71 for the Upper North Bosque River watershed in Texas. In a study performed by  
9 Tolson and Shoemaker (2007), in the Cannonsville watershed (Texas, USA), the reported  
10 values of  $R^2$  (from 0.72 to 0.83) and NSE (from 0.52 to 0.76) were similar to those found in  
11 Del Reguero watershed. In another study performed by White and Chaubey (2005), the values  
12 of  $R^2$  and NSE ranged between 0.58 and 0.76 and -0.29 and 0.67, respectively, for three  
13 gauges located in the Beaver Reservoir watershed (Arkansas).

14

### 15 **3.7. Total dissolved phosphorus (TDP) calibration and validation**

16 Results indicated a relatively good relationship between daily observed and simulated TDP  
17 loads ( $R^2 = 0.35$ ) in the calibration process. This relationship was improved when monthly  
18 observed and simulated TDP loads were considered ( $R^2 = 0.50$ ). However, an underestimation  
19 of TDP loads during the February to May period was shown (PBIAS = 40.50%). This  
20 explains the relatively low NSE (NSE = 0.38) obtained (Table 4). Low values of NSE on a  
21 monthly basis were also reported in other SWAT modeling studies. Bouraoui et al. (2002)  
22 performed a study about climate change impacts on nutrient loads in the Yorkshire Ouse  
23 watershed (UK). The monthly value of NSE for TDP calibration was 0.02, which was judged  
24 as very low. Also Chu et al. (2004) achieved a negative value of monthly NSE (-0.08) for  
25 TDP predictions in the Warner Creek watershed. The percent bias (PBIAS) between simulated

1 and observed TDP loads shows that they were under-predicted (PBIAS of 11.82%) and that  
2 the RSR was unsatisfactory (RSR of 0.74) (Table 4).

3 The validation results were better than the calibration results. A good relationship between  
4 observed and simulated TP loads was observed on a daily ( $R^2 = 0.72$ ) and on a monthly ( $R^2 =$   
5 0.67) basis (Table 4). The statistical results indicate a “satisfactory” SWAT-IRRIG  
6 performance in describing monthly TDP loads at Del Reguero watershed outlet. Indeed, the  
7 NSE monthly value of 0.56 was considered ‘satisfactory’. The value of PBIAS (19.96%)  
8 shows that simulated TDP loads were somewhat over-predicted, but it was considered as  
9 “very good” according to Moriasi et al. (2007).

10 The validation monthly values of  $R^2$  and NSE achieved in this study are within the range of  
11 variation of those achieved in the study performed by Brarmort et al. (2006) in the Dreisbach  
12 and Smith Fry watersheds (Indiana). Performance values presented by the cited authors were  
13 0.63 and 0.86 for  $R^2$ , whereas values of NSE ranged from 0.51 to 0.74. Values of  $R^2$  (0.65)  
14 and NSE (0.55) found by Chu et al. (2004) for a monthly time step are similar to those found  
15 in this study. In the Upper North Bosque River watershed (Texas), Saleh and Du (2004)  
16 reported a TDP validation NSE value of 0.40 on a monthly basis.

17

### 18 **3.8. Particulate phosphorus (PP) calibration and validation**

19 A poor agreement between daily observed and simulated daily PP loads was obtained ( $R^2 =$   
20 0.04) in the calibration process, but the agreement for the monthly data was satisfactory ( $R^2 =$   
21 0.66). Cerucci and Conrad (2003) calibrated SWAT-PP predictions using measured data  
22 obtained for the Townbrook watershed in New York, and reported a monthly  $R^2$  value of 0.40,  
23 if the measured data from February and March were excluded from the regression.

