

Proceeding Paper

Estimating the Potential Evapotranspiration of Egypt Using a Regional Climate Model and a High-Resolution Reanalysis Dataset [†]

Samy Ashraf Anwar ^{1,*} and Irida Lazić ²

¹ Egyptian Meteorological Authority, Qobry EL-Kobba, Cairo P.O. Box 11784, Egypt

² Faculty of Physics, Institute for Meteorology, University of Belgrade, Dobračina 16, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia; irida.lazic@ff.bg.ac.rs

* Correspondence: ratesamy@yahoo.com

† Presented at the 7th International Electronic Conference on Water Sciences, 15–30 March 2023; Available online: <https://ecws-7.sciforum.net>.

Abstract: Station observation is a good data source to monitor the potential evapotranspiration (PET) changes of a specific site particularly for the purpose of crop irrigation activities; however it represents only the site geographic characteristics and provides real time/historical records. Hence, there was an urgent need to find a promising tool and a simple empirical to predict/project the PET in locations where station observation is not feasible. The Hargreaves–Samani method (HS) is recommended after the Penman–Monteith equation. To address this issue, the Regional Climate Modeling version 4 (RegCM4) with spatial resolution 25-km was used to compute the PET using the HS for the period 1979–2017. Era-Interim reanalysis of 1.5 degrees (EIN15) and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis version 2 of 1.8 degrees (NNRP2) were used to examine the influence of the lateral boundary condition on the simulated PET. The two simulations were designated as EIN15-RegCM4 and NNRP2-RegCM4 respectively. To examine the possible influences on the simulated PET, a comparison was conducted between EIN15-RegCM4 and NNRP2-RegCM4. After that, a comparison was conducted between the original HS formula (HS) and its calibrated version (HS_{new}) with respect to the 0.1 degree ERA5-land derived reanalysis product (hereafter ERA5) using EIN15-RegCM4. Results showed switching between EIN15 and NNRP2 didn't show a notable influence on the simulated PET. Further, calibrating the HS coefficients indicate a considerable improvement in estimating the PET (relative to the original equation) when it is compared with ERA5. Such improvement is confirmed by a significant low mean bias. Over majority of locations, the RegCM4 shows a good performance using the calibrated HS equation. In conclusion, the RegCM4 can be used to estimate the PET using the calibrated HS either for making a daily forecast or projecting the future PET under different global warming scenarios.

Keywords: Egypt; ERA-Interim; regional climate model; potential evapotranspiration; ERA5

Citation: Anwar, S.A.; Lazić, I. Estimating the Potential Evapotranspiration of Egypt Using a Regional Climate Model and a High-Resolution Reanalysis Dataset. *Environ. Sci. Proc.* **2023**, *5*, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Academic Editor: Firstname Last-name

Published: 15 March 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Potential evapotranspiration (PET) plays an important role in the global terrestrial hydrology cycle. Also, PET is used for calculating the water needs of different crops and assessing hydrological and meteorological droughts, water balance analysis, and designing and operating irrigation projects [1]. Ref. [2] reported that, Penman–Monteith (PM) equation is the standard model to compute the PET on various time scales. However, ref. [3] reported that computing PET (using PM) is not recommended for arid/hyper-arid regions because it requires surplus of soil moisture and it requires large number of meteorological variables leading to amplifying the uncertainty of the estimated PET.

PET can be computed using simple empirical models such as: temperature-based method [4,5], radiation-based method [6] and physically processed-based models (e.g., [2]). Ref. [2] reported that Hargreaves-Samani (HS) can be recommended directly after PM and it can operate on daily/monthly time scales. Estimating the PET (using HS equation) showed a reliable performance in computing the PET with respect to observations as reported by [7,8]. Further, calibrating the HS showed a reliable performance in computing the PET with respect to PM observations [9–11]. Recently, ref. [3] calibrated the regional climate model (RegCM4) output using Climate Research Unit (CRU) and linear regression model (LRM) at specific locations. However, calibrating the coefficients of the HS equation over Egypt and role of lateral boundary condition (used to downscale the RegCM4) in simulating the PET weren't conducted till present day. Therefore, the present study aims to:

1. Examine the influence of lateral boundary condition (EIN15 and NNRP2) on the simulated PET with respect to ERA5-land derived product (hereafter ERA5; [12]).
2. Address the added value of the calibrated HS equation (relative to the original version) in comparison with the ERA5.
3. Validate the calibrated HS equation (versus the original version) by examining the climatological annual cycle of the simulated PET with respect to ERA5 at locations defined by [3].

