



**Geology, Ecology, and Landscapes**

**ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: [www.tandfonline.com/journals/tgel20](https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/tgel20?src=pdf)**

# **Seasonal and annual trends in reference evapotranspiration and prediction using machine learning models across seven climatic zones of Bangladesh**

**Md. Naimur Rahman**

**To cite this article:** Md. Naimur Rahman (13 Nov 2024): Seasonal and annual trends in reference evapotranspiration and prediction using machine learning models across seven climatic zones of Bangladesh, Geology, Ecology, and Landscapes, DOI: [10.1080/24749508.2024.2429223](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080/24749508.2024.2429223)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/24749508.2024.2429223>

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the International Water, Air & Soil Conservation Society(INWASCON).



႕

Published online: 13 Nov 2024.



 $\overrightarrow{S}$  [Submit your article to this journal](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=tgel20&show=instructions&src=pdf)  $\overrightarrow{S}$ 

**III** Article views: 92



View related [articles](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/mlt/10.1080/24749508.2024.2429223?src=pdf)  $\mathbb{Z}$ 



View [Crossmark](http://crossmark.crossref.org/dialog/?doi=10.1080/24749508.2024.2429223&domain=pdf&date_stamp=13%20Nov%202024) data  $\mathbb{Z}$ 

#### RESEARCH ARTICLE

**a** OPEN ACCESS **a** Check for updates

INWASCON

# **Seasonal and annual trends in reference evapotranspiration and prediction using machine learning models across seven climatic zones of Bangladesh**

Md. Naimur Rahman D[a,b](#page-1-0)[,c](#page-1-1)

<span id="page-1-1"></span><span id="page-1-0"></span><sup>a</sup>Department of Geography, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China; <sup>b</sup>David C Lam Institute for East-West Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China; <sup>c</sup>Department of Development Studies, Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

#### **ABSTRACT**

The primary aim of this investigation is to examine the historical (1989–2020) and future trends and magnitude of Reference Evapotranspiration ( $ET<sub>0</sub>$ ) in terms of spatiotemporal measures, considering its significance as a hydro-meteorological parameter influenced by changing climate. The FAO-56 Penman-Monteith method is employed to analyze  $ET_0$ , while the Modified Mann Kendall test is utilized to assess trends and Sen's Slope Estimator is used for magnitude analysis. The future prediction is conducted using Support Vector Machine (SVM), Artificial Neural Network (ANN), and Random Forest (RF) models. Results show an increasing  $ET<sub>o</sub>$  trend annually in the southeastern and northeastern zones, while decreased values are observed in other regions, particularly in the northwest (0.83 mm). Sen's slope estimator reveals distinct fluctuations in  $ET_0$ , with notable disparities in the Southeastern, Northeastern, Southwestern, and South-Central zones. Notably, Chattogram and Sitakunda experience an  $ET_0$ magnitude of 0.02 mm/Year, while other zones show a magnitude of 0.01 mm/Year. SVM outperformed other models, predicting rising  $ET_0$  in various seasons. These findings offer insights for optimizing irrigation systems and sustainable water management under changing climatic conditions.

#### **ARTICLE HISTORY**

Received 11 October 2023 Accepted 10 November 2024

Taylor & Francis

#### **KEYWORDS**

Reference evapotranspiration; Bangladesh; machine learning; spatial

#### **1. Introduction**

<span id="page-1-16"></span><span id="page-1-13"></span><span id="page-1-8"></span><span id="page-1-6"></span><span id="page-1-2"></span>The evaluation of  $ET_0$  holds critical significance in the efficient management and design of agricultural hydrology, the formulation of ideal irrigation scheduling strategies, and the creation of models for optimizing crop growth (Pereira et al., [2020](#page-15-0); Salam, Towfiqul Islam, et al., [2020\)](#page-15-1).  $ET_0$ , situated at the intersection of hydrological and carbon cycles, is intricately linked to crop yield and energy balance. Furthermore, its effects resonate through ocean-atmospheric circulation systems, significantly impacting climatic variations (Fan et al., [2019](#page-14-0); Jung et al., [2010\)](#page-14-1). Accurate assessment of  $ET_0$  enables agricultural decision-makers to make well-informed choices, promoting sustainable practices and effective resource management (Behboudian et al., [2021](#page-13-0)).  $ET_0$  is governed by many environmental parameters, including wind speed, relative humidity, air temperature, solar radiation (SR), and sunshine duration (SD), all of which intricately interplay to influence its dynamics (Rajput et al., [2024](#page-15-2)). Understanding the variations in  $ET_0$  has proven to be challenging due to unpredictable fluctuations in these climatic factors. Surprisingly, despite a clear link between  $ET_0$  and temperature, divergent trends have been observed in different regions of the earth. The "evapotranspiration paradox" is a global phenomenon affecting numerous regions, with extensive research <span id="page-1-7"></span>identifying the primary contributing factors as decreasing SD and declining wind speeds (Fu et al., [2022;](#page-14-2) Kitsara et al., [2013;](#page-14-3) Wang et al., [2014;](#page-16-0) Xing et al., [2016\)](#page-16-1).

<span id="page-1-12"></span><span id="page-1-11"></span><span id="page-1-9"></span>The phenomenon of climate change has enhanced the atmosphere's capacity to retain moisture, leading to increased cloud formation and a subsequent reduction in SD and SR across various regions (Mishra, [2019](#page-15-3)). It is important to note that the impact of increased cloud cover on SD and SR varies depending on the type of clouds present (Matuszko, [2012](#page-15-4)). Additionally, regional variability in cloud cover changes has been significant. For example, cloud cover has markedly increased in Southeast Asia, while it has decreased in North America (Dai, [2021;](#page-13-1) Mao et al., [2019\)](#page-15-5). Similar variability has been observed in other meteorological factors, such as relative humidity, which increased by up to 2.0% per decade over the past four decades in key regions of the United States, China, and India while remaining relatively stable in other areas (Mao et al., [2019\)](#page-15-5).

<span id="page-1-15"></span><span id="page-1-10"></span><span id="page-1-5"></span><span id="page-1-4"></span><span id="page-1-3"></span>Furthermore, wide-ranging fluctuations in meteorological conditions have led to notable disparities in  $ET_0$  trends across various regions (Cabral Júnior et al., [2019](#page-13-2); Chen et al., [2023](#page-13-3); Ndiaye et al., [2020;](#page-15-6) Ramachandra et al., [2022](#page-15-7)) Reports of  $ET_0$  trends from various regions highlight the heterogeneity in its behavior. Notably, substantial increases in  $ET_0$ 

<span id="page-1-14"></span>CONTACT Md. Naimur Rahman **۞** naimurbrur@gmail.com; naimurbrur@life.hkbu.edu.hk **D**epartment of Geography, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong 999077, China

<sup>© 2024</sup> The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the International Water, Air & Soil Conservation Society(INWASCON). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

<span id="page-2-22"></span><span id="page-2-15"></span><span id="page-2-4"></span><span id="page-2-3"></span><span id="page-2-2"></span><span id="page-2-1"></span><span id="page-2-0"></span>were reported in China (Chen et al., [2023](#page-13-3); Dong et al., [2020](#page-14-4)), Egypt (Yassen et al., [2020](#page-16-2)), U.S.A. (McEvoy et al., [2020](#page-15-8)), Senegal (Ndiaye et al., [2020](#page-15-6)), Iran (Biazar et al., [2019;](#page-13-4) Dinpashoh & Babamiri, [2020\)](#page-13-5), India (Baruah et al., [2023](#page-13-6); Ramachandra et al., [2022](#page-15-7)) and Pakistan (Ahmad et al., [2021;](#page-13-7) Ashraf et al., [2023\)](#page-13-8). Conversely, reductions in  $ET_0$  were observed in Iran (Cheshmberah & Zolfaghari, [2019\)](#page-13-9) and Brazil (Cabral Júnior et al., [2019;](#page-13-2) Ferreira et al., [2022](#page-14-5)). Some areas, such as Peninsula Malaysia (Pour et al., [2020](#page-15-9)) and the Mountains of Qilian in China (Lin et al., [2018\)](#page-14-6), have shown no significant variation in  $ET_0$ . In certain regions increasing and decreasing trends in  $ET_0$  were reported, as observed in the Tibetan Highland (Zhang et al., [2019](#page-16-3)) and the Huahe River basin (Li et al., [2018\)](#page-14-7).

<span id="page-2-21"></span><span id="page-2-16"></span><span id="page-2-13"></span><span id="page-2-12"></span><span id="page-2-11"></span><span id="page-2-6"></span>For a tropical, humid country like Bangladesh, predominantly situated in deltas, understanding the relationship between  $ET_0$  and other climatic variables presents a complex challenge (Jerin et al., [2021](#page-14-8)). Changes in  $ET_0$  can substantially influence crop yield, land suitability, and irrigation demand in this agriculturally dependent region (Katerji & Rana, [2011](#page-14-9); Wang et al., [2017\)](#page-16-4). Moreover,  $ET_0$  plays a critical role in managing several hydrological risks that directly or indirectly impact this highly vulnerable nation, including droughts, soil salinization, low river flows, and groundwater depletion (Kamruzzaman et al., [2019](#page-14-10); Mainuddin et al., [2015](#page-14-11); Rahman et al., [2021\)](#page-15-10). It is imperative to closely monitor and conduct comprehensive analyses since even a minor change in  $ET_0$  can significantly impact the ecology and ecosystem of the nation (Jerin et al., [2021](#page-14-8)).

<span id="page-2-20"></span><span id="page-2-18"></span><span id="page-2-17"></span><span id="page-2-14"></span><span id="page-2-10"></span><span id="page-2-9"></span><span id="page-2-7"></span>With evident patterns of rising temperatures across the nation, the effects of climate change in Bangladesh have become more pronounced (Rahman et al., [2023\)](#page-15-11). Reports of variations in precipitation patterns, particularly during the monsoon and pre-monsoon seasons, have also emerged (Rahman & Azim, [2021b\)](#page-15-12). Various other meteorological factors have changed as a result of global warming and other environmental shifts (Hwang et al., [2020;](#page-14-12) Rahman and Azim, [2022\)](#page-15-13). For instance, the hours of sunshine have significantly decreased due to increased air pollution (Rahman et al., [2023\)](#page-15-11).  $ET_0$  in Bangladesh has unavoidably been impacted by these climate changes (Rahman et al., [2023](#page-15-11)). To understand the impact of climate change on  $ET_0$ , it is crucial to explore the spatiotemporal trend and magnitude in the context of Bangladesh. At present, only two notable studies have been identified in the literature, each with a distinct focus. Jerin et al. ([2021\)](#page-14-8) emphasized spatiotemporal evaluation, while Salam, Islam, et al. [\(2020](#page-15-14)) focused primarily on methodological approaches. However, both studies were limited by insufficient station coverage and restricted applicability across Bangladesh's seven climatic zones. Against this backdrop, the current research offers a significant contribution.

