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1. Introduction

Declining rates of observed near-surface wind speed (u) (termed a “stilling”, [1]) are usually on the order of -0.010 m s⁻¹ a⁻¹ [2]. Stilling has been reported in many regions around the world, summarized by McVicar et al. [3] in Table 2, e.g., Australia [1], China [4], and North America [5]. Stilling alters the aerodynamic condition, which is the key factor in the fully physical-
ly-based models to assess the evaporation demand \cite{6,7}, such as potential evaporation ($E_p$), references evapotranspiration ($ET_r$) and pan evaporation ($E_{pan}$). Due to its simplicity and cost effectiveness, $E_{pan}$ has been widely used to reflect the evaporation demand of the atmosphere when estimating terrestrial evaporation \cite{8} and crop water requirement \cite{9}.

The “evaporation paradox” phenomenon, that is decline trend in pan evaporation with increasing trend in air temperature, has drawn great attention to explore causes for changes in pan evaporation and its application for global hydrological cycle \cite{12,10}. Different from the empirical method used to estimate pan evaporation \cite{11-15}, Rotstayn et al. \cite{16} combined the works of Linacre \cite{17} and Thom et al. \cite{18} to develop a steady state pan evaporation model for a US Class A pan called the “PenPan model, which has been used to assess the cause of pan evaporation (e.g., Roderick et al. \cite{19}). Improved by Yang and Yang \cite{19}, PenPan model was also used to simulate the changes in pan evaporation for the standard Chinese 20 cm diameter pan (D20 pan). According to Yang and Yang \cite{19} and Xie et al. \cite{20}, the declines in $u$ were the main causes for changes in pan evaporation in most parts of China. As pointed out by Thom et al. \cite{19}, vapour transfer function- $f_q(u)$ depends not only on wind speed but also on the difference between surface temperature for water and air temperature \cite{18}. Thom et al., (1981) \cite{18} deduced the wind function $f_q(u)$ (unit: mm d^{-1} mb^{-1}) as:

\begin{equation}
    f_q(u) = 0.12 \times (1+1.35u)
\end{equation}

where, $u$ (m s^{-1}) is the mean wind speed at two meters above the ground. Yang and Yang (2012) \cite{19} deduced the $f_q(u)$ using the data in Beijing stations as:

\begin{equation}
    f_q(u) = 5.4 \times (1+0.40u)
\end{equation}

Vapour transfer function should be an attractive approach to establish a physical model and derive its differential to analyze the attribution of changes in $E_{pan}$ \cite{19}. Consequently, the objectives of the present study are: (i) to explore the temporal trends for $u$ across China, and explain where can found the stilling; and (ii) to improve the PenPan model using vapour transfer function, and to explain aerodynamic effects of declines of $u$. To address these objectives the remainder of this paper is structured as followed: section 2 presented the physical model for analyzing the aerodynamic effects of stilling; section 3 explained the materials and method; section 4 explored the temporal trends for $u$; and section 5 gave the aerodynamic effects of the stilling.

\textbf{2. Materials and Method}\n
\textbf{2.1 Assessing the Aerodynamic Effects of Stilling Using PenPan Model}\n
The PenPan model is based on Penman’s combination equation, using Linacre \cite{17} and Thom et al. \cite{19} models to describe the radiative and aerodynamic components \cite{16}, respectively. The PenPan model can be represented as:

\begin{equation}
    E_p = E_{p,R} + E_{p,A} = \left( \frac{s}{s + a\gamma} \frac{R_n}{\lambda} \right) + \left( \frac{a\gamma}{s + a\gamma} \frac{f_q(u)D}{\lambda} \right)
\end{equation}

where, $s$ ($P_a K^{-1}$) is the change in saturation vapour pressure ($e_a$, Pa) with temperature evaluated at the air temperature ($T_a$, K) two meters above the ground, $R_n$ (W m^{-2}) is the net radiation on the pan, $\lambda$ (J kg^{-1}) is the latent heat of vaporization, $a$ is the ratio of effective surface area for heat and vapour transfer ($a=5$ for D20 pan) \cite{19}, $\gamma$ (-67 Pa K^{-1}) is the psychrometric constant, $D$ ($= e_v-e_a$, Pa) is the vapour pressure deficit at two meters, and $f_q(u)$ (mm d^{-1} mb^{-1}) is the vapour transfer function.