Section 2 describes the study area and experiment design; Section 3 shows the results of the study. Section 4 provides the discussion and conclusion.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

A brief description of the study area is available in ref. [3]; model domain dimension is covered in Section 2.2.

2.2. Model Description and Experiment Design

This study used the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP) regional climate model version 4.7 (hereafter RegCM-4.7.0; [13]). The RegCM is a broad community used it for conducting long term simulations and future regional climate projections in Intercomparison projects [14]. To address the influence of the lateral boundary condition on the simulated PET, two experiments were conducted over the period 1979–2017. The first two years were considered as spin-up to properly initialize the RegCM4 model as in [15], so the actual analysis starts at 1981 and ends at 2017. The two experiments adopted both ERA-Interim reanalysis of 1.5 degrees (EIN15; [16]) and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis version 2 of 1.8 degrees (NNRP2; [17]) to downscale the RegCM4 model. The RegCM4 model domain (Figure 1) was customized with grid spacing of 25 km with 60 grid points in both zonal and meridional directions centered at 27° latitude and 30° longitude. Also, the following physical schemes were used in the present study: Emanuel convection scheme over land and ocean [18], radiation scheme of [19] and Holtslag boundary layer scheme [20]. The simulated PET was calculated using the default HS equation as:

$$PET_{HS} = 0.0135 \times SW \times (T2m + 17.8) \tag{1}$$

The calibrated version is written as

$$PET_{HS} = 0.0105 \times SW \times (T2m + 17.8) \tag{2}$$

Several attempts have been done to obtain a reasonable bias of the calibrated HS equation (using ERA5 as the observational dataset). It was found that swtiching the radiation coefficient from 0.0135 to 0.0105 gave promising results more than calibrating the temperature coefficient (17.8). Note that SW (global incident solar radiation) is expressed in units of mm day⁻¹ to show how much energy is used to evaporate water [2] and T2m is the 2-m mean air temperature (in °C).




Figure 1. The figure shows the domain dimension and surface elevation (in meters). Please note that the RegCM4 model only supports elevation above mean sea level.

2.3. Validation Data

Various reanalysis products were used to evaluate the RegCM4 performance:

1. ERA5 ([21]): it provides hourly estimates of a large number of atmospheric, land and oceanic climate variables with 0.25° horizontal grid spacing and 137 vertical levels (up to a height of 80 km). For the purpose of the present study, monthly means were aggregated to the seasonal time scale.
2. ERA5land ([22]): this product provides the surface meteorological variables at high-resolution (0.1 degrees) using the land surface model of the ERA5 (tiled ECMWF Scheme for Surface Exchanges over Land incorporating land surface hydrology; H-TESSEL).

Please note that both ERA5 and ERA5land were used to evaluate the simulated SW and T2m of the RegCM4 (since these fields were used as inputs of the HS equation) to take into account the influence of the horizontal grid spacing of the reanalysis product.

3. Station observation is a major source to monitor the PET changes both spatially and temporary. However, availability of long-term record wasn't feasible to evaluate the RegCM4 performance (before and after calibrating the HS equation) in this study. Recently, a new high-resolution global gridded PET (hPET) product was developed [12]. This product uses the hourly meteorological variables provided by the offline land model of the ERA5 reanalysis product [21]. Also, it adopts the PM equation to compute the PET and it is integrated over the period 1981–2021 in 0.1 degree grid spacing over the global land area. In the present study, monthly mean PET data was used to evaluate the RegCM4 performance both spatially and for locations defined by [3] in the Introduction Section.

For the purpose of the present study, all products were bilinearly interpolated on the RegCM4 curvilinear grid following [10,15].

3. Results

Before assessing the performance of the RegCM4 (in simulating the PET), it is important to quantify the RegCM4 model bias concerning the simulated SW and T2m (as inputs of the HS equation). Figure S1 shows the simulated SW with respect to ERA5 and ERA5land as well as the difference between ERA5 and ERA5land themselves for the seasons: March-April-May (MAM), June-July-August (JJA), September-October-November (SON) and December-January-February (DJF). From Figure S1, it can be noticed that the RegCM4 is able to reproduce the spatial pattern of the SW with respect to ERA5 and ERA5land in all seasons (Figure S1a–c,g–i,m–o,s–u). Also, the RegCM4 overestimates the SW in the MAM season by 10–30 W m⁻² (Figure S1d,e). In the JJA and SON, the RegCM4 bias ranges from 20 to 40 W m⁻² (Figure S1 j,k,p,q). Lastly in the DJF; the RegCM4 bias

becomes 10–20 $W m^{-2}$ with respect to both products (Figure S1 v,w). Further, there is no noted difference between ERA5 and ERA5land in all seasons (Figure S1 f,l,r,x). It can be noted that the RegCM4 bias is maximized in the JJA and SON and it is minimized in the DJF.