24 The monthly NSE value was about 0.66, indicating a good agreement between observed and  
25 simulated PP loads in the calibration period. This result was better than those obtained in

1 other SWAT modelling studies. Saleh et al. (2000) evaluated SWAT using data measured at  
2 the Upper Bosque River watershed outlet. They found that the monthly calibration statistics  
3 parameters generally indicated a good model performance for PP loads ( $\text{NSE} = 0.54$ ). In  
4 Texas, Saleh and Du, (2004) tested SWAT predictions of PP using measured data within the  
5 Upper Bosque River watershed. They concluded that SWAT satisfactorily simulated PP losses  
6 with a monthly calibration  $\text{NSE}$  value of 0.59. The percentage difference between simulated  
7 and observed PP loads shows that simulated PP loads were moderately over-predicted (PBIAS  
8 of 2.68%), but considered as ‘very good’. The RMSE-observation standard deviation ratio  
9 (RSR) showed a monthly value of 0.61, also considered as ‘satisfactory’ (Table 4).  
10 A relatively good relationship ( $R^2 = 0.36$ ) was obtained between the observed and simulated  
11 daily PP loads in the validation process. On a monthly basis the relationship between  
12 observed and simulated PP loads improved ( $R^2 = 0.60$ ). The  $\text{NSE}$  value was about 0.52,  
13 indicating a “satisfactory” prediction of monthly PP loads. The  $\text{NSE}$  value achieved during  
14 the validation period was within the range of variation found by Santhi et al. (2001) for the  
15 Bosque River watershed in Texas. Considering the PBIAS value (29.20%), the results show  
16 that the simulated PP loads were over-predicted, although they were considered “good”  
17 according to Moriasi et al. (2007). The RSR value (0.66) was also considered “satisfactory” at  
18 the monthly time step (Table 4).

19

#### 20 **4. Conclusions**

21 The SWAT model does not reproduce the irrigation return flows (IRF) at the outlet of  
22 intensive irrigated watersheds when the irrigation source is outside the watershed. SWAT2005  
23 model modifications regarding: (i) the maximum amount of irrigation water to be applied, (ii)  
24 the soil water percolation under irrigation, and (iii) the order of soil water routing were  
25 necessary for model applications to intensive irrigation watersheds such as those found in the

1 middle Ebro River Basin (Spain). The SWAT-IRRIG modified version showed better model  
2 performance under irrigated systems. The monthly model calibration ( $\text{NSE} = 0.90$ ,  $\text{PBIAS} =$   
3  $1.1\%$ , and  $\text{RSR} = 0.33$ ) and validation ( $\text{NSE} = 0.80$ ,  $\text{PBIAS} = 3.2\%$ , and  $\text{RSR} = 0.45$ )  
4 statistics indicated a “very good” SWAT-IRRIG performance in describing stream discharge  
5 at the outlet of the Del Reguero study watershed. However, the model was unable to predict  
6 satisfactorily the observed streamflow peaks and, therefore, it should be further improved to  
7 obtain better estimations of sediments and particulate phosphorus. The monthly SWAT-  
8 IRRIG calibration and validation results indicated, respectively, a “good” and “satisfactory”  
9 performance in describing total phosphorus and total suspended sediment loads measured at  
10 the outlet of Del Reguero watershed. The SWAT-IRRIG model calibrated for hydrology,  
11 sediments and phosphorus can be used to determine the effects of different best management  
12 practices scenarios on phosphorus transfer from irrigated agricultural land to the IRF  
13 receiving water bodies.

14

## 15 **Acknowledgments**

16 This work has been financed by La Caixa bank, the General Community of Alto Aragon  
17 Irrigation Districts and the Scientific and Technologic Aula Dei Park Foundation with the  
18 valuable collaboration of the laboratory staff of CITA-DGA. We thank the Instituto Nacional  
19 de Investigación y Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA) for awarding Ahmed Skhiri a  
20 predoctoral fellowship.

21

## 22 **References**

23 Arabi, M., Govindaraju, R.S., Hantush, M.M., Engel, B.A., 2006. Role of watershed  
24 subdivision on modelling the effectiveness of best management practices with SWAT.  
25 J. Am. Water Resour. As. 42 (2), 513–528.