<span id="page-2-19"></span><span id="page-2-5"></span>This study seeks to address the existing research gap regarding the spatiotemporal trends, magnitude evaluation, and prediction of evapotranspiration  $(ET_0)$ in Bangladesh. Among the various methods for estimating evapotranspiration, this research employs the FAO-56 Penman-Monteith method, which is a fully physically based model that incorporates principles of mass and energy conservation (FAO, [2024](#page-14-13)). This method is widely regarded as a benchmark for estimating reference evapotranspiration in numerous studies, underscoring its efficacy as an estimation technique (Sahoo et al., [2012](#page-15-15); Srivastava et al., [2018](#page-16-5)). In addition to the FAO-56 Penman-Monteith method for estimation, the study utilizes several machine learning models for predictive purposes, demonstrating improved results across seven climatic zones in the country (Ikram et al., [2023;](#page-14-14) Kumari et al., [2022\)](#page-14-15). This innovative approach sets this study apart from previous research by integrating machine learning models and achieving a more comprehensive coverage of stations and climatic zones, which has not been accomplished before.

<span id="page-2-8"></span>The primary objective of this study is to provide comprehensive insights into the evolving dynamics of  $ET_0$  (or potential evapotranspiration) in Bangladesh. By analyzing existing data and trends, the research will illuminate the underlying patterns and factors contributing to fluctuations in  $ET_0$  over time. The findings hold significant value for various sectors, including agriculture, hydrology, and resource management. Ultimately, this research will equip decision-makers with the information necessary to make informed choices regarding crop selection, irrigation schedules, water resource allocation, and other critical operational aspects. Moreover, the study will also help identify adaptation strategies and measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change on the country's water resources and agricultural productivity.

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

#### *2.1. Study area*

Bangladesh covers an area of roughly 147,610 square kilometers and is located within the geographic coordinates of 20°34 N to 26°38 N latitude and 88°10 E to 92°41 E longitude. It is the world's biggest deltaic nation in the Ganges-Brahmaputra-Meghna (GBM) river basin. Bangladesh's climatic cycles are distinguished by several seasons, notably the pre-monsoon period from March to May, the monsoon period from June to August, the post-monsoon period from September to November, and the winter period from December to February. As shown in [Figure 1](#page-3-0), these seasons outline seven unique climatic zones across the country: the southeastern area (A), the northeastern region (B), the northern section of the northern region (C), the northwestern region (D), the western region (E), and the southwestern region (F) and south-central region (G). The climate of Bangladesh is classified as subtropical humid monsoonal, typified by the influence of the monsoon winds. Notably, the northwestern segment of the nation encounters recurrent drought conditions owing to insufficient water resources, leading to an annual mean rainfall of less than 1200 mm (M. Rahman et al., [2021](#page-15-10); Rahman & Azim, [2022](#page-15-13)). Therefore, the southeastern and northeastern zones have high rainfall intensity (Rahman & Azim, [2022](#page-15-13)). Consequently, the western part of

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

**Figure 1.** Demonstrate the digital elevation model of seven climatic zones of Bangladesh.

Bangladesh consistently exhibits drier climatic conditions compared to other regions. [Figure 1](#page-3-0) shows the study area of this research (M. Rahman et al., [2021](#page-15-10); Rahman & Azim, [2022\)](#page-15-13).

# *2.2. Data analysis and pre-processing*

Maximum temperature, minimum temperature, atmospheric humidity, wind velocity, and sunshine information originating from 26 research locations under the purview of the Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council (BARC) were systematically compiled spanning the period of 1989 to 2020. The incidence of absent data was minimal, accounting for less than 2% of the dataset, thereby facilitating the uninterrupted progression of the meteorological investigation (M. N. Rahman & Azim, [2021a](#page-15-13)). For testing the homogeneity, the von Neumann ratio, standard normal homogeneity test, and range test were tested, and the datasets were found to be homogeneous (Alexandersson, [1986](#page-13-10); Buishand, [1982\)](#page-13-11). Hence, for the prediction study, 70% of the data were used for training, and the rest 30% of the data was used for testing.

# <span id="page-4-0"></span>*2.3. Methods*

<span id="page-4-6"></span><span id="page-4-4"></span>To explore the seasonal and annual variations in  $ET_0$ , this research utilized the Modified Mann-Kendall (MMK) trend test (Kendall, [1975](#page-14-16); Mann, [1945](#page-14-17)). This test allowed for the assessment of trends over time, indicating potential changes in  $ET_0$ . Consequently, the author employed Sen's Slope Estimator (Sen, [1968\)](#page-15-16) to quantify the magnitude of  $ET_0$  based on the identified trends. Subsequently, the FAO-56 Penman-Monteith method was utilized to extract  $ET_0$  values, leveraging available climatological data, including solar radiation, air temperature, humidity, and wind speed (Batchelor & Roberts, [1983;](#page-13-12) Bernadette et al., [2014\)](#page-13-13) [\(Figure 2\)](#page-5-0). This method is considered a benchmark for estimating ET0 due to its comprehensive approach that accounts for the combined effects of these climatic parameters.

In addition to these methods, the author applied machine learning models, including ANN, SVM, and RF, to predict future variations in  $ET_0$ . These models are well-established in the field of predictive analytics, offering significant advantages in accuracy for various forecasting purposes (Elbeltagi et al., [2021;](#page-14-18) Heramb et al., [2023](#page-14-19)). By integrating historical data, we ensured a robust framework for our predictions, while being mindful of potential missing values, which typically do not exceed 2% to maintain the integrity of the analysis (Mortuza et al., [2019;](#page-15-17) Rahman et al., [2021](#page-15-10)).

# 2.3.1. **ET**<sub>0</sub> estimation

The FAO Penman-Monteith equation leverages available climatological data, including solar radiation, air

temperature, humidity, and wind speed (Batchelor & Roberts, [1983](#page-13-12); Bernadette et al., [2014](#page-13-13)). Higher temperatures and solar radiation increase  $ET_0$  by providing more energy for vaporization. Wind speed enhances  $ET_0$  by reducing the boundary layer's thickness, facilitating water vapor transport. Humidity influences  $ET_0$  through the vapor pressure deficit: lower humidity increases  $ET_0$  by creating a larger deficit, while higher humidity decreases  $ET_0$  by reducing the deficit (Batchelor & Roberts, [1983](#page-13-12); Bernadette et al., [2014;](#page-13-13) FAO, [2024](#page-14-13)). This model ensures a comprehensive  $ET_0$  estimate by considering these parameters collectively. Ideally, these weather measurements should be collected 2 meters above a wellwatered, extensive green grass surface (Batchelor & Roberts, [1983;](#page-13-12) Bernadette et al., [2014](#page-13-13)). This study opted to estimate  $ET_0$  using the FAO56-PM recommended equation based on existing meteorological data rather than relying on  $ET_0$  measurements obtained from an evaporation pan. The FAO56-PM equation, proposed by (Allen et al., [1998\)](#page-13-14), is widely recognized as the global standard model for estimating  $ET_0$ . The equation itself is expressed as:

<span id="page-4-2"></span>
$$
ET_0 = \frac{0.408\Delta(R_n - G) + \gamma \frac{900}{T + 273} U_2(e_s - e_a)}{\Delta + \gamma (1 + 0.34 U_2)} \tag{1}
$$

Here,  $ET_0$  is reference evapotranspiration (mmd<sup>-1</sup>), is net radiation at the crop surface  $(M\text{Im}^{-2} d^{-1})$ , G is soil heat flux density (MJm<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>), T is the mean daily air temperature at 2 m height ( $^{\circ}$ C), is wind U<sub>2</sub> speed at 2 m height (ms−1), *es* is saturation vapour pressure (kPa),  $e_a$  is actual vapour pressure (kPa),  $e_s - e_a$ is saturation vapour pressure deficit (kPa), the slope of vapour pressure curve (kPa °C ∆ is − 1), γ is psychrometric constant (kPa  $°C-1$ ), recommended  $G = 0$ (Allen et al., [1998\)](#page-13-14).

#### <span id="page-4-1"></span>**2.3.2.** *ET<sub>0</sub>* **prediction**

<span id="page-4-3"></span>ANN, SVM, and RF were employed to see the future variabilities of  $ET_0$ . These methods are widely accepted as prediction models for different prediction purposes, and predicting  $ET_0$  is one of them (Elbeltagi et al., [2021](#page-14-18); Heramb et al., [2023\)](#page-14-19). Incorporating historical data is a valuable practice, but one must beware of missing data. Typically, a missing value of up to 2% is considered acceptable, as it has a relatively low impact on outcomes and is highly unlikely to have any significant influence on the results (Mortuza et al., [2019](#page-15-17); Rahman et al., [2021](#page-15-10)).

<span id="page-4-5"></span>In this study, the input variables for the prediction model included maximum and minimum temperature, sunshine, humidity, and wind speed [\(Figure 2](#page-5-0)). To train and validate the model, we utilized historical climate data spanning from 1989 to 2020, collected from 26 meteorological stations. The dataset was divided into two portions, with 70% allocated for

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

**Figure 2.** Comprehensive overview of the research design framework.

training and 30% for testing, ensuring robust model validation. Predictions generated by ANN, SVM, and RF were assessed using statistical metrics such as Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Mean Absolute Error (MAE), and the Coefficient of Determination  $(R^2)$ 

<span id="page-5-1"></span>The ANN is a highly advanced form of Artificial Intelligence that is specifically designed to simulate the complex biological neural networks of the human brain (Azid et al., [2013;](#page-13-15) Moustris et al., [2010](#page-15-18)). ANN can learn and recognize intricate patterns to make predictions, classify data, and cluster. ANN has become extremely popular due to its exceptional accuracy in making predictions, the advanced algorithms employed, and highly sophisticated techniques (Azid et al., [2014;](#page-13-16) Chaloulakou et al., [2003\)](#page-13-17).

<span id="page-5-4"></span><span id="page-5-2"></span>The SVM is an incredibly effective and widely used machine learning algorithm, ideal for classification and regression analysis tasks. This type of supervised machine learning algorithm is specifically designed to identify the optimal hyperplane in a given dataset, ensuring that different classes are effectively separated (Meris et al., [2020;](#page-15-19) Salam & Islam, [2020\)](#page-15-20).

<span id="page-5-3"></span>RF is an exceptional tree-based supervised ensemble learning model proposed by Breiman [\(2001](#page-13-18)) that has revolutionized the field of machine learning. Breiman's contribution was to improve the Bagging models to RF, which is now widely used for predicting as well as regression problems. It is a highly sophisticated yet simple and robust model that offers remarkable prediction accuracy, making it a clear winner when compared to the Adaboost. The error produced by RF is dependent on individual trees, and the model trains various decision trees from two viewpoints: one is the sample dimension, and the other one is the feature dimension. With its unique features and unparalleled accuracy, Random Forest is undoubtedly the go-to model for various complex machinelearning challenges (Dong et al., [2020\)](#page-14-4).