Like SW, the RegCM4 shows a good ability to capture the spatial pattern of the simulated T2m with respect to reanalysis products in all seasons (Figure S2 a–c,g–i,m–o,s–u). Also, there is no observable difference between ERA5 and ERA5land (Figure S2 f,l,r,x); which means that resolution of the observational dataset doesn't affect the evaluation of the RegCM4. In addition, obvious warm-bias is noted in all seasons ranging from 3 to 7 °C (Figure S2d,e,j,k,p,q,v,w) with mostly pronounced warm bias during the summer. Such noted bias can be attributed to the fact that land-cover of Egypt is mostly represented as desert leading to a low specific/relative humidity. As a result, the convective activity is affected producing low total cloud cover (not shown), high SW approaching the earth surface and eventually warming the earth surface and adjacent air layer close to the earth surface. Another possible reason is that Holtslag scheme is characterized by high-turbulent activity leading to enhancement of the warming effect produced by the SW.

3.1. Influence of Lateral Boundary Condition

To examine the influence of the lateral boundary condition on the simulated PET, equation 1 was used to compute the simulated PET. Figure 2 shows the simulated PET (by the EIN15-RegCM4 and NNRP2-RegCM4 respectively) with respect to the ERA5. From Figure 2, it can be noted that the RegCM4 shows a good consistence in reproducing the spatial pattern of the simulated PET in comparison with the ERA5 product (see Figure 2 a–c; g–i; m–o; s–u). Also, it can be observed that there is no significant difference between EIN15 and NNRP2 in all seasons (Figure 2 f,l,r,x). Such behavior can be attributed to two reasons: 1—RegCM4 has a similar performance when it is driven either by EIN15 or NNRP2 [23] and 2—RegCM4 physical parameterization dominates over the lateral boundary condition [24]. In addition, it can be observed that both simulations have a bias of 1–2.5 $mm day^{-1}$ in the March-April-May season (MAM; Figure 2 d,e).

The bias approaches its maximum in the June-July-August season because the RegCM4 shows a bias of 1–4.5 $mm day^{-1}$ overall Egypt (JJA; Figure 2 j,k). In the September-October-November (SON) season, the bias ranges between 1–3 $mm day^{-1}$ over coastal regions and middle Egypt and 1–1.5 $mm day^{-1}$ over Upper Egypt (see Figure 2 p,q). Lastly in the December-January-February (DJF), the bias is around 0.5–2 $mm day^{-1}$ over majority of Egypt (Figure 2 v,w). A simple check between Figures S1, S2 and 2; it can be noted that the PET spatial pattern is more consistent with the SW than T2m. Therefore, calibrating the SW coefficient is more effective than T2m (see equation 2). This point will be discussed briefly in Section 3.2.




Figure 2. The figure shows the potential evapotranspiration over the period 1981–2017 (PET; in mm day^{-1}) for: MAM season in the first row (a–f); JJA in the second (g–l); SON in the third (m–r), DJF in the fourth (s–x). For each row, EIN15 is on the left, followed by NNRP2. ERA5 is in the third from left, EIN15 minus ERA5, NNRP2 minus ERA5 and the difference between NNRP2 and EIN15. Significant difference/bias is indicated in black dots using student *t*-test with alpha equals to 5%.

3.2. Added Value of the Calibrated HS Equation

As noted in Section 3.1, that there is no significant difference between the two simulations. Therefore, the RegCM4–EIN15 simulation was taken as an example to examine the added value of the calibrated HS equation compared to ERA5. Figure 3 shows the simulated PET before calibration (HS), after calibration (HSnew) in comparison with the ERA5 and the difference between HSnew and HS. In general, both simulations are able to capture the spatial pattern of the simulated PET against the ERA5 (Figure 3a–c,g–i,m–o,s–u). However, HSnew shows added value over the HS in all seasons particularly in the JJA. Such value is indicated in two points: 1—better ability to reproduce the PET spatial pattern relative to HS and 2—the RegCM4 bias is significantly reduced in all seasons (particularly in the JJA) compared to the HS. For instance in the MAM season, the HS shows a bias of 1–2.5 mm day^{-1} overall the domain (Figure 3d). On the other hand, the HSnew shows a bias of 0.5 mm day^{-1} over majority of Egypt with some regions approaching to 0.5–1 mm day^{-1} and 0.5 to –1.5 mm day^{-1} around Lake Nasser (Figure 3e). Qualitatively, the HSnew reduces the PET by 0.6–1.2 mm day^{-1} relative to the HS (Figure 3f).