- 1 Aragüés, R., Tanji, K.K., 2003. Water quality of irrigation return flows. In: Dekker, M. (Ed.),  
2 Encyclopaedia of Water Science, pp. 502–506.
- 3 Arnold, J.G., Allen, P.M., 1999. Validation of automated methods for estimating baseflow  
4 and groundwater recharge from stream flow records. *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 35,  
5 411–424.
- 6 Arnold, J.G., Fohrer, N., 2005. SWAT2000: current capabilities and research opportunities in  
7 applied watershed modelling. *Hydrol. Process.* 19, 563–572.
- 8 Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Williams, J.R., 1998. Large-area hydrologic  
9 modeling and assessment: Part I. Model development. *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 34  
10 (1), 73–89.
- 11 Baffaut, C., Benson, V., 2009. Possibilities and challenges for modelling flow and pollutant  
12 transport in a karst watershed with SWAT. *Transactions of ASABE* 52 (2), 469–479.
- 13 Beasley, D.B., 1991. ANSWERS User's Manual Second Edition Agricultural Engineering  
14 Department. University of Georgia, Tifton, GA, USA.
- 15 Borah, D.K., Bera, M., 2003. Watershed-scale hydrologic and nonpoint-source pollution  
16 models: Review of mathematical bases. *Transactions of the ASAE* 46 (6), 1553–1566.
- 17 Borja, A., 2005. The European water Framework directive: A Challenger for nearshore,  
18 coastal and continental shelf research. *Continental Shelf Research* 25, 1768–1783.
- 19 Bouraoui, F., Benabdallah, S., Jrad, A., Bidoglio, G., 2005. Application of the SWAT model  
20 on the Medjerda River basin (Tunisia). *J. Phys. Chem. Earth* 30 (8-10), 497–507.
- 21 Bouraoui, F., Galbiati, L., Bidoglio, G., 2002. Climate change impacts on nutrient loads in the  
22 Yorkshire Ouse catchment (UK). *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sc.* 6 (2), 197–209.
- 23 Bracmort, K.S., Arabi, M., Frankenberger, J.R., Engel, B.A., Arnold, J.G., 2006. Modeling  
24 long-term water quality impact of structural BMPs. *Transactions of ASABE* 49 (2),  
25 367–374.

- 1 Cabelguenne, M., Debaeke, P., Bouniols, A., 1999. EPICphase, a version of the EPIC model  
2 simulating the effects of water and nitrogen stress on biomass and yield, taking  
3 account of developmental stages: Validation on maize, sunflower, sorghum, soybean  
4 and winter wheat. *J. Agr. Syst.* 60, 175–196.
- 5 Cau, P., Paniconi, C., 2007. Assessment of alternative land management practices using  
6 hydrological simulation and a decision support tool: Arborea agricultural region,  
7 Sardinia. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sc.* 11(6), 1811–1823.
- 8 Causapé, J., Pérez, S., 2008. Evaluador medioambiental de regadíos EMR 1.0. Available in  
9 <http://jcausape.es/investigacion/EMR.htm> [19 October, 2010].
- 10 Cavero, J., Farré, I., Debaeke, P., Faci, J.M., 2000. Simulation of Maize Yield under Water  
11 Stress with the EPICphase and CROPWAT Models. *J. Agron.* 92, 679–690.
- 12 Cerucci, M., Conrad, J.M., 2003. The use of binary optimization and hydrologic models to  
13 form riparian buffers. *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 39(5), 1167–1180.
- 14 Cheng, H., Ouyang, W., Hao, F., Ren, X., Yang, S., 2006. The nonpoint-source pollution in  
15 livestock-breeding areas of the Heihe River basin in Yellow River. *Stoch. Environ.  
16 Res. Risk. Assess.* 3, 213–221.
- 17 Chu, T.W., Shirmohammadi, A., Montas, H., Sadeghi, A., 2004. Evaluation of the SWAT  
18 model's and nutrient components in the piedmont physiographic region of Maryland.  
19 *Transactions of the ASAE* 47(5), 1523–1538.
- 20 Conan, C., Bouraoui, F., Turpin, N., de Marsily, G., Bidoglio, G., 2003a. Modeling flow and  
21 nitrate fate at catchment scale in Brittany (France). *J. Environ. Qual.* 32(6), 2026–  
22 2032.
- 23 Conan, C., de Marsily, G., Bouraoui, F., Bidoglio, G., 2003b. A long-term hydrological  
24 modeling of the upper Guadiana river basin (Spain). *Phys. Chem. Earth* 28 (4-5), 193–  
25 200.