<span id="page-5-5"></span>Three commonly used statistical indicators (Quej et al., [2019\)](#page-15-21) were used to evaluate and compare the accuracy and performance of the studied models for daily  $ET_0$  estimation: coefficient of determination  $(R<sup>2</sup>, Equation (2))$ , root mean square error (RMSE, Equation (3)), and mean absolute error (MAE,

Equation (4)). The statistical indicators' mathematical equations are:

$$
R^{2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i,m} - Y_{i,e})^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i,m} - \bar{Y}_{i,e})^{2}}
$$
(2)

RMSE = 
$$
\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i,m} - Y_{i,e})^2}
$$
 (3)

$$
MAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |Y_{i,m} - Y_{i,e}|
$$
 (4)

$$
MSE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i,m} - \hat{Y}_{i,e})^2
$$
 (5)

where Yi,m, Yi,e,  $\overline{Y}_{i,e}$  and n is the measured, estimated, and mean of global solar radiation, respectively, and n is the number of observations. Higher  $R^2$  values, i.e., closer to 1, indicate higher model performance and a regression line that fits the data well. The lower the RMSE and MAE values, the better the model performs.

#### **2.3.3.** *ET<sub>0</sub>* **spatial interpolation**

<span id="page-6-2"></span><span id="page-6-0"></span>In this study, the Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) method was employed as a reliable and widely used interpolation technique to estimate unknown hydrological or geographic values (Amini et al., [2019](#page-13-19); Das, [2019](#page-13-20)). This approach operates on the principle that each known data point exerts an influence on its surroundings, which diminishes as the distance from the point increases (Ozelkan et al., [2015\)](#page-15-22). The weight assigned to each point is inversely proportional to its distance from the location of interest, providing an accurate estimation based on proximity (Hodam et al., [2017](#page-14-20)). IDW was chosen for its simplicity and effectiveness in capturing local spatial variability(Rahman et al., [2023\)](#page-15-11).

# <span id="page-6-1"></span>**3. Result and discussion**

# **3.1. Trend and magnitude of ET<sub>0</sub>**

The topographical variation in the trend of  $ET_0$ ([Figure 3](#page-7-0)) reveals a declining prevalence of adverse trends in the northwestern, western, southwestern, and south-central regions during the pre-monsoon season. In contrast, the northern section of the northern region exhibits a significant negative trend, with a Z-statistic of − 3.84 ([Figure 3](#page-7-0)). Conversely, the southeastern, northeastern, and parts of the southcentral zones show a positive trend in  $ET_0$  [\(Figure 3\)](#page-7-0). Additionally, the magnitude of the  $ET_0$  pattern shows negative slope values in the northern part of the northern region, as well as in the northwestern and southwestern zones, which aligns with the Modified Mann-Kendall trend findings presented in [Table 1.](#page-7-1) On the other hand, several scattered locations in the

southeastern and northeastern zones exhibit a significant  $ET_0$  magnitude of 0.02, as shown in [Table 1](#page-7-1).

During the monsoon season, all zones and stations display positive trends, except specific areas: the northern section of the northern region (Rangpur), the northwestern region (Bogura and Dinajpur), and the southeastern zone (Hatiya) [\(Figure 3](#page-7-0)). Among these zones, the northern part of the northern region stands out with the most pronounced negative trend, indicated by a Z-statistic of less than − 4.70 [\(Figure 3](#page-7-0)). In contrast, Sen's slope estimation indicates positive or negligible magnitudes in several areas across all zones, except for the northern part of the northern region, as presented in [Table 1.](#page-7-1) Furthermore, the northern part of the northern zone shows a substantial negative  $ET_0$ value of −0.02 mm/year ([Table 1](#page-7-1)).

In the post-monsoon season, a positive  $ET_0$  trend is observed across all zones, except three specific stations: Rangpur (−0.52 Z statistic), Satkhira (−0.032 Z statistic), and Madaripur (−0.032 Z statistic). These stations are in the northern part of the northern region, the southwestern zone, and the south-central zone, respectively [\(Figure 3\)](#page-7-0). Notably, the most significant positive trends are recorded in Sitakunda (Z = 4.53), Patuakhali ( $Z = 4.13$ ), and Sylhet ( $Z = 4.13$ ), covering the southeastern and northeastern zones, as shown in the map. The magnitude of  $ET_0$  changes remains relatively consistent, except in Chattogram and Sitakunda, where a slight increase of 0.02 mm/ year is observed in the southeastern zone ([Table 1](#page-7-1)).

All zones, except the southeastern, northeastern, and northern parts of the northern region, show a significant decline in the  $ET_0$  trend in the winter season. Only one point in the southwestern and southcentral zones exhibits an increasing trend ([Figure 3](#page-7-0)). The most pronounced positive trends are concentrated in the southeastern and northeastern zones, particularly at Sitakunda ( $Z = 4.63$ ), Patuakhali ( $Z =$ 3.85), and Chattogram  $(Z = 3.53)$  in the southeastern zone, and Srimangal  $(Z = 3.54)$  and Sylhet  $(Z = 3.36)$  in the northeastern zone, as illustrated in [Figure 3](#page-7-0). Trend variations differ considerably, with the highest variance reaching 0.04 mm/year in the southeastern zone and 0.02 mm/year in the northeastern zone [\(Table 1](#page-7-1)). Conversely, substantial negative trends are recorded in Rajshahi (−2.38 mm/year) in the western zone, Madaripur (−3.21 mm/year) in the south-central zone, Hatiya (−3.98 mm/year) in the southeastern zone, and Satkhira (−3.85 mm/year), Khulna (−2.48 mm/year), and Faridpur (−2.11 mm/year) in the southwestern zone, as detailed in [Table 1](#page-7-1).

The annual spatial trend analysis reveals a notably high  $ET_0$  trend in the southeastern and northeastern zones, primarily due to their dense hilly and forested areas. In contrast, a reduced  $ET_0$  trend is observed in the remaining climatic zones, with the northwestern

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

Figure 3. Demonstrates spatiotemporal distribution of ET<sub>0</sub> trend in sub-climatic zones at 95% confidence interval.

<span id="page-7-1"></span>



zone displaying the lowest value at 0.83, as demonstrated in [Figure 3.](#page-7-0) Furthermore, Sen's slope estimator demonstrates variations in the magnitude of  $ET_0$ across different parts of the Southeastern, Northeastern, Southwestern, and Southcentral climatic zones. Specifically, Chattogram and Sitakunda exhibit an  $ET_0$  of 0.02 mm/year, while other zones maintain a slightly lower  $ET_0$  of 0.01 mm/year. Conversely, a significant decline in  $ET_0$  is noted in the northern part of the northern region (−0.01 mm/ year) and specific areas within the southeastern, northwestern, southwestern, and south-central zones, including Hatiya, Bogura, Faridpur, Satkhira, and Mymensingh, where  $ET_0$  also stands at  $-0.01$  mm/ year as shown in [Table 1](#page-7-1). The observations revealed a correlation between seasonal variations in maximum and minimum temperatures. The declining trend in  $ET_0$ , representing potential evapotranspiration, aligns with the results of previous research studies. This indicates the presence of a broader underlying climatic pattern affecting plants' ability to absorb and retain moisture across various regions (Salam & Islam, [2020](#page-15-20)). This pattern is attributed to the spatiotemporal temperature variations that exist within different subclimatic zones of the country. These variations are caused by factors such as variations in altitude, the proximity to the coast, and seasonal changes. The studies indicate that while some regions of the country experience increasing temperatures and  $ET_0$  trends, others show a decline (Kamal et al., [2021](#page-14-21); M. N. Rahman & Azim, [2021a;](#page-15-13) M. Rahman et al., [2021](#page-15-10))

## <span id="page-8-0"></span>**3.2. Prediction of ET<sub>0</sub>**

This study utilizes three distinct predictive models: ANN, SVM, and RF. Assessing model accuracy is a critical phase in the development of machine learning models, as it allows for the evaluation of prediction performance. The assessment includes metrics such as MSE, MAE, RMSE, and R-squared. The dataset is split, with 70% used for training and the remaining 30% reserved for testing. Although memorization performance is considered, it is not sufficient as the sole evaluation metric. Therefore, testing results are analysed to demonstrate prediction accuracy. Negative R-squared values indicate a poor model fit; however, in this study, no negative R-squared values were observed, with a statistic of zero indicating the absence of such cases.

Zone A, located in the southeastern region, demonstrated significant performance of the SVM model, as shown in [Table 2](#page-9-0), with no zero or negative R-squared values. The RMSE values were particularly low, with measurements of 0.16, 0.04, 0.03, 0.08, and 0.15 for the pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, winter, and

annual seasons. These low RMSE, MSE, and MAE values underscore the model's accuracy. Consequently, it is anticipated that the monsoon, post-monsoon, and winter seasons will exhibit higher  $ET_0$ , with positive prediction values of 96%, 94%, and 85%, respectively. The pre-monsoon season is projected to show a 77% increase in  $ET_0$  variation. These results align with the validation performance, further emphasizing the effectiveness of the SVM model. In contrast, the other two models showed relatively minor performance and were deemed unsuitable for Zone A.

In Zone B, encompassing the northeastern region, the ANN and RF models exhibited lower performance than the SVM model across all seasonal and annual timeframes. This is evident from the R-squared values in [Table 2,](#page-9-0) where some instances even resulted in negative values or nominal predictive outcomes for ANN and RF. Conversely, the SVM model demonstrated consistently strong performance throughout all seasons. This is reflected in the low RMSE values, ranging from 0.01 (monsoon) to 0.11 (winter), with a minimum of 0.05 achieved annually. Additionally, the SVM model yielded minimal MSE values, ranging from 0.0003 (monsoon) to 0.14 (winter), and MAE values ranging from 0.01 (monsoon) to 0.08 (winter) across all seasons and annually. These findings are consistent with the validation performance, solidifying the SVM model's efficacy in Zone B. Similar to Zone A, projections for Zone B indicate a rise in potential evapotranspiration  $(ET_0)$  across all seasons. The expected increases are 97% (pre-monsoon), 99% (monsoon), 91% (post-monsoon), 74% (winter), and 91% (annual).

In Zone C, located in the northern region, the ANN model demonstrated strong performance for estimating  $ET_0$  during the pre-monsoon, post-monsoon, and winter seasons. Notably, the post-monsoon season exhibited a significant 100% increase in  $ET_0$ , as predicted by the ANN model. R-squared values of 0.92 and 0.55 for the pre-monsoon and annual periods indicated an upward trend in  $ET_0$ . However, the ANN model's capability for predicting the RF variable during the winter season was negligible. In contrast, the SVM model achieved consistently high performance across all seasons, with R-squared values exceeding 0.87 for each period (pre-monsoon: 0.96, monsoon: 0.93, post-monsoon: 0.98, winter: 0.87, and annual: 0.94). Additionally, the SVM model exhibited substantial accuracy, as evidenced by consistently decreasing RMSE, MSE, and MAE values across all measurements.