In the JJA and SON seasons, the HS overestimates the PET overall Egypt by 1–4.5 mm day^{-1} overall Egypt (see Figure 3j,p). After calibration, the HSnew reduces the PET bias to be 0.5–1.5 mm day^{-1} over the North coast of Egypt and the Western desert and –0.5

mm day⁻¹ around Lake Nasser and middle Egypt (see Figure 3k,q). From qualitative point of view, the HSnew approximately reduces the simulated PET by 1.6–2.2 mm day⁻¹ in the JJA (Figure 3l) and by 0.8–1.6 mm day⁻¹ in the SON (Figure 3r). Lastly in the DJF, it can be observed that HSnew shows its added value over the HS in the middle and upper Egypt where the bias was 0.5–2 mm day⁻¹ prior calibration (Figure 3v) and became 0.5–1 mm day⁻¹ post calibration (Figure 3w). Further, the HSnew approximately reduces the PET by 0.4–1.2 mm day⁻¹ relative to the HS (see Figure 3x). Overall, it can be noted that the added value of the HSnew (over the HS) can be arranged according to season in the following order: 1—JJA; 2—SON; 3—MAM and 4—DJF. These findings are in agreement with the results reported in Figure S1.




Figure 3. The figure shows the potential evapotranspiration over the period 1981–2017 (PET; in mm day⁻¹) for: MAM season in the first row (a–f); JJA in the second (g–l); SON in the third (m–r), DJF in the fourth (s–x). For each row, HS is on the left, followed by HSnew. ERA5 is in the third from left, HS minus ERA5, HSnew minus ERA5 and the difference between HSnew and HS. Significant difference/bias is indicated in black dots using student *t*-test with alpha equals to 5%.

To further explore the added value of the calibrated HS, the climatological annual cycle (Figure 4) of the simulated PET of the HS, HSnew (compared to ERA5) was plotted for locations reported by [3]. Only Port-Said wasn't mentioned because it shows missing values. From Figure 4, it can be observed that performance of HS/HSnew varies with location and month. For instance, the HS is close to ERA5 in months January, February, November and December; while HSnew is close to ERA5 for the rest of months in Alexandria. For Arish, Marsa-Matruh and Ismailia; HSnew is closer to ERA5 than HS. In Giza and Asswan, the situation is quite different because HS performs better than HSnew in all months. Further, HSnew shows an improved performance over HS in Assyut. Also, the situation in Luxor is similar to the one observed in Alexandria. Finally in Siwa, Dakhla and Kharga, HSnew shows an improved performance (relative to the HS) in comparison with the ERA5.




Figure 4. The figure shows the climatological annual cycle of the simulated PET for HS, HSnew compared to ERA5 for locations reported by [3].

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Potential evapotranspiration (PET) is important for monitoring hydrological, meteorological droughts as well as assessing the crop irrigation needs. Also, it is a major component in the global terrestrial hydrology cycle. Therefore, availability of long-term records of PET on a hierarchy of time scales ranging (from hourly to seasonal) is important. Ref. [2] recommends the PM model to compute the PET because it is based on the physical exchange of water and energy between vegetation and atmosphere. However, it requires a large number of meteorological variables (which may not be available for a long time for a variety of locations). Further, uncertainty of the involved meteorological variables may induce a source of uncertainty in the computed PET (and in particular if they are

derived from reanalysis products/regional climate models). In addition, it requires a surplus of soil moisture (which is not suitable for the domain of the present study). Hence, there was an urgent need to compute the PET with a simple empirical method (only needs few meteorological inputs).