- 1 Confalonieri, R., Bechini, L., 2004. A preliminary evaluation of the simulation model  
2 CropSyst for alfalfa. *Eur. J. Agron.* 21, 223–237.
- 3 European Union, 2000. Directive 2000/60 of the European Parliament and of the Council  
4 establishing a framework for community action in the field of water pollution. Official  
5 Journal L327, December 22, 2000: 1–72.
- 6 FitzHugh, T.W., Mackay, D.S., 2000. Impacts of input parameter spatial aggregation on an  
7 agricultural nonpoint source pollution model. *J. Hydrol.* 236, 35–53.
- 8 Galván, L., Olías, M., Fernández de Villarán, R., Domingo Santos, J.M., Nieto, J.M.,  
9 Sarmiento, A.M., Cánovas, C.R., 2009. Application of the SWAT model to an AMD-  
10 affected river (Meca River, SW Spain). Estimation of transported pollutant load. *J.*  
11 *Hydrol.* 377, 445–454.
- 12 Gassman, P.W., Reyes, M.R., Green, C.H., Arnold, J.G., 2007. The Soil and Water  
13 Assessment Tool: historical development, applications and future research directions.  
14 *Transactions of the ASABE* 50 (4), 1211–1250.
- 15 Gikas, G.D., Yiannakopoulou, T., Tsirhrintzis, V.A., 2005. Modeling of nonpoint-source  
16 pollution in a Mediterranean drainage basin. *Environ. Model. Assess.* 11 (3), 219–233.
- 17 Green, C.H., Tomer, M.D., Di Luzio, M., Arnold, J.G., 2006. Hydrologic evaluation of the  
18 Soil and Water Assessment Tool for a large tile-drained watershed in Iowa.  
19 *Transactions of the ASABE* 49 (2), 413–422.
- 20 Green, C.H., van Griensven, A., 2008. Autocalibration in hydrological modelling: Using  
21 SWAT2005 in small-scale watersheds. *Environ. Modell. Softw.* 23, 422–434.
- 22 Grunwald, S., Qi, C., 2006. GIS-based water quality modeling in the Sandusky watershed,  
23 Ohio, USA. *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 42(4), 957–973.