Zone D (northwestern region) exhibited strong performance with the SVM model, as evidenced by a non-zero and non-negative R-squared value in [Table 2.](#page-9-0) Low RMSE values (0.05 to 0.12) were also observed across all seasons (pre-monsoon, monsoon,

<span id="page-9-0"></span>**Table 2.** Demonstrate the seasonal and annual ANN, SVM, and RF Model validation and testing outcome (bold colours are the significant predictive  $ET_0$ , and red colours values are insignificant values). RMSE, R2, MSE and MAE Values of different models

|    | Α            |                              |                   |                 |                  |                 | B                |               |                              |                  |                 |                  |               |                  |
|----|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
|    |              |                              | Pre-<br>monsoon   | Monsoon         | Post-<br>monsoon | Winter          | Annual           |               |                              | Pre-<br>monsoon  | Monsoon         | Post-<br>monsoon | Winter        | Annual           |
|    | ANN Training | RMSE                         | 0.15              | 0.08            | 0.11             | 0.19            | 0.22             | Training      | RMSE                         | 0.38             | 0.19            | 0.07             | 0.16          | 0.13             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.34              | 0.59            | 0.15             | $-1.21$         | $-4.64$          |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-0.96$          | $-0.01$         | 0.84             | 0.28          | 0.22             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b><br>MAE            | 0.02<br>0.1       | 0.007<br>0.06   | 0.01<br>0.08     | 0.03<br>0.13    | 0.05<br>0.1      |               | <b>MSE</b><br>MAE            | 0.14<br>0.15     | 0.03<br>0.12    | 0.006<br>0.05    | 0.02<br>0.12  | 0.01<br>0.1      |
|    | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.64              | 0.09            | 0.38             | 0.73            | 1.82             | Testing       | RMSE                         | 0.63             | 0.29            | 0.38             | 0.37          | 0.77             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-2.51$           | 0.78            | $-5.24$          | $-11.08$        | $-88.01$         |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-1.17$          | $-1.15$         | $-9.01$          | $-1.91$       | $-14.88$         |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.04              | 0.008           | 0.14             | 0.53            | 3.31             |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.4              | 0.08            | 0.14             | 0.14          | 0.6              |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.26              | 0.06            | 0.16             | 0.41            | 0.89             |               | MAE                          | 0.36             | 0.14            | 0.22             | 0.29          | 0.38             |
|    | SVM Training | RMSE                         | 0.04              | 0.03            | 0.03             | 0.06            | 0.04             | Training      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.05             | 0.03            | 0.04             | 0.06          | 0.04             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub><br><b>MSE</b> | 0.95<br>$\pmb{0}$ | 0.92            | 0.91             | 0.77            | 0.8              |               | R <sub>2</sub><br><b>MSE</b> | 0.96             | 0.97            | 0.94             | 0.87          | 0.91             |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.03              | 0.001<br>0.02   | 0.001<br>0.03    | 0.004<br>0.5    | 0.001<br>0.03    |               | MAE                          | 0.002<br>0.04    | 0.0009<br>0.26  | 0.002<br>0.03    | 0.004<br>0.06 | 0.001<br>0.03    |
|    | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.16              | 0.04            | 0.03             | 0.08            | 0.15             | Testing       | RMSE                         | 0.07             | 0.01            | 0.03             | 0.11          | 0.05             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.77              | 0.96            | 0.94             | 0.85            | 0.38             |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.97             | 0.99            | 0.91             | 0.74          | 0.91             |
|    |              | MSE                          | 0.03              | 0.001           | 0.001            | 0.006           | 0.02             |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.005            | 0.0003          | 0.001            | 0.14          | 0.003            |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.1               | 0.03            | 0.03             | 0.05            | 0.11             |               | MAE                          | 0.04             | 0.01            | 0.02             | 0.08          | 0.04             |
| RF | Training     | RMSE                         | 0.13              | 0.13            | 0.09             | 0.11            | 0.09             | Training      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.16             | 0.12            | 0.2              | 0.18          | 0.11             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub><br>MSE        | 0.36<br>0.01      | 0<br>0.01       | 0.38<br>0.009    | 0.21<br>0.01    | $-0.06$<br>0.009 |               | R <sub>2</sub><br><b>MSE</b> | $-0.57$<br>0.02  | 0.61<br>0.014   | $-0.09$<br>0.04  | 0.11<br>0.03  | 0.42<br>0.01     |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.11              | 0.09            | 0.07             | 0.09            | 0.07             |               | MAE                          | 0.13             | 0.1             | 0.17             | 0.14          | 0.09             |
|    | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.33              | 0.16            | 0.2              | 0.21            | 0.26             | Testing       | RMSE                         | 0.37             | 0.22            | 0.15             | 0.21          | 0.19             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.01              | 0.24            | $-0.72$          | $-0.04$         | $-0.94$          |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.26             | $-0.24$         | $-0.73$          | 0.04          | $-0.04$          |
|    |              | MSE                          | 0.11              | 0.02            | 0.04             | 0.04            | 0.07             |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.13             | 0.04            | 0.02             | 0.04          | 0.03             |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.23              | 0.12<br>C       | 0.15             | 0.17            | 0.2              |               | MAE                          | 0.23             | 0.17<br>D       | 0.12             | 0.15          | 0.16             |
|    |              |                              |                   |                 |                  |                 |                  |               |                              |                  |                 |                  |               |                  |
|    |              |                              | Pre-<br>monsoon   | Monsoon         | Post-<br>monsoon |                 | Winter Annual    |               |                              | Pre-<br>monsoon  | Monsoon         | Post-<br>monsoon | Winter        | Annual           |
|    | ANN Training | RMSE                         | 0.08              | 0.18            | 0.01             | 0.44            | 0.2              | Training RMSE |                              | 0.38             | 0.09            | 0.07             | 0.18          | 0.12             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.93              | 0.69            | 0.641            | $-2.9$          | 0.86             |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-0.91$          | 0.67            | 0.71             | $-0.54$       | 0.02             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.007             | 0.03            | 0.01             | 0.115           | 0.006            |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.14             | 0.009           | 0.006            | 0.03          | 0.014            |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.06              | 0.14            | 0.096            | 0.25            | 0.06             |               | MAE                          | 0.2              | 0.05            | 0.06             | 0.14          | 0.09             |
|    | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.1               | 0.35            | 0.01<br>1        | 0.44            | 0.2              | Testing       | RMSE                         | 1.29             | 1.05            | 1.06             | 0.26          | 2.41<br>$-288.7$ |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub><br><b>MSE</b> | 0.92<br>0.01      | $-0.51$<br>0.12 | 0.0002           | $-2.03$<br>0.19 | 0.55<br>0.04     |               | R <sub>2</sub><br><b>MSE</b> | $-15.29$<br>1.67 | $-28.43$<br>1.1 | $-65.91$<br>1.12 | 0.26<br>0.06  | 5.81             |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.08              | 0.18            | 0.01             | 0.36            | 0.1              |               | MAE                          | 0.63             | 0.52            | 0.48             | 0.18          | 1.17             |
|    | SVM Training | RMSE                         | 0.04              | 0.05            | 0.02             | 0.13            | 0.04             | Training      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.066            | 0.02            | 0.03             | 0.07          | 0.05             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.98              | 0.97            | 0.98             | 0.42            | 0.95             |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.94             | 0.99            | 0.93             | 0.6           | 0.78             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.002             | 0.003           | 0.0006           | 0.017           | 0.002            |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.004            | 0.004           | 0.001            | 0.01          | 0.003            |
|    | Testing      | MAE<br><b>RMSE</b>           | 0.03<br>0.07      | 0.04<br>0.07    | 0.02<br>0.047    | 0.11<br>0.08    | 0.03<br>0.07     | Testing       | MAE<br>RMSE                  | 0.04<br>0.05     | 0.015<br>0.04   | 0.02<br>0.09     | 0.099<br>0.12 | 0.045<br>0.09    |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.96              | 0.93            | 0.98             | 0.87            | 0.94             |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.97             | 0.94            | 0.44             | 0.6           | 0.55             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.005             | 0.006           | 0.0022           | 0.008           | 0.005            |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.003            | 0.002           | 0.009            | 0.01          | 0.009            |
|    |              | <b>MAE</b>                   | 0.07              | 0.04            | 0.03             | 0.06            | 0.04             |               | <b>MAE</b>                   | 0.04             | 0.04            | 0.05             | 0.099         | 0.05             |
| RF | Training     | RMSE                         | 0.17              | 0.21            | 0.09             | 0.19            | 0.17             | Training      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.16             | 0.09            | 0.13             | 0.11          | 0.07             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.74              | 0.58            | 0.78             | $-0.26$         | 0.41             |               | R2                           | 0.63             | 0.71            | 0.11             | 0.32          | 0.58             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b><br>MAE            | 0.03<br>0.13      | 0.04<br>0.14    | 0.008<br>0.07    | 0.03<br>0.16    | 0.02<br>0.12     |               | MSE<br>MAE                   | 0.02<br>0.11     | 0.008<br>0.07   | 0.018<br>0.108   | 0.014<br>0.08 | 0.006<br>0.067   |
|    | Testing      | RMSE                         | 0.15              | 0.05            | 0.28             | 0.26            | 0.18             | Testina       | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.26             | 0.15            | 0.22             | 0.18          | 0.12             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.83              | 0.96            | 0.111            | $-0.07$         | 0.62             |               | R2                           | 0.32             | 0.4             | $-1.84$          | 0.18          | 0.17             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.02              | 0.002           | 0.08             | 0.068           | 0.03             |               | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.06             | 0.02            | 0.048            | 0.03          | 0.016            |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.1               | 0.02<br>E.      | 0.12             | 0.14            | 0.1              |               | MAE                          | 0.25             | 0.11<br>F       | 0.16             | 0.14          | 0.11             |
|    |              |                              | Pre-              |                 | Post-            |                 |                  |               |                              | Pre-             |                 | Post-            |               |                  |
|    |              |                              | monsoon           | Monsoon         | monsoon          |                 | Winter Annual    |               |                              | monsoon          | Monsoon         | monsoon          |               | Winter Annual    |
|    | ANN Training | RMSE                         | 0.24              | 0.17            | 0.09             | 0.17            | 0.2              | Training      | RMSE                         | 0.17             | 0.2             | 0.21             | 0.2           | 0.24             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.52              | 0.1             | 0.43             | $-0.42$         | $-0.74$          |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.61             | $-0.6$          | $-1.31$          | $-0.69$       | $-2.18$          |
|    |              | MSE<br>MAE                   | 0.05<br>0.16      | 0.03<br>0.09    | 0.009<br>0.07    | 0.03<br>0.144   | 0.04<br>0.15     |               | MSE<br>MAE                   | 0.03<br>0.12     | 0.04<br>0.11    | 0.04<br>0.13     | 0.04<br>0.15  | 0.05<br>0.16     |
|    | Testing      | RMSE                         | 0.69              | 1.1             | 0.85             | 0.43            | 0.9              | Testing       | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.79             | 0.81            | 0.28             | 0.3           | 1.34             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-4.74$           | $-23.27$        | $-33.03$         | $-7.18$         | $-44.72$         |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | $-9.11$          | $-13.56$        | $-4.53$          | $-1.46$       | $-71.38$         |
|    |              | MSE                          | 0.47              | 1.22            | 0.72             | 0.18            | 0.81             |               | MSE                          | 0.63             | 0.64            | 0.08             | 0.09          | 1.79             |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.26              | 0.46            | 0.55             | 0.39            | 0.41             |               | MAE                          | 0.55             | 0.29            | 0.15             | 0.19          | 0.54             |
|    | SVM Training | RMSE                         | 0.09              | 0.07            | 0.05             | 0.09            | 0.07             | Training      | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.05             | 0.02            | 0.04             | 0.11          | 0.07             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub><br>MSE        | 0.92<br>0.009     | 0.83<br>0.006   | 0.79<br>0.003    | 0.63<br>0.008   | 0.77<br>0.005    |               | R <sub>2</sub><br>MSE        | 0.97<br>0.002    | 0.98<br>0.0005  | 0.9<br>0.002     | 0.53<br>0.01  | 0.005<br>0.005   |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.06              | 0.04            | 0.04             | 0.07            | 0.05             |               | MAE                          | 0.04             | 0.018           | 0.03             | 0.08          | 0.05             |
|    | Testing      | RMSE                         | 0.04              | 0.04            | 0.13             | 0.15            | 0.1              | Testing       | <b>RMSE</b>                  | 0.06             | 0.03            | 0.04             | 0.15          | 0.06             |
|    |              | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.92              | 0.96            | 0.19             | $-0.03$         | 0.34             |               | R <sub>2</sub>               | 0.94             | 0.97            | 0.84             | 0.39          | 0.83             |
|    |              | <b>MSE</b>                   | 0.001             | 0.002           | 0.01             | 0.02            | 0.01             |               | MSE                          | 0.003            | 0.001           | 0.002            | 0.02          | 0.004            |
|    |              | MAE                          | 0.03              | 0.03            | 0.08             | 0.13            | 0.07             |               | MAE                          | 0.04             | 0.02            | 0.03             | 0.13          | 0.04             |