Following Roderick et al. \cite{19}, changes in pan evaporation can result from radiative and aerodynamic components and be given by differentiating equation,

\begin{equation}
    \frac{dE_p}{dt} = \frac{dE_{p,R}}{dt} + \frac{dE_{p,A}}{dt}
\end{equation}

Then $dE_{p,A}/dt$ is partitioned into three components, denoted $U^*$, $D^*$ and $T^*$ for changes in $u$, $D$ and $T_a$ respectively. The components are defined by,

\begin{equation}
    \frac{dE_{p,A}}{dt} \approx \frac{dE_{p,R}}{du} \frac{du}{dt} + \frac{dE_{p,R}}{dD} \frac{dD}{dt} + \frac{dE_{p,R}}{dT_a} \frac{dT_a}{dt} = U^* + D^* + T^*
\end{equation}

As $u$ trends present different patterns, we get $f_q(u) \sim u$ from 266 stations using 1959-1969 monthly data. According to the $f_q(u)$, the improved PenPan model based on Yang and Yang’s \cite{19} equation is used to assess the aerodynamic effects of $u$ changes across China.

\textbf{2.2 Meteorological Data}\n
In order to test the temporal trends for $u$ and its aerodynamic effects on $E_{pan}$, data were collected from China Meteorological Administration (CMA), including monthly $E_{pan}$, $u$, $T_a$, relative humidity ($r_h$) and sunshine hours ($sh$) from 266 stations across China (Figure 1). Considering the data integrity and continuity, 266 stations were selected to do this work during 1959-2000 (Figure 1).
Due to that radiation component was not observed at most stations, net radiation \( R_n \) was calculated at monthly scale using the equation as follows:

\[
R_n = (1 - \alpha_p)R_p + R_{l,in} - R_{l,out},
\]

where, \( R_{l,in} \) is the incoming shortwave radiation on a pan, \( R_{l,out} \) is the outgoing longwave radiation, estimated by assuming that the pan is a black body radiating at \( T_a \), \( \alpha_p \) is constant (=0.14).

\[
R_p = [f_{dir}P_{rad} + 2.0 \times (1 - f_{dir}) + 2.0 \times A_s]R_s,
\]

where \( R_p \) is the downward solar irradiance at the surface, \( f_{dir} \) is the fraction of \( R \) that is direct, \( A_s \) is the albedo of the ground surrounding the pan, and \( P_{rad} \) is the pan radiation factor, which accounts for the extra direct irradiance intercepted by the walls of the pan when the sun is not directly overhead.

\[
R_{l,in} = \sigma T_a^4(1 - (0.34 - 0.14\sqrt{e_a/1000}) - (1.35R_v / (R_s(0.75 + 2 \times 10^{-5}z))) - 0.35)),
\]

where \( \sigma \) is Stefan-Boltzmann constant (4.903*10^{-9} MJ m^{-2} K^{-4} day^{-1}), \( e_a \) is the actual vapor pressure (P_a), \( R_s \) is solar radiation on the top of the atmosphere, and \( z \) (m) is the station elevation [9].

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 The Trends Pattern of Wind Speed Over China

As showed in Figure 2, stilling phenomena has experienced across China. The average \( u \) trend of -0.012 m s^{-1} a^{-1} was in agreement with results presented for other mid-latitude site. Furthermore, temporal trends for \( u \) in mid-latitude basins (i.e. HuaiRB: -0.023 m s^{-1} a^{-1}; NWRB: -0.022 m s^{-1} a^{-1}) presented obviously downward trends, followed by north basins (i.e. SHRB: -0.015 m s^{-1} a^{-1}, LHRB: -0.013 m s^{-1} a^{-1}) and south regions (i.e. YzRB: -0.008 m s^{-1} a^{-1}, PRB: -0.008 and SWRB: -0.001 m s^{-1} a^{-1}).