- 1 Gupta, H.V., Sorooshian, S., Yapo, P.O., 1999. Status of automatic calibration for hydrologic  
2 models: Comparison with multilevel expert calibration. *J. Hydrol. Eng-ASCE* 4(2),  
3 135–143.
- 4 Hanratty, M.P., Stefan, H.G., 1998. Simulating climate change effects in a Minnesota  
5 agricultural watershed. *J. Environ. Qual.* 27 (6), 1524–1532.
- 6 Hao, F.H., Zhang, X.S., Yang, Z.F., 2004. A distributed nonpoint source pollution model:  
7 Calibration and validation in the Yellow River basin. *J. Environ. Sci.* 16 (4), 646–650.
- 8 Hatterman, F., Krysanova, V., Wechsung, F., Wattenbach, M., 2004. Integrating groundwater  
9 dynamics in regional hydrological modelling. *Environ. Modell. Softw.* 19 (11), 1039–  
10 1051.
- 11 Holman, I.P., Hollis, J.M., Alavi, G., Bellamy, P.H., Jarvis, N., Vachaud, G., Loveland, P.J.,  
12 Gardenas, A., Tao C Bo, C.J., Kreuger, J., 2001. CAMSCALE-Upscaling Predictive  
13 Models and Catchment Water Quality. Draft Final Report to DGXII, Commission of  
14 the European Communities under Contract ENV4-CT97-0439.
- 15 Jha, M., Arnold, J.G., Gassman, P.W., Giorgi, F., Gu, R., 2006. Climate change sensitivity  
16 assessment on upper Mississippi river basin steamflows using SWAT. *J. Am. Water  
17 Resour. As.* 42(4), 997–1015.
- 18 Jha, M., Gassman, P.W., Arnold, J.G., 2007. Water quality modeling for the Raccoon River  
19 watershed using SWAT2000. *Transactions of the ASABE* 50(2), 479–493.
- 20 Jie, Z., Guang-yong, L., Zhen-zhong, H., Guo-xia, M., 2010. Hydrological cycle simulation of  
21 an irrigation district based on SWAT model. *Math.Comp. Model.* 51(11-12): 1312–  
22 1318.
- 23 Kalin, L., Hantush, M., 2006. Hydrologic modeling of an eastern Pennsylvania watershed  
24 with NEXRAD and rain gauge data. *J. Hydrol. Eng-ASCE* 11(6), 555–569.

- 1 Kannan, N., Jeong, J., Srinivasan, R., 2011. Hydrologic modeling of a canal-irrigated  
2 agricultural watershed with irrigation best management practices: Case study. *J.*  
3 *Hydrol. Eng-ASCE*. 16(9): 746–757.
- 4 Klemeš, V., 1986. Operational testing of hydrological simulation models. *J. Hydrol. Sci.* 31,  
5 13–24.
- 6 Krysanova, V., Hatterman, F., Wechsung, F., 2005. Development of the ecohydrological  
7 model SWIM for regional impact studies and vulnerability assessment. *J. Hydrol.*  
8 *Process.* 19 (3), 763–783.
- 9 Krysanova, V., Muller Wohlfeil, D.I., Becker, A., 1998. Development and test of a spatially  
10 distributed hydrological/water quality model for mesoscale watersheds. *Ecol. Model.*  
11 106 (2-3), 261–289.
- 12 Lenhart, T., Eckhardt, K., Fohrer, N., Frede, H.G., 2002. Comparison of two different  
13 approaches of sensitivity analysis. *Phys. Chem. Earth* 27, 645–654.
- 14 Lenhart, T., Fohrer, N., Frede, H.G., 2003. Effects of land use changes on the nutrient balance  
15 in mesoscale catchments. *Phys. Chem. Earth* 28, 1301–1309.
- 16 Lenhart, T., Van Rompaey, A., Steegen, A., Fohrer, N., Frede, H.G., Govers, G., 2005.  
17 Considering spatial distribution and deposition of sediment in lumped and semi-  
18 distributed models. *J. Hydrol. Process.* 19(3), 785–794.
- 19 Leonard, R.A., Wauchope, R.D., 1980. CREAMS: a field-scale model for chemicals, runoff  
20 and erosion from agricultural management systems. In: Kinsel, W.G. (Ed.), *The*  
21 *Pesticide Submodel*. USDA Conservation Research Report No. 2.
- 22 Matsubayashi, U., Velasquez, G.T., Takagi, F., 1993. Hydrograph separation and flow  
23 analysis by specific electrical conductance of Water. *J. Hydrol.* 152, 179–199.