**Table 2.** (Continued).

| <b>RF</b> | Training     | RMSE                       | 0.29    | 0.12    | 0.48     | 0.11     | 0.15          | Training | RMSE           | 0.21    | 0.1     | 0.14    | 0.13    | 0.11          |
|-----------|--------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | 0.3     | 0.54    | 0.86     | 0.41     | $-0.03$       |          | R <sub>2</sub> | 0.43    | 0.6     | 0.01    | 0.31    | 0.25          |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.08    | 0.01    | 0.002    | 0.01     | 0.02          |          | <b>MSE</b>     | 0.04    | 0.01    | 0.02    | 0.01    | 0.01          |
|           |              | MAE                        | 0.21    | 0.1     | 0.03     | 0.09     | 0.11          |          | MAE            | 0.18    | 0.07    | 0.12    | 0.11    | 0.1           |
|           | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                | 0.34    | 0.16    | 0.11     | 0.21     | 0.2           | Testing  | <b>RMSE</b>    | 0.255   | 0.18    | 0.14    | 0.21    | 0.13          |
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | $-0.44$ | 0.44    | 0.36     | $-1.08$  | $-1.84$       |          | R <sub>2</sub> | $-0.04$ | 0.25    | $-0.54$ | $-0.14$ | 0.31          |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.12    | 0.02    | 0.01     | 0.04     | 0.05          |          | <b>MSE</b>     | 0.06    | 0.034   | 0.02    | 0.04    | 0.01          |
|           |              | MAE                        | 0.28    | 0.14    | 0.07     | 0.16     | 0.2           |          | MAE            | 0.22    | 0.11    | 0.13    | 0.15    | 0.12          |
|           |              | G                          |         |         |          |          |               |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | <b>RF</b><br>Pre-<br>Post- |         |         |          |          |               |          | Pre-           |         | Post-   |         |         |               |
|           |              |                            | monsoon | Monsoon | monsoon  |          | Winter Annual |          |                | monsoon | Monsoon | monsoon |         | Winter Annual |
|           | ANN Training | RMSE                       | 0.29    | 0.39    | 0.21     | 0.25     | 0.24          | Training | RMSE           | 0.14    | 0.11    | 0.085   | 0.15    | 0.08          |
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | $-1.27$ | $-7.48$ | $-1.4$   | $-2.86$  | $-4.86$       |          | R <sub>2</sub> | 0.47    | 0.25    | 0.61    | $-0.32$ | 0.37          |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.08    | 0.15    | 0.04     | 0.06     | 0.06          |          | <b>MSE</b>     | 0.019   | 0.013   | 0.007   | 0.02    | 0.006         |
|           |              | MAE                        | 0.2     | 0.26    | 0.15     | 0.19     | 0.16          |          | MAE            | 0.11    | 0.09    | 0.06    | 0.12    | 0.07          |
|           | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                | 0.28    | 0.73    | 0.9      | 1.18     | 0.67          | Testing  | <b>RMSE</b>    | 0.3     | 0.2     | 0.28    | 0.33    | 0.22          |
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | 0.26    | $-11.4$ | $-20.45$ | $-20.89$ | $-9.12$       |          | R <sub>2</sub> | 0.14    | 0       | $-1.08$ | $-0.74$ | $-0.18$       |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.07    | 0.54    | 0.81     | 1.39     | 0.45          |          | <b>MSE</b>     | 0.09    | 0.04    | 0.07    | 0.11    | 0.05          |
|           |              | MAE                        | 0.22    | 0.41    | 0.54     | 0.8      | 0.34          |          | MAE            | 0.19    | 0.18    | 0.21    | 0.25    | 0.17          |
| SVM       | Training     | <b>RMSE</b>                | 0.09    | 0.06    | 0.05     | 0.1      | 0.07          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | 0.78    | 0.8     | 0.81     | 0.32     | 0.47          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.008   | 0.003   | 0.003    | 0.01     | 0.005         |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | MAE                        | 0.07    | 0.05    | 0.04     | 0.08     | 0.06          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           | Testing      | <b>RMSE</b>                | 0.2     | 0.16    | 0.08     | 0.11     | 0.14          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | R <sub>2</sub>             | 0.6     | 0.36    | 0.83     | 0.78     | 0.56          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | <b>MSE</b>                 | 0.04    | 0.02    | 0.006    | 0.01     | 0.01          |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |
|           |              | <b>MAE</b>                 | 0.14    | 0.1     | 0.05     | 0.09     | 0.1           |          |                |         |         |         |         |               |

post-monsoon, winter, and annual). Furthermore, relatively small MSE and MAE values supported the model's accuracy. These findings suggest potential increases in  $ET_0$  values for the pre-monsoon, monsoon, winter, and annual seasons in upcoming years based on their respective R-squared values (0.97, 0.94, 0.60, and 0.55). Notably, the post-monsoon season is projected to experience a 44% increase in  $ET_0$  fluctuation. These results align with the SVM model's effectiveness during validation, highlighting its suitability for Zone D. Conversely, the performance of the other two models was negligible, precluding their evaluation in this region.

In Zone E, denoting the western area, the RF method exhibited proficient performance during the monsoon and post-monsoon seasons, indicated by R-squared increases of 0.44 and 0.36 for  $ET_0$ , as shown in [Table 2.](#page-9-0) Conversely, the RF model's predictive ability, particularly the ANN predictand value, was insignificant across all seasons – pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, winter, and annual. The SVM model showcased notable enhancements in  $ET_0$ for all seasons except winter, evidenced by R-squared values of 0.92, 0.96, 0.19, and 0.34 for pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, and annual periods, respectively. Furthermore, the SVM model's accuracy is noteworthy, as evidenced by the consistent reductions observed in RMSE, MSE, and MAE values across measurements.

Zone F, representing the southwestern region, demonstrates notable SVM performance with nonzero and positive  $R^2$  values, as outlined in [Table 2](#page-9-0). Additionally, the RMSE remains consistent at 0.06

across the pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, and annual seasons, indicating strong model stability. The reduction in MSE and MAE values further highlights the model's high precision. As a result,  $ET_0$ values are projected to increase significantly in the coming years, with anticipated growth rates of 94%, 97%, 84%, and 83% for the pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, and annual seasons, respectively. Furthermore, the winter season is expected to see a considerable 39% rise in  $ET_0$  variability. These findings align with the validation performance, underscoring the reliability and significance of the SVM model. In contrast, alternative approaches proved ineffective and unsuitable for evaluation within Zone F.

Zone G, encompassing the south-central region, witnessed robust SVM performance, surpassing expectations with diminished RMSE, MSE, and MAE values and avoiding 0 or negative r-squared values, as shown in [Table 2.](#page-9-0) Specifically, SVM demonstrated RMSE values of 0.2, 0.16, 0.08, 0.11, and 0.14 for premonsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, winter, and annual seasons. Furthermore, MSE (0.04, 0.02, 0.006, 0.1, and 0.01) and MAE (0.14, 0.1, 0.05, 0.09, and 0.1) values indicated reduced magnitudes across premonsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, winter, and annual periods, underscoring the model's substantial accuracy. Consequently, future  $ET_0$  variation projections suggest that the post-monsoon season will exhibit the most significant  $ET_0$  increase over the coming decades, with an anticipated 83% climb. Additionally, substantial rises of approximately 60%, 78%, and 56% in  $ET_0$  variance are foreseen for the pre-monsoon, winter, and annual seasons. These results align with <span id="page-11-2"></span>testing effectiveness, validating the SVM model's applicability. Conversely, the performance of the other two models remained marginal, precluding their recognition within Zone G. In a related manner (Ferreira et al., [2019](#page-14-22)), found that the SVM was the most robust alternate approach to the FAO56-PM. Also indicated that for estimating  $ET_0$ , SVM performed the best, with R2 values ranging from 0.882% to 0.993% (Wen et al., [2015](#page-16-6)). Based on precision, dependability, ease of use, and excellent correlation with  $ET_0$ 's, the SVM model is the most appropriate approach for  $ET_0$  prediction in Bangladesh. However, Salam, Islam, et al. [\(2020\)](#page-15-14) found a different model of the Abtew ( $ET<sub>0</sub>$ ,6) model (Abtew, [1996\)](#page-13-21) for the interannual and multiyear  $ET_0$  prediction.

<span id="page-11-4"></span><span id="page-11-1"></span>[Table 3](#page-11-0) presents correlation coefficients between various climate variables, seasons, and geographic zones predicting the  $ET_0$ . It reveals several notable patterns, as strong positive correlations exist between maximum temperature and wind speed across most zones and seasons, suggesting a linked relationship like most dependent in predicting the  $ET_0$ . Rainfall shows weak to moderate negative correlations with maximum temperature, wind speed, and sunshine hours, indicating inverse relationships. Humidity generally has moderate to strong positive correlations with wind speed, especially in Zones C, D, and G, hinting at potential connections. Zone B stands out with consistently high correlations between maximum temperature and wind speed, suggesting a robust association in that region. Zone C exhibits distinct patterns with weaker correlations between temperature and

<span id="page-11-0"></span>

wind and even positive correlations between rainfall and temperature in some seasons, implying unique climate dynamics. These correlations offer insights into the interplay of climate variables

<span id="page-11-3"></span>The nation's agricultural output is expected to suffer due to increasing  $ET_0$  trends in the coming years (Kousari & Ahani, [2012;](#page-14-23) Rahman et al., [2019](#page-15-23)) It has been observed that the FAO Penman-Monteith method is more accurate in estimating  $ET_0$ , while various machine learning techniques are highly effective at predicting it (Ikram et al., [2023;](#page-14-14) Kumari et al., [2022](#page-14-15)). Boro rice, known as dry season rice, is an essential staple for Bangladesh's vast population. It plays a crucial role in the country's economy and is cultivated nationwide. However, this grain crop heavily relies on copious water supply during all its growth phases, from soil preparation to grain harvesting. The cultivation period for Boro rice spans from November to April, and irrigation is a must during this period. Bangladesh faces challenges such as limited rainfall, and drought episodes can further exacerbate the situation. In such circumstances, the water supply becomes scarce, significantly impacting the crop yield and the country's overall economy (Rahman & Azim, [2021b](#page-15-12)). Consequently, the escalating  $ET_0$  trend adds complexity to the predicament faced by various waterdependent industries. Farmers may extract additional water from subsurface sources in this evolving scenario. However, groundwater quality has deteriorated since the 1980s (Salam, Islam, et al., [2020](#page-15-14)). While precipitation projections indicate a rise in national precipitation in the 21st century, groundwater



recharge is influenced by more than just precipitation. The transboundary water crisis significantly impacts groundwater replenishment, agriculture, fisheries, and national navigation (Biswas, [2011\)](#page-13-22).