Figure 2. The temporal trend of \( u \) in different regions of China. Furthermore, number of stations used in different basin also presented in the bracket.

![Figure 2](https://example.com/figure2.png)
Figure 3. Temporal trends for \( u \) (a) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) (b) across China during 1959-2000. If the trend is significant \((P < 0.01)\), a ring is placed around the dot; units is \( \text{m s}^{-1} \text{a}^{-1} \) for \( u \) and \( \text{mm a}^{-2} \) for \( E_{\text{pan}} \). The values located in the bottom of plot are interpreted as follows. The first line shows in order from left to right: (1) the number of stations with positive \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends; (2) in parenthesis the number of stations with significant \((P < 0.01)\) positive \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends; (3) the \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trend (units = \( \text{mm a}^{-2} \)) calculated for all stations with positive trends; and (4) in parenthesis the \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trend (units = \( \text{mm a}^{-2} \)) calculated for all stations with significant \((P < 0.01)\) positive \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends. The second line presents the same four statistics except for stations exhibiting negative \( u \) and \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends.

The temporal trends for \( u \) (Figure 3a) presented that: (1) most of stations (205 among 266) presented negative trends with an average slope of -0.0174 \( \text{m s}^{-1} \text{a}^{-1} \), while only 61 stations showed positive trends with an average slope of 0.0077 \( \text{m s}^{-1} \text{a}^{-1} \); (2) especially, there were 154 stations showing significant negative trends at 99% confidence level with an average slope of 0.0215 \( \text{mm a}^{-2} \), and only 19 stations showed significant positive trends at 99% confident level with an average slope of 0.0149 \( \text{mm a}^{-2} \). Stilling in \( u \) altered the \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends. As showed in Figure 3b, \( E_{\text{pan}} \) presented similar trends with the changes in \( u \) trends: (1) most of stations (187 among 266) showed negative trends, while only 79 stations presented positive trends; (2) the numbers of stations showing negative and positive significant trends at 99% confident level were 94 and 17, respectively.

3.2 Aerodynamic Effects of Stilling on the \( E_{\text{pan}} \)

Using data from 266 stations during 1959-1969, \( f_q(u) \sim u \) equation can be recalibrated from equation (9):

\[
f_q(u) = 9.58 \times (1 + 0.40u)
\]

\[R^2 = 0.27.\]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The equation was used to simulate the \( E_{\text{pan}} \) across China. The calculated \( E_{\text{pan}} \) was compared with observed \( E_{\text{pan}} \) in 266 stations (Figure 4). Compared with results using Yang and Yang’s equation \cite{19} \((y=2.54+1.62x, R^2=0.91, \text{RMSE}=107 \text{ mm mth}^{-1})\), the agreement between improved modeled and observed \( E_{\text{pan}} \) at 266 stations \((y=8.73+0.99x, R^2=0.94, \text{RMSE}=23 \text{ mm mth}^{-1})\) was excellent.