Among various empirical methods, the HS model was chosen in this study because it gives a good performance with observational datasets of the PM [7–11]. However, the HS hasn't been calibrated in Egypt till today. In the present study, the regional climate model (RegCM4) was used to compute the PET comparing between the non-calibrated/calibrated HS with respect to ERA5. The influence of lateral boundary condition on the simulated PET was also examined. The results showed that switching between EIN15 and NNRP2 didn't show a considerable impact on the simulated PET (Figure 2). Spatially, the calibrated HS showed its added value (relative to the original HS model) particularly in the JJA season; such value can be seen by reduction of the PET bias with respect to the ERA5 (Figure 3). On a point-scale, the HS/HSnew performance varies with location and month (Figure S3). Nevertheless, the calibrated HS model can be recommended to construct a regional map of PET of Egypt, predict the daily PET for locations (where station observations are not available) and project the future PET under different global warming scenarios [10,15]. To ensure more robust results of the simulated PET (using the calibrated HS model); a future work will consider the following points:

1. Revising the short/longwave radiation scheme, tuning the parameters of the boundary layer scheme to possibly reduce the uncertainty of the simulated SW, T2m and eventually PET.
2. Adapting a bias-correction technique (e.g., [3]) to correct the simulated PET over location of interest.
3. Studying the influence of climate change on PET of Egypt using the calibrated HS equation [25] and CMIP5/6 simulations [10,15,26].

Supplementary Materials:

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.A.A.; methodology, S.A.A.; software, S.A.A.; validation, S.A.A.; formal analysis, S.A.A. and I.L.; investigation, S.A.A. and I.L.; resources, S.A.A.; data curation, S.A.A.; writing—original draft preparation, S.A.A. and I.L.; writing—review and editing, S.A.A. and I.L.; visualization, S.A.A.; supervision, S.A.A. and I.L.; project administration, S.A.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: Egyptian Meteorological Authority (EMA) is acknowledged for providing the computational power to conduct the model simulations. Hourly potential evapotranspiration (hPET) was retrieved from the web-link: <https://data.bris.ac.uk/data/dataset/qb8ujazzda0s2aykkv0oq0ctp>. However, the monthly mean was acquired from the authors upon request (accessed on 18 October 2022).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Abdullah, S.S.; Malek, M.A.; Abdullah, N.S.; Kisi, O.; Yap, K.S. Extreme learning machines: A new approach for prediction of reference evapotranspiration. *J. Hydrol.* **2015**, *527*, 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.04.073>.
2. Allen, G.R.; Pereira, S.L.; Raes, D.; Smith, M. *Crop Evapotranspiration: Guidelines for Computing Crop Water Requirements*; Report 56; Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO): Rome, Italy, 1998; 300p.
3. Anwar, S.A.; Salah, Z.; Khaled, W.; Zakey, A.S. Projecting the Potential Evapotranspiration in Egypt Using a High-Resolution Regional Climate Model (RegCM4). *Environ. Sci. Proc.* **2022**, *19*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ecas2022-12841>.
4. Hargreaves, G.L.; Samani, Z.A. Reference crop evapotranspiration from temperature. *Appl. Eng. Agric.* **1985**, *1*, 96–99.