<span id="page-12-0"></span>As the levels of  $ET_0$ , or evapotranspiration, increase, it poses a significant challenge for farmers as it leads to increased irrigation costs, which can harm their productivity. Additionally, other waterintensive industries such as manufacturing and construction, will also be affected, as there is a growing concern about the environmental and public health implications of excessive water usage. In addition, changes in  $ET_0$  levels can significantly impact various hydrological processes, including soil moisture levels, groundwater extraction, and runoff, which can have far-reaching consequences for the environment and ecosystems (Jerin et al., [2021\)](#page-14-8). For instance, flooding adversely impacts the progress of infrastructure development, network systems, academic and administrative institutions, and tangible assets (Kabir & Hossen, [2019](#page-14-24)). To address the country's climatic variability and  $ET_0$  consequences, potential strategies include exploring alternative uses of groundwater for irrigation, constructing reservoirs to retain monsoon water, and adopting suitable irrigation frameworks.

# <span id="page-12-1"></span>**4. Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study has comprehensively analyzed  $ET_0$  trends, magnitudes, and predictions in Bangladesh. The findings highlight the exceptional predictive capabilities of the SVM model in forecasting patterns, outperforming the ANN and RF models in various zones.

- (1) For Zone A, SVM-based predictions indicate an expected increase in  $ET_0$  values in the coming years, particularly during the monsoon, postmonsoon, and winter seasons, with positive prediction values of 96%, 94%, and 85%, respectively. Higher temperatures, monsoon humidity, and reduced winter cloud cover contribute to the increase.
- (2) Similarly, Zone B is projected to experience elevated  $ET_0$  levels across all seasons, with prediction values of 97%, 99%, 91%, 74%, and 91% for pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, winter, and annual periods, respectively. Zone B's climate, characterized by high temperatures, strong solar radiation, and variable humidity, drives this trend.
- (3) Zone C is expected to significantly rise  $ET_0$ during all seasons, as reflected by the respective R-squared values of 0.96, 0.93, 0.98, 0.87, and 0.94. Increasing temperatures, variable rainfall, and higher wind speeds contribute to the rise.
- (4) In Zone D, the pre-monsoon, monsoon, winter, and annual seasons are anticipated to have higher  $ET_0$  values in the coming years, with R-squared values of 0.97, 0.94, 0.6, and 0.55, respectively. Elevated pre-monsoon and monsoon temperatures, lower winter humidity, and higher solar radiation influence these predictions.
- (5) For Zone E, an increase in  $ET_0$  is projected for all seasons except winter, with R-squared values of 0.92, 0.96, 0.19, and 0.34 for pre-monsoon, monsoon, post-monsoon, and annual periods, respectively. Lower winter temperatures and higher humidity likely contribute to the lower  $ET_0$  prediction for that season.
- (6) Similarly, this study's predictions suggest that Zone F's pre-monsoon, monsoon, postmonsoon, and annual seasons will experience increased  $ET_0$  in the following years F, with projection values of 94%, 97%, 84%, and 83%, respectively. Zone F's climate, characterized by high temperatures, intense solar radiation, and seasonal winds, contributes to the rise.

The study reveals that combining prediction outcomes, historical trends, and magnitude assessments can significantly inform irrigation practices in Bangladesh. Highlighting the need for prudent water resource management, this research addresses challenges posed by climate change and  $ET_0$  fluctuations across the country's seven climatic zones. The insights offer a foundation for policy development, urging policymakers to adopt sustainable approaches for water resource resilience. The study's recommendations emphasize sustainable practices as key to long-term water sustainability. The government and stakeholders must collaborate on water management policies grounded in scientific evidence and practical experience, ensuring both immediate alleviation of challenges and safeguarding future water needs in Bangladesh.

# **Abbreviations**



# **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

#### **ORCID**

Md. Naimur Rahman D http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5236-3784

## **Data availability statement**

Data will be made available upon request.

# **References**

- <span id="page-13-21"></span>Abtew, W. ([1996\)](#page-11-1). Evapotranspiration measurements and modeling for three wetland systems in south Florida 1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, *32*(3), 465–473. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1996.tb04044.x)  [1752-1688.1996.tb04044.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.1996.tb04044.x)
- <span id="page-13-7"></span>Ahmad, M. J., Cho, G.-H., Kim, S.-H., Lee, S., Adelodun, B., & Choi, K.-S. [\(2021\)](#page-2-0). Influence mechanism of climate change over crop growth and water demands for wheat-rice system of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, *12*(4), 1184–1202. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2020.009)  [10.2166/wcc.2020.009](https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2020.009)
- <span id="page-13-10"></span>Alexandersson, H. [\(1986\)](#page-4-0). A homogeneity test applied to precipitation data. *Journal of Climatology*, *6*(6), 661–675. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3370060607>
- <span id="page-13-14"></span>Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., Smith, M., & A B W. [\(1998\)](#page-4-1). *Crop evapotranspiration - guidelines for computing crop water requirements - FAO irrigation and drainage paper 56*. *Irrigation and drainage*. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2010.12.001)  [1016/j.eja.2010.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2010.12.001)
- <span id="page-13-19"></span>Amini, M. A., Torkan, G., Eslamian, S., Zareian, M. J., & Adamowski, J. F. ([2019](#page-6-0)). Analysis of deterministic and geostatistical interpolation techniques for mapping meteorological variables at large watershed scales. *Acta Geophysica*, *67*(1), 275–275. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-018-0235-x)  [s11600-018-0235-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-018-0235-x)
- <span id="page-13-8"></span>Ashraf, H., Qamar, S., Riaz, N., Shamshiri, R. R., Sultan, M., Khalid, B., Ibrahim, S. M., Imran, M., & Khan, M. U. [\(2023](#page-2-0)). Spatiotemporal Estimation of Reference Evapotranspiration for Agricultural Applications in Punjab, Pakistan. *Agriculture*, *13*(7), 1388. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13071388)  [org/10.3390/agriculture13071388](https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13071388)
- <span id="page-13-15"></span>Azid, A., Juahir, H., Latif, M. T., Zain, S. M., Osman, M. R., Azid, A., Juahir, H., Latif, M. T., Zain, S. M., & Osman, M. R. [\(2013\)](#page-5-1). Feed-forward artificial neural network model for air pollutant index prediction in the southern region of Peninsular Malaysia. *Journal of Environmental Protection*, *4*(12), 1–10. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.4236/JEP.2013.412A1001)  [10.4236/JEP.2013.412A1001](https://doi.org/10.4236/JEP.2013.412A1001)
- <span id="page-13-16"></span>Azid, A., Juahir, H., Toriman, M. E., Kamarudin, M. K. A., Saudi, A. S. M., Hasnam, C. N. C., Aziz, N. A. A., Azaman, F., Latif, M. T., Zainuddin, S. F. M., Osman, M. R., & Yamin, M. [\(2014\)](#page-5-2). Prediction of the level of air pollution using principal component analysis and artificial neural network techniques: A case study in Malaysia. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*, *225*(8), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-014-2063-1>
- <span id="page-13-6"></span>Baruah, U. D., Saikia, A., & Mili, N. [\(2023](#page-2-1)). Modelling of reference crop evapotranspiration in humid-wet tropical region of India. In S. Sharma, J. C. Kuniyal, P. Chand & P.

Singh (Eds.), *Climate change adaptation, risk management and sustainable practices in the Himalaya* (pp. 407–417). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24659-3_17) [24659-3\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24659-3_17) .

- <span id="page-13-12"></span>Batchelor, C. H., & Roberts, J. ([1983\)](#page-4-2). Evaporation from the irrigation water, foliage and panicles of paddy rice in north-east Sri Lanka. *Agricultural Meteorology*, *29*(1), 11–26. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-1571\(83\)90072-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-1571(83)90072-9)
- <span id="page-13-0"></span>Behboudian, M., Kerachian, R., Motlaghzadeh, K., & Ashrafi, S. ([2021](#page-1-2)). Evaluating water resources management scenarios considering the hierarchical structure of decision-makers and ecosystem services-based criteria. *Science of the Total Environment*, *751*, 141759. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141759) [doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141759](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141759)
- <span id="page-13-13"></span>Bernadette, I. C., Moses, A. O., & Martin, I. O. [\(2014\)](#page-4-2). Evaluation of evapotranspiration using FAO penman-monteith method in Kano Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Technology*, *3*(11), 698–703. [https://scholar.google.com/citations?view\\_op=](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation%26hl=en%26user=t6VSHxaeLV0C%26citation_for_view=t6VSHxaeLV0C:4TOpqqG69KYC) [view\\_citation&hl=en&user=t6VSHxaeLV0C&citation\\_](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation%26hl=en%26user=t6VSHxaeLV0C%26citation_for_view=t6VSHxaeLV0C:4TOpqqG69KYC) [for\\_view=t6VSHxaeLV0C:4TOpqqG69KYC](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation%26hl=en%26user=t6VSHxaeLV0C%26citation_for_view=t6VSHxaeLV0C:4TOpqqG69KYC)
- <span id="page-13-4"></span>Biazar, S. M., Dinpashoh, Y., & Singh, V. P. ([2019\)](#page-2-2). Sensitivity analysis of the reference crop evapotranspiration in a humid region. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *26*(31), 32517–32544. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-06419-w) [10.1007/s11356-019-06419-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-06419-w)
- <span id="page-13-22"></span>Biswas, A. K. [\(2011](#page-12-0)). Cooperation or conflict in transboundary water management: Case study of South Asia. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, *56*(4), 662–670. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2011.572886) [doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2011.572886](https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2011.572886)
- <span id="page-13-18"></span>Breiman, L. [\(2001\)](#page-5-3). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, *45*  (1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- <span id="page-13-11"></span>Buishand, T. A. ([1982](#page-4-0)). Some methods for testing the homogeneity of rainfall records. *Journal of Hydrology*, *58*(1), 11–27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(82\)90066-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(82)90066-X)
- <span id="page-13-2"></span>Cabral Júnior, J. B., Silva, C. M. S. E., de Almeida, H. A., Bezerra, B. G., & Spyrides, M. H. C. ([2019\)](#page-1-3). Detecting linear trend of reference evapotranspiration in irrigated farming areas in Brazil's semiarid region. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, *138*(1–2), 215–225. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-019-02816-w) [10.1007/s00704-019-02816-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-019-02816-w)
- <span id="page-13-17"></span>Chaloulakou, A., Grivas, G., & Spyrellis, N. ([2003\)](#page-5-2). Neural network and multiple regression models for PM10 prediction in Athens: A comparative assessment. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, *53*(10), 1183–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10473289.2003.10466276>
- <span id="page-13-3"></span>Chen, J., Zhang, J., Peng, J., Zou, L., Fan, Y., Yang, F., & Hu, Z. ([2023](#page-1-4)). Alp-valley and elevation effects on the reference evapotranspiration and the dominant climate controls in Red River Basin, China: Insights from geographical differentiation. *Journal of Hydrology*, *620*, 129397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.129397>
- <span id="page-13-9"></span>Cheshmberah, F., & Zolfaghari, A. A. [\(2019](#page-2-3)). The effect of climate change on future reference evapotranspiration in different climatic zones of Iran. *Pure & Applied Geophysics*, *176*(8), 3649–3664. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-019-02148-w) [s00024-019-02148-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-019-02148-w)
- <span id="page-13-1"></span>Dai, A. [\(2021\)](#page-1-5). Hydroclimatic trends during 1950–2018 over global land. *Climate Dynamics*, *56*(11–12), 4027–4049. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05684-1>
- <span id="page-13-20"></span>Das, S. [\(2019](#page-6-0)). Extreme rainfall estimation at ungauged sites: Comparison between region-of-influence approach of regional analysis and spatial interpolation technique. *International Journal of Climatology*, *39*(1), 407–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5819>
- <span id="page-13-5"></span>Dinpashoh, Y., & Babamiri, O. ([2020\)](#page-2-2). Trends in reference crop evapotranspiration in Urmia Lake basin. *Arabian*