- 1 McElroy, A.D., Chiu, S.Y., Nebgen, J.W., Aleti, A., Bennett, F.W., 1976. Loading functions  
2 for assessment of water pollution from nonpoint sources. EPA document EPA 600/2-  
3 76-151. USEPA, Athens, GA.
- 4 McKay, M.D., 1988. Sensitivity and uncertainty analysis using a statistical sample of input  
5 values. In: Ronen, Y. (Ed.), Uncertainty Analysis. CRC Press Inc., Boca Raton,  
6 Florida, pp. 145–186
- 7 Moriasi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L.,  
8 2007. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in  
9 watershed simulations. *Transactions of the ASABE* 50(3), 885–900.
- 10 Morris, M.D., 1991. Fractional sampling plants for preliminary computational experiments.  
11 *Technometrics* 33 (2), 161–174.
- 12 Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe, J.E., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models: Part1. A  
13 discussion of principles. *J. Hydrol.* 10 (3), 282–290.
- 14 Nasr, A., Bruen, M., Jordan, P., Moles, R., Kiely, G., Byrne, P., 2007. A comparison of  
15 SWAT, HSPF, and SHETRAN/GOPC for modeling phosphorus export from three  
16 catchments in Ireland. *Water Res.* 41(5), 1065–1073.
- 17 Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2005. Soil and Water Assessment  
18 Tool theoretical documentation version 2005: Draft-January 2005, US Department of  
19 Agriculture-Agricultural Research Service, Temple, Texas.
- 20 Panagopoulos, Y., Makropoulos, C., Baltas, E., Mimikou, M., 2011a. SWAT parameterization  
21 for the identification of critical diffuse pollution source areas under data limitations.  
22 *Ecol. Model.* 222(19), 3500–3512.
- 23 Panagopoulos, Y., Makropoulos C., Mimikou M., 2011b. Reducing surface water pollution  
24 through the assessment of the cost-effectiveness of BMPs at different spatial scales. *J.*  
25 *Environ. Manag.* 92(10), 2823–2835.


- 1 Plus, M., La Jeunesse, I., Bouraoui, F., Zaldivar, J.M., Chapelle, A., Lazure, P., 2006.
- 2 Modelling water discharges and nitrogen inputs into a Mediterranean lagoon: Impact
- 3 on the primary production. *Ecol. Model.* 193(1-2), 69–89.
- 4 Saleh, A., Arnold, J.G., Gassman, P.W., Hauck, L.W., Rosenthal, W.D., Williams, J.R.,
- 5 McFarland, A.M.S., 2000. Application of SWAT for the upper North Bosque River
- 6 watershed. *Transactions of the ASAE* 43 (5), 1077–1087.
- 7 Saleh, A., Du, B., 2004. Evaluation of SWAT and HSPF within BASINS program for the
- 8 upper North Bosque River watershed in central Texas. *Transactions of the ASAE* 47
- 9 (4), 1039–1049.
- 10 Santhi, C., Arnold, J.G., Williams, J.R., Dugas, W.A., Srinivasan, R., Hauck, L.M., 2001.
- 11 Validation of the SWAT model on a large river basin with point and nonpoint sources.
- 12 *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 37 (5), 1169–1188.
- 13 Santhi, C., Srinivasan, R., Arnold, J.G., Williams, J.R., 2006. A modeling approach to
- 14 evaluate the impacts of water quality management plans implemented in a watershed
- 15 in Texas. *Environ. Modell. Softw.* 21(8), 1141–1157.
- 16 Skhiri, A., Dechmi, F., 2012. Sprinkler irrigation water use and phosphorus fertilization
- 17 impact in Del Reguero watershed (Spain) I: Water balance and irrigation performance.
- 18 *Agri. Water Manag.* 103, 130–139.
- 19 Srinivasan, R., Ramanarayanan, T.S., Arnold, J.G., Bednarz, S.T., 1998. Large-area
- 20 hydrologic modeling and assessment: Part II. Model application. *J. Am. Water Resour.*
- 21 *As.* 34(1), 91–101
- 22 Tolson, B.A., Shoemaker, C.A., 2007. Cannonsville reservoir watershed SWAT2000 model
- 23 development, calibration, and validation. *J. Hydrol.* 337 (1-2), 68–86.
- 24 USDA-SCS, 1972. National Engineering Handbook. United States Department of Agriculture
- 25 (USDA), Soil Conservation Service SCS.