5. Hargreaves, G.L.; Allen, R.G. History and evaluation of Hargreaves evapotranspiration equation. *J. Irrigat. Drain. Eng.* **2003**, *129*, 53–63.
6. Irmak, S.; Irmak, A.; Allen, R.G.; Jones, J.W. Solar and Net Radiation-Based Equations to Estimate Reference Evapotranspiration in Humid Climates. *J. Irrig. Drain. Eng.* **2003**, *129*, 5.
7. Er-Raki, S.; Chehbouni, A.; Khabba, S.; Simonneaux, V.; Jarlan, L.; Ouldbba, A.; Rodriguez, J.C.; Allen, R. Assessment of reference evapotranspiration methods in semi-arid regions: Can weather forecast data be used as alternate of ground meteorological parameters? *J. Arid. Environ.* **2010**, *74*, 1587–1596.
8. Potop, V.; Boroneant, C. *Assessment of Potential Evapotranspiration at Chisinau Station*; Mendel a Bioklimatologie: Brno, Czech Republic, 2014; pp. 3–5.
9. Sperna Weiland, F.C.; Tisseuil, C.; Dürr, H.H.; Vrac, M.; Van Beek, L.P.H. Selecting the optimal method to calculate daily global reference potential evaporation from CFSR reanalysis data for application in a hydrological model study. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **2012**, *16*, 983–1000; <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-983-2012>.
10. Anwar, S.A.; Mamadou, O.; Diallo, I.; Sylla, M.B. On the influence of vegetation cover changes and vegetation-runoff systems on the simulated summer potential evapotranspiration of tropical Africa using RegCM4. *Earth Syst. Environ.* **2021**, *5*, 883–897. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-021-00252-3>.
11. Cobaner, M.; Citakoğlu, H.; Haktanir, T.; Kisi, O. Modifying Hargreaves–Samani equation with meteorological variables for estimation of reference evapotranspiration in Turkey. *Hydrol. Res.* **2017**, *48*, 480–497. <https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2016.217>.
12. Singer, M.; Asfaw, D.; Rosolem, R.; Cuthbert, M.O.; Miralles, D.G.; MacLeod, D.; Michaelides, K. Hourly potential evapotranspiration (hPET) at 0.1deg grid resolution for the global land surface from 1981-present. *Sci. Data* **2021**, *8*, 224. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-01003-9>.
13. Giorgi, F.; Coppola, E.; Solmon, F.; Mariotti, L.; Sylla, M.B.; Bi, X.; Elguindi, N.; Diro, G.T.; Nair, V.; Giuliani, G.; et al. BrankovicRegCM4: Model description and preliminary tests over multiple CORDEX domains. *Clim. Res.* **2012**, *52*, 7–29.
14. Giorgi, F.; JSPal XBi Sloan, L.; Elguindi, N.; Solmon, F. Introduction to the TAC special issue: The RegCNET network. *Theor. Appl. Clim.* **2006**, *86*, 1–4.
15. Anwar, S.A.; Diallo, I. Modelling the Tropical African Climate using a state-of-the-art coupled regional climate-vegetation model. *Clim. Dyn.* **2022**, *58*, 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-02-05892-9>.
16. Dee, D.P.; Uppala, S.M.; Simmons, A.J.; Berrisford, P.; Poli, P.; Kobayashi, S.; Andrae, U.; Balmaseda, M.A.; Balsamo, G.; Bauer, P.; et al. The ERA-Interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **2011**, *137*, 553–597.
17. Kanamitsu, M.; Ebisuzaki, W.; Woollen, J.; Yang, S.K.; Hnilo, J.J.; Fiorino, M.; Potter, G.L. NCEP-DOE AMIP-II Reanalysis (R2). *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **2002**, *83*, 1631–1643.
18. Emanuel, K.A. A scheme for representing cumulus convection in large-scale models. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **1991**, *48*, 2313–2335.
19. Clough, S.A.; Shephard, M.W.; Mlawer, E.J.; Delamere, J.S. Atmospheric radiative transfer modeling: A summary of the AER codes, Short Communication. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **2005**, *91*, 233–244.
20. Holtslag, A.A.M.; Boville, B.A. Local versus nonlocal boundary layer diffusion in a global model. *J. Clim.* **1993**, *6*, 1825–1842.
21. Hersbach, H.; Bell, B.; Berrisford, P.; Hirahara, S.; Horányi, A.; Muñoz-Sabater, J.; Nicolas, J.; Peubey, C.; Radu, R.; Schepers, D.; et al. The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **1993**, *146*, 1999–2049.
22. Muñoz-Sabater, J.; Dutra, E.; Agustí-Panareda, A.; Albergel, C.; Arduini, G.; Balsamo, G.; Boussetta, S.; Choulga, M.; Harrigan, S.; Hersbach, H.; et al. ERA5-Land: A state-of-the-art global reanalysis dataset for land applications. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **2021**, *13*, 4349–4383. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021>.
23. Wang, G.; Yu, M.; Pal, J.S.; Mei, R.; Bonan, G.B.; Levis, S.; Thornton, P.E. On the development of a coupled regional climate-vegetation model RCM–CLM–CN–DV and its validation in Tropical Africa. *Clim. Dyn.* **2016**, *46*, 515–539. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2596-z>.
24. Erfanian, A.; Wang, G.; Yu, M.; Anyah, R. Multi-Model Ensemble Simulations of Present and Future Climates over West Africa: Impacts of Vegetation Dynamics. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **2016**, *8*, 1411–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016ms000660>.
25. Awal, R.; Rahman, A.; Fares, A.; Habibi, H. Calibration and Evaluation of Empirical Methods to Estimate Reference Crop Evapotranspiration in West Texas. *Water* **2022**, *14*, 3032. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w14193032>.
26. Anwar, S.A.; Diallo, I. A RCM investigation of the influence of vegetation status and runoff scheme on the summer Gross Primary Production of Tropical Africa. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* **2021**, *145*, 1407–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03667-0>.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.