*Journal of Geosciences*, *13*(10), 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-020-05404-9)  [1007/s12517-020-05404-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-020-05404-9) 

- <span id="page-14-4"></span>Dong, Q., Wang, W., Shao, Q., Xing, W., Ding, Y., & Fu, J. [\(2020\)](#page-2-4). The response of reference evapotranspiration to climate change in Xinjiang, China: Historical changes, driving forces, and future projections. *International Journal of Climatology*, *40*(1), 235–254. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6206)  [10.1002/joc.6206](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6206)
- <span id="page-14-18"></span>Elbeltagi, A., Kumari, N., Dharpure, J. K., Mokhtar, A., Alsafadi, K., Kumar, M., Mehdinejadiani, B., Ramezani Etedali, H., Brouziyne, Y., Towfiqul Islam, A. R. M., & Kuriqi, A. ([2021](#page-4-3)). Prediction of combined terrestrial evapotranspiration index (CTEI) over Large River Basin Based on machine learning approaches. *Water*, *13*(4), e547. <https://doi.org/10.3390/W13040547>
- <span id="page-14-0"></span>Fan, J., Ma, X., Wu, L., Zhang, F., Yu, X., & Zeng, W. ([2019](#page-1-6)). Light gradient boosting machine: An efficient soft computing model for estimating daily reference evapotranspiration with local and external meteorological data. *Agricultural Water Management*, *225*, 105758. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.105758)  [doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.105758](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.105758)
- <span id="page-14-13"></span>FAO. ([2024\)](#page-2-5). *FAO penman-monteith equation*. FAO Penman-Monteith Equation. [https://www.fao.org/3/](https://www.fao.org/3/x0490e/x0490e06.htm)  [x0490e/x0490e06.htm](https://www.fao.org/3/x0490e/x0490e06.htm)
- <span id="page-14-22"></span>Ferreira, L. B., da Cunha, F. F., de Oliveira, R. A., & Fernandes Filho, E. I. ([2019\)](#page-11-2). Estimation of reference evapotranspiration in Brazil with limited meteorological data using ANN and SVM–A new approach. *Journal of Hydrology*, *572*, 556–570. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhy](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.03.028)  [drol.2019.03.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.03.028)
- <span id="page-14-5"></span>Ferreira, L. B., da Cunha, F. F., & Fernandes Filho, E. I. [\(2022\)](#page-2-6). Exploring machine learning and multi-task learning to estimate meteorological data and reference evapotranspiration across Brazil. *Agricultural Water Management*, *259*, 107281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.107281)  [agwat.2021.107281](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.107281)
- <span id="page-14-2"></span>Fu, J., Gong, Y., Zheng, W., Zou, J., Zhang, M., Zhang, Z., Qin, J., Liu, J., & Quan, B. [\(2022\)](#page-1-7). Spatial-temporal variations of terrestrial evapotranspiration across China from 2000 to 2019. *Science of the Total Environment*, *825*, 153951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153951>
- <span id="page-14-19"></span>Heramb, P., Ramana Rao, K. V., Subeesh, A., & Srivastava, A. ([2023](#page-4-3)). Predictive modelling of reference evapotranspiration using machine learning models<br>coupled with Grey Wolf Optimizer. Water coupled with Grey Wolf Optimizer. *Water (Switzerland)*, *15*(5), 856. [https://doi.org/10.3390/](https://doi.org/10.3390/w15050856)  [w15050856](https://doi.org/10.3390/w15050856)
- <span id="page-14-20"></span>Hodam, S., Sarkar, S., Marak, A. G. R., Bandyopadhyay, A., & Bhadra, A. [\(2017\)](#page-6-1). Spatial interpolation of reference evapotranspiration in India: Comparison of IDW and Kriging methods. *Journal of the Institution of Engineers (India): Series A*, *98*(4), 511–524. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40030-017-0241-z)  [s40030-017-0241-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40030-017-0241-z)
- <span id="page-14-12"></span>Hwang, J. H., Azam, M., Jin, M. S., Kang, Y. H., Lee, J. E., Latif, M., Ahmed, R., Umar, M., & Hashmi, M. Z. ([2020](#page-2-7)). Spatiotemporal trends in reference evapotranspiration over South Korea. *Paddy and Water Environment*, *18*(1), 235–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10333-019-00777-4>
- <span id="page-14-14"></span>Ikram, R. M. A., Mostafa, R. R., Chen, Z., Islam, A. R. M. T., Kisi, O., Kuriqi, A., & Zounemat-Kermani, M. ([2023](#page-2-8)). Advanced hybrid metaheuristic machine learning models application for reference crop evapotranspiration prediction. *Agronomy*, *13*(1), 98. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy13010098)  [3390/agronomy13010098](https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy13010098)
- <span id="page-14-8"></span>Jerin, J. N., Islam, H. M. T., Islam, A. R. M. T., Shahid, S., Hu, Z., Badhan, M. A., Chu, R., & Elbeltagi, A. ([2021](#page-2-9)). Spatiotemporal trends in reference evapotranspiration

and its driving factors in Bangladesh. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, *144*(1), 793–808. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03566-4) [1007/s00704-021-03566-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03566-4) 