- 1 van Griensven, A., Bauwens, W., 2003. Multiobjective autocalibration for semidistributed  
2 water quality models. *Water Resour. Res.* 39 (12), 1348–1357.
- 3 van Griensven, A., Bauwens, W., 2005. Application and evaluation of ESWAT on the Dender  
4 basin and Wister Lake basin. *Hydrol. Process.* 19(3), 827–838.
- 5 Van Liew, M.W., 2009. Streamflow, sediments and nutrient simulation of the Bitterroot  
6 watershed using SWAT. Proceedings of the 2009 International SWAT conference,  
7 August 5-7, 2009, Boulder, Colorado.
- 8 Wang, X., Melesse, A.M., 2006. Effects of STATSGO and SSURGO as inputs on SWAT  
9 model's snowmelt simulation. *J. Am Water Resour. As.* 42(5), 1217–1236.
- 10 Wang, X., Melesse, A.M., Yang, W., 2006. Influences of potential evapotranspiration  
11 estimation methods on SWAT's hydrologic simulation in a Northwestern Minnesota  
12 watershed. *Transactions of the ASABE* 49(6), 1755–1771.
- 13 Watson, B.M., Srikanthan, R., Selvalingam, S., Ghafouri, M., 2005. Evaluation of three daily  
14 rainfall generation models for SWAT. *Transactions of the ASABE* 48(5), 1697–1711.
- 15 Wattenbach, M., Hatterman, F., Weng, R., Wechsung, F., Krysanova, V., Badeck, F., 2005. A  
16 simplified approach to implement forest eco-hydrological properties in regional  
17 hydrological modelling. *Ecol. Model.* 187(1), 49–50.
- 18 White, K.L., Chaubey, I., 2005. Sensitivity analysis, calibration, and validations for a  
19 multisite and multivariable SWAT model. *J. Am. Water Resour. As.* 41(5), 1077–  
20 1089.
- 21 Williams, J.R. Hann, R.W., 1978. Optimal operation of large agricultural watersheds with  
22 water quality constraints. Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M Univ., Tech.  
23 Rept. No. 96.
- 24 Williams, J.R., Jones, C.A., Dyke, P.T., 1984. A modeling approach to determining the  
25 relationship between erosion and productivity. *Transactions of the ASAE* 27, 129–144.

1 Williams, J.R., 1990. The erosion productivity impact calculator (EPIC) model: A case  
2 history. *Philosophical Transactions: J. Bio. Sci.* 329, 421–428.


3 Williams, J.R., 1995. Chapter 25: The EPIC model. In *Computer Models of Watershed*  
4 *Hydrology*, 909-1000. Singh, V.P., ed. Highlands Ranch, Colo.: Water Resources  
5 Publications.

6



2 Figure 1. Del Reguero watershed localization.


3




1

2 Figure 2. Average calibration (left) and validation (right) results of crop yield (top) and actual  
3 evapotranspiration (ET<sub>a</sub>) (bottom) for alfalfa, corn, barley and sunflower in the study area.