Figure 4. Comparison of the observed (OBS) and calculated (CAL) monthly \( E_{\text{pan}} \) during 1970-2000 from 266 stations across China. (a) using \( f_q(u) \) from Eq. (9), (b) using \( f_q(u) \) from Eq. (2) for Yang and Yang’s equation. Best fit regression and 1:1 line were also showed. Furthermore, the \( R^2 \) and RMSE were showed for the 98952 data between observed and calculated monthly \( E_{\text{pan}} \).
Following the method provided by Roderick et al.\textsuperscript{[1]}, we separated the $E_{\text{pan}}$ rate into radiative and aerodynamic components, and then aerodynamic component was separated into three individual components ($U^*$, $D^*$ and $T^*$) (showed in Table 1 and Figure 5). The results showed: (1) changes in aerodynamic component controlled the trends in $E_{\text{pan}}$ (Figure 5.c), and changes in $u$ contributed majority of changes in $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends (Figure 5d); (2) the changes in $D$ (Figure 5e) and $T$ (Figure 5f) attributed a minor changes in $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends; (3) as expected, $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends and its radiative and aerodynamic components showed spatial variations, i.e., $u$ contributed negative effects in $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends, especially in NWRB and middle and lower regions of YRB and Upper reaches of HuaiRB. The downward trends in $u$ resulted in two regions showing large decreasing trends in $E_{\text{pan}}$, NWRB, and the regions in Middle-lower regions YRB and upper HuaiRB (Table 1 and Figure 5), that consistent with the trends in OBS $E_{\text{pan}}$ (Figure 3b); and (4) as showed in Table 1 and Figure 5, $u$ and $T$ played negative effect in $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends, while changes in $D$ contributed a positive effect in $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends, which resulted in an increasing $E_{\text{pan}}$ trends in YRB, PRB, SWRB and SERB and opposite trends showed in others basins (Table 1).

Table 1. Observed (OBS) and model-calculated (CACL) trends in $E_{\text{pan}}$ rate ($dE_{\text{pan}}/dt$, in mm a$^{-2}$) in different regions of China for 1959-2000

| Regions  | OBS | CAL-C=Rad+Aero | Rad | Aero | Aero Partition |
|----------|-----|----------------|-----|------|----------------|
|          | $dE_{\text{pan}}/dt$ | $dE_{\text{pan}}/dt$ | $dE_{\text{pan}}/dt$ | $dE_{\text{pan}}/dt$ | $U^*$ | $D^*$ | $T^*$ |
| China    | -3.06 | -1.11 | -0.06 | -1.06 | -2.51 | 1.69 | -0.33 |
| SRB      | -1.21 | 0.36  | 0.39  | -0.03 | -2.39 | 2.84 | -0.42 |
| LRB      | -0.89 | -0.30 | 0.17  | -0.47 | -2.76 | 2.90 | -0.44 |
| HHRB     | -4.41 | -1.45 | 0.21  | -1.66 | -4.79 | 3.53 | -0.53 |
| YRB      | -2.82 | 1.13  | 0.30  | 0.83  | -1.80 | 2.80 | -0.44 |
| HuaiRB   | -7.48 | -2.25 | -0.44 | -1.81 | -2.74 | 0.63 | -0.25 |
| YzRB     | -3.00 | -1.61 | -0.51 | -1.10 | -1.49 | 0.24 | -0.11 |
| PRB      | -3.10 | 0.77  | -0.35 | 1.12  | -1.59 | 2.97 | -0.23 |
| NWRB     | -4.38 | -5.42 | 0.41  | -5.83 | -5.86 | 0.83 | -0.64 |
| SWRB     | 0.02  | 1.13  | 0.44  | 0.69  | -0.43 | 1.50 | -0.28 |
| SERB     | -1.83 | -0.23 | -0.57 | 0.33  | -1.34 | 1.79 | -0.15 |
Figure 5. Trends in simulated pan evaporation and its components at 266 stations for the period 1959-2000. (a) Calculated $E_{\text{pan}}$ rate. (b) Radiative component of pan evaporation ($E_{\text{pan,R}}$) rate. The trends in the aerodynamic component are further partitioned into the change due to (d) $U^*$, (e) $D^*$, and (f) $T^*$. The change in each panel, averaged across all 266 stations is (a) -1.11 mm a$^{-2}$, (b) -0.06 mm a$^{-2}$, (c) -1.06 mm a$^{-2}$, (d) -2.51 mm a$^{-2}$, (e) +1.69 mm a$^{-2}$, and (f) -0.33 mm a$^{-2}$.

4. Discussion

4.1 Changes in Temporal Trends in Wind Speed

As addressed in Figure 3