- <span id="page-14-1"></span>Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Ciais, P., Seneviratne, S. I., Sheffield, J., Goulden, M. L., Bonan, G., Cescatti, A., Chen, J., De Jeu, R., Dolman, A. J., Eugster, W., Gerten, D., Gianelle, D., Gobron, N., Heinke, J., Kimball, J., Law, B. E. . . . Zaehle, S. [\(2010](#page-1-8)). Recent decline in the global land evapotranspiration trend due to limited moisture supply. *Nature*, *467*(7318), 951–954. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09396) [org/10.1038/nature09396](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09396)
- <span id="page-14-24"></span>Kabir, M. H., & Hossen, M. N. ([2019\)](#page-12-1). Impacts of flood and its possible solution in Bangladesh. *Disaster Advances*, *12*  (10), 48–57.
- <span id="page-14-21"></span>Kamal, A. S. M., Hossain, F., & Shahid, S. ([2021\)](#page-8-0). Spatiotemporal changes in rainfall and droughts of Bangladesh for 1. 5 and 2° C temperature rise scenarios of CMIP6 models. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, *146*(1), 527–542. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03735-5) [03735-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03735-5)
- <span id="page-14-10"></span>Kamruzzaman, M., Hwang, S., Cho, J., Jang, M. W., & Jeong, H. ([2019](#page-2-10)). Evaluating the spatiotemporal characteristics of agricultural drought in Bangladesh using effective drought index. *Water*, *11*(12), 2437. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.3390/W11122437) [10.3390/W11122437](https://doi.org/10.3390/W11122437)
- <span id="page-14-9"></span>Katerji, N., & Rana, G. ([2011\)](#page-2-11). Crop reference evapotranspiration: A discussion of the concept, analysis of the process and validation. *Water Resources Management*, *25*(6), 1581–1600. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-010-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-010-9762-1) [9762-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-010-9762-1)
- <span id="page-14-16"></span>Kendall, M. G. ([1975](#page-4-4)). *Rank correlation methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- <span id="page-14-3"></span>Kitsara, G., Papaioannou, G., Papathanasiou, A., & Retalis, A. [\(2013](#page-1-9)). Dimming/Brightening in Athens: Trends in sunshine duration, cloud cover and reference evapotranspiration. *Water Resources Management*, *27*(6), 1623–1633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-012-0229-4>
- <span id="page-14-23"></span>Kousari, M. R., & Ahani, H. ([2012\)](#page-11-3). An investigation on reference crop evapotranspiration trend from 1975 to 2005 in Iran. *International Journal of Climatology*, *32*  (15), 2387–2402. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3404>
- <span id="page-14-15"></span>Kumari, A., Upadhyaya, A., Jeet, P., Al-Ansari, N., Rajput, J., Sundaram, P. K., Saurabh, K., Prakash, V., Singh, A. K., Raman, R. K., Gaddikeri, V., & Kuriqi, A. ([2022\)](#page-2-8). Estimation of actual evapotranspiration and crop coefficient of transplanted puddled rice using a modified non-weighing Paddy Lysimeter. *Agronomy*, *12*(11), e2850. <https://doi.org/10.3390/AGRONOMY12112850>
- <span id="page-14-7"></span>Li, M., Chu, R., Shen, S., & Islam, A. R. M. ([2018\)](#page-2-12). Quantifying climatic impact on reference evapotranspiration trends in the Huai River Basin of eastern China. *Water*, *10*(2), 144. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w10020144>
- <span id="page-14-6"></span>Lin, P., He, Z., Du, J., Chen, L., Zhu, X., & Li, J. ([2018\)](#page-2-13). Impacts of climate change on reference evapotranspiration in the Qilian Mountains of China: Historical trends and projected changes. *International Journal of Climatology*, *38*(7), 2980–2993. [https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5477) [joc.5477](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5477)
- <span id="page-14-11"></span>Mainuddin, M., Kirby, M., Chowdhury, R. A. R., & Shah-Newaz, S. M. [\(2015](#page-2-14)). Spatial and temporal variations of, and the impact of climate change on, the dry season crop irrigation requirements in Bangladesh. *Irrigation Science*, *33*(2), 107–120. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-014-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-014-0451-3) [0451-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-014-0451-3)
- <span id="page-14-17"></span>Mann, H. B. ([1945\)](#page-4-4). Nonparametric tests against trend. *Econometrica*, *13*(3), 245. [https://doi.org/10.2307/](https://doi.org/10.2307/1907187) [1907187](https://doi.org/10.2307/1907187)
- <span id="page-15-5"></span>Mao, K., Yuan, Z., Zuo, Z., Xu, T., Shen, X., & Gao, C. [\(2019\)](#page-1-10). Changes in global cloud cover based on remote sensing data from 2003 to 2012. *Chinese Geographical Science*, *29*(2), 306–315. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11769-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11769-019-1030-6)  [019-1030-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11769-019-1030-6)
- <span id="page-15-4"></span>Matuszko, D. [\(2012](#page-1-11)). Influence of the extent and genera of cloud cover on solar radiation intensity. *International Journal of Climatology*, *32*(15), 2403–2414. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2432)  [org/10.1002/joc.2432](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2432)
- <span id="page-15-8"></span>McEvoy, D. J., Pierce, D. W., Kalansky, J. F., Cayan, D. R., & Abatzoglou, J. T. [\(2020\)](#page-2-15). Projected changes in reference evapotranspiration in California and Nevada: Implications for drought and wildland fire danger. *Earth's Future*, *8*(11), e2020EF001736. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001736)  [10.1029/2020EF001736](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001736)
- <span id="page-15-19"></span>Meris, P. R., Dimaunahan, E., Dela Cruz, J. C., Fadchar, N. A., Manuel, M. C., Bonaobra, J. C. C., Ranosa, F. J. I., Mangaoang, J. L. D., & Reyes, P. C. [\(2020\)](#page-5-4). IOT based - automated indoor air quality and LPG leak detection control system using support vector machine. *2020 11th IEEE Control and System Graduate Research Colloquium, ICSGRC 2020 - Proceedings*, Shah Alam, Malaysia (pp. 231–235). [https://doi.org/10.1109/](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSGRC49013.2020.9232472)  [ICSGRC49013.2020.9232472](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSGRC49013.2020.9232472) .
- <span id="page-15-3"></span>Mishra, A. K. [\(2019\)](#page-1-12). Investigating changes in cloud cover using the long‐term record of precipitation extremes. *Meteorological Applications*, *26*(1), 108–116. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1002/met.1745)  [org/10.1002/met.1745](https://doi.org/10.1002/met.1745)
- <span id="page-15-17"></span>Mortuza, M. R., Moges, E., Demissie, Y., & Li, H. Y. ([2019](#page-4-5)). Historical and future drought in Bangladesh using copula-based bivariate regional frequency analysis. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, *135*(3–4), 855–871. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-018-2407-7>
- <span id="page-15-18"></span>Moustris, K. P., Ziomas, I. C., & Paliatsos, A. G. ([2010](#page-5-1)). 3-day-ahead forecasting of regional pollution index for the pollutants NO2, CO, SO2, and O3 using artificial neural networks in Athens, Greece. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*, *209*(1–4), 29–43. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-009-0179-5)  [s11270-009-0179-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-009-0179-5)
- <span id="page-15-6"></span>Ndiaye, P. M., Bodian, A., Diop, L., Deme, A., Dezetter, A., Djaman, K., & Ogilvie, A. ([2020\)](#page-1-4). Trend and sensitivity analysis of reference evapotranspiration in the Senegal river basin using NASA meteorological data. *Water*, *12*  (7), 1957. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w12071957>
- <span id="page-15-22"></span>Ozelkan, E., Bagis, S., Ozelkan, E. C., Ustundag, B. B., Yucel, M., & Ormeci, C. [\(2015](#page-6-2)). Spatial interpolation of climatic variables using land surface temperature and modified inverse distance weighting. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, *36*(4), 1000–1025. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2015.1007248)  [org/10.1080/01431161.2015.1007248](https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2015.1007248)
- <span id="page-15-0"></span>Pereira, L. S., Paredes, P., & Jovanovic, N. ([2020](#page-1-13)). Soil water balance models for determining crop water and irrigation requirements and irrigation scheduling focusing on the FAO56 method and the dual kc approach. *Agricultural Water Management*, *241*, 106357. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106357)  [1016/j.agwat.2020.106357](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106357)
- <span id="page-15-9"></span>Pour, S. H., Wahab, A. K. A., Shahid, S., & Ismail, Z. B. [\(2020\)](#page-2-16). Changes in reference evapotranspiration and its driving factors in Peninsular Malaysia. *Atmospheric Research*, *246*, 105096. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2020.105096)  [atmosres.2020.105096](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2020.105096)
- <span id="page-15-21"></span>Quej, V. H., Almorox, J., Arnaldo, J. A., & Moratiel, R. [\(2019](#page-5-5)). Evaluation of temperature-based methods for the estimation of reference evapotranspiration in the Yucatán peninsula, Mexico. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, *24*(2), 5018029. [https://doi.org/10.1061/](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0001747)  [\(ASCE\)HE.1943-5584.0001747](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0001747)
- <span id="page-15-23"></span>Rahman, M. A., Yunsheng, L., Sultana, N., & Ongoma, V. ([2019](#page-11-3)). Analysis of reference evapotranspiration (ET0) trends under climate change in Bangladesh using observed and CMIP5 data sets. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, *131*(3), 639–655. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00703-018-0596-3) [1007/s00703-018-0596-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00703-018-0596-3)
- <span id="page-15-11"></span>Rahman, M. N., Anowerul, S., Akter, F., Hasan, R., Ahmad, B., & Rouf, A. [\(2023\)](#page-2-17). Quantification of rainfall, temperature, and reference evapotranspiration trend and their interrelationship in sub-climatic zones of Bangladesh. *Heliyon Elsevier*, *9*(9), e19559. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19559) [org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19559](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e19559)
- <span id="page-15-13"></span>Rahman, M. N., & Azim, S. A. ([2021a](#page-2-7)). Meteorological drought in Bangladesh using standardized precipitation index: A spatiotemporal approach. *The Dhaka University Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences*, *10*(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3329/dujees.v10i3.59067>
- <span id="page-15-12"></span>Rahman, M. N., & Azim, S. A. [\(2021b\)](#page-2-18). Spatiotemporal evaluation of rainfall trend during 1979-2019 in seven climatic zones of Bangladesh. *Geology, Ecology & Landscapes*, *7*(4), 340–355. [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/24749508.2021.2022425) [24749508.2021.2022425](https://doi.org/10.1080/24749508.2021.2022425)
- <span id="page-15-10"></span>Rahman, M., Rony, N., Md, R. H., & Jannat, F. A. ([2021\)](#page-2-14). Spatiotemporal evaluation of drought trend during 1979–2019 in seven climatic zones of Bangladesh. *Heliyon Elsevier*, *7*(11), e08249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08249) [heliyon.2021.e08249](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08249)
- <span id="page-15-2"></span>Rajput, J., Singh, M., Lal, K., Khanna, M., Sarangi, A., Mukherjee, J., & Singh, S. ([2024](#page-1-14)). Data-driven reference evapotranspiration (ET0) estimation: A comparative study of regression and machine learning techniques. *Environment, Development, and Sustainability*, *26*(5), 12679–12706. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03978-4) [03978-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03978-4)
- <span id="page-15-7"></span>Ramachandra, J. T., Veerappa, S. R. N., & Udupi, D. A. ([2022\)](#page-1-15). Assessment of spatiotemporal variability and trend analysis of reference crop evapotranspiration for the southern region of Peninsular India. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(28), 41953–41970. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-15958-0>
- <span id="page-15-15"></span>Sahoo, B., Walling, I., Deka, B. C., & Bhatt, B. P. ([2012\)](#page-2-19). Standardization of reference evapotranspiration models for a subhumid valley rangeland in the Eastern Himalayas. *Journal of Irrigation & Drainage Engineering*, *138*(10), 880–895. [https://doi.org/10.1061/](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IR.1943-4774.0000476) [\(ASCE\)IR.1943-4774.0000476](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IR.1943-4774.0000476)
- <span id="page-15-20"></span>Salam, R., & Islam, A. R. M. T. [\(2020\)](#page-5-4). Potential of RT, bagging and RS ensemble learning algorithms for reference evapotranspiration prediction using climatic datalimited humid region in Bangladesh. In *Journal of hydrology* (Vol. 590). Elsevier B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhy](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125241) [drol.2020.125241](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125241)
- <span id="page-15-14"></span>Salam, R., Islam, A. R. M. T., Pham, Q. B., Dehghani, M., Al-Ansari, N., & Linh, N. T. T. ([2020](#page-2-20)). The optimal alternative for quantifying reference evapotranspiration in climatic sub-regions of Bangladesh. *Scientific Reports*, *10*  (1), 20171. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-77183-y>
- <span id="page-15-1"></span>Salam, R., Towfiqul Islam, A. R. M., & Islam, S. [\(2020\)](#page-1-16). Spatiotemporal distribution and prediction of groundwater level linked to ENSO teleconnection indices in the northwestern region of Bangladesh. *Environment, Development, and Sustainability*, *22*(5), 4509–4535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-019-00395-4>
- <span id="page-15-16"></span>Sen, P. K. ([1968\)](#page-4-6). Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall's tau. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *63*(324). [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1968.10480934) [01621459.1968.10480934](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1968.10480934)
- <span id="page-16-5"></span>Srivastava, A., Sahoo, B., Raghuwanshi, N. S., & Chatterjee, C. [\(2018](#page-2-19)). Modelling the dynamics of evapotranspiration using variable infiltration capacity model and regionally calibrated Hargreaves approach. *Irrigation Science*, *36*(4–5), 289–300. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-018-0583-y)  [1007/s00271-018-0583-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00271-018-0583-y)
- <span id="page-16-0"></span>Wang, X., Liu, H., Zhang, L., & Zhang, R. ([2014\)](#page-1-9). Climate change trend and its effects on reference evapotranspiration at Linhe Station, Hetao Irrigation District. *Water Science & Engineering*, *7*(3), 250–266.
- <span id="page-16-4"></span>Wang, Z., Xie, P., Lai, C., Chen, X., Wu, X., Zeng, Z., & Li, J. [\(2017\)](#page-2-21). Spatiotemporal variability of reference evapotranspiration and contributing climatic factors in China during 1961–2013. *Journal of Hydrology*, *544*, 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.11.021>
- <span id="page-16-6"></span>Wen, X., Si, J., He, Z., Wu, J., Shao, H., & Yu, H. ([2015](#page-11-4)). Support-vector-machine-based models for modeling daily reference evapotranspiration with limited climatic

data in extreme arid regions. *Water Resources Management*, *29*(9), 3195–3209. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-015-0990-2) [s11269-015-0990-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-015-0990-2) 

- <span id="page-16-1"></span>Xing, W., Wang, W., Shao, Q., Yu, Z., Yang, T., & Fu, J. ([2016](#page-1-9)). Periodic fluctuation of reference evapotranspiration during the past five decades: Does evaporation paradox really exist in China? *Scientific Reports*, *6*(1), 1–12. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39503) [srep39503](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39503)
- <span id="page-16-2"></span>Yassen, A. N., Nam, W.-H., & Hong, E.-M. ([2020\)](#page-2-22). Impact of climate change on reference evapotranspiration in Egypt. *Catena*, *194*, 104711. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104711) [catena.2020.104711](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104711)
- <span id="page-16-3"></span>Zhang, X., Wang, L., & Chen, D. ([2019](#page-2-12)). How does temporal trend of reference evapotranspiration over the Tibetan plateau change with elevation? *International Journal of Climatology*, *39*(4), 2295–2305. [https://doi.org/10.1002/](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5951) [joc.5951](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5951)