4




1  
2 Figure 3. Crop yield, actual evapotranspiration (ET<sub>a</sub>) and groundwater flow (GWQ) of the  
3 different crops (alfalfa, corn, barley, and sunflower) grown in platform, sallow alluvial, and  
4 deep alluvial soils during the calibration (left) and the validation (right) process.  
5




1      Figure 4. Comparison of monthly discharge between observed data, simulated with  
2      SWAT2005, and with SWAT-IRRIG.  
3  
4




1  
2 Figure 5. Observed and simulated daily streamflows at the Del Reguero watershed outlet  
3 during the calibration (A) and the validation (B) periods.  
4



1      Figure 6. Comparison of daily (A and C) and monthly (B and D) stream discharge observed  
2      and simulated with SWAT-IRRIG at Del Reguero watershed outlet for the calibration (A and  
3      B) and validation (C and D) periods. The diagonal line represents the 1:1 relationship.  
4  
5  
6



1                          Figure 7. Comparison of total suspended sediments (TSS) loads observed and simulated with  
2                          SWAT-IRRIG at Del Reguero watershed outlet over the calibration (A and B) and validation  
3                          (C and D) periods at a daily (A and C) and monthly (B and D) time step. The diagonal line  
4                          represents the 1:1 relationship  
5  
6



1      Figure 8. Comparison between total phosphorus (TP) loads observed and simulated with  
 2      SWAT-IRRIG at Del Reguero watershed outlet over the calibration (A and B) and validation  
 3      (C and D) periods at a daily (A and C) and monthly (B and D) time step. The diagonal line  
 4      represents the 1:1 relationship.  
 5  
 6

1 Table 1.  
 2 Main crop parameters for corn, alfalfa, barley and sunflower used for calibration process of  
 3 SWAT2005 crop growth model.

Parameters	Crop			
	Corn	Alfalfa	Barley	Sunflower
Biomass energy ratio (kg MJ <sup>-1</sup> )	39.00	29.00	23.00	20.00
Harvest index (Mg Mg <sup>-1</sup> )	0.57	0.90	0.42	0.28
Maximum leaf area index (m <sup>2</sup> m <sup>-2</sup> )	5.00	5.50	6.00	5.00
Optimum air temperature (°C)	25.00	25.00	15.00	25.00
Base temperature (°C)	8.00	2.00	0.00	6.00
Maximum root depth (m)	1.50	1.80	1.70	2.50
Light extinction factor	0.50	0.67	0.65	0.90

4

1 Table 2.  
2 Comparison between SWAT2005 default and SWAT-IRRIG modified versions. Difference  
3 between the two versions is calculated.

Parameter	SWAT2005 version	SWAT-IRRIG version	Underestimation (%)
Lateral flow (LATQ, mm)	4.57	7.95	74.0
Groundwater flow (GW_Q, mm)	14.40	63.52	341.1
Transmission losses (TLOSS, mm)	0.15	0.16	6.7
Total water yield (WYLD, mm)	44.65	97.14	117.6
NSE	-0.50	0.90	-
PBIAS (%)	51.81	1.10	-

4

5

1 Table 3.

2 Monthly total suspended sediment (TSS), total phosphorus (TP), total dissolved phosphorus  
3 (TDP) and particulate phosphorus (PP) observed and simulated values, and the corresponding  
4 coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE), root mean square error  
5 (RMSE), RMSE-observation standard deviation ratio (RSR), and percent bias (PBIAS)  
6 calculated for the calibration period (January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008 to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2008) and  
7 validation one (January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009).

Water quality variables	Observed data	Simulated data	$R^2$	NSE	RMSE	RSR	PBIAS (%)
Calibration							
TSS (Mg)	23.31	19.61	0.87	0.72	0.41	0.38	-15.87
TP (kg)	272.41	245.84	0.70	0.66	7.05	0.57	-9.75
TDP (kg)	233.57	205.96	0.50	0.38	6.82	0.74	-11.82
PP (kg)	38.84	39.88	0.66	0.66	2.84	0.61	2.68
Validation							
TSS (Mg)	31.63	31.19	0.93	0.52	0.49	0.27	-1.39
TP (kg)	173.19	209.30	0.71	0.63	7.32	0.56	20.85
TDP (kg)	156.71	188.00	0.67	0.56	6.84	0.60	19.96
PP (kg)	16.49	21.30	0.60	0.52	1.34	0.66	29.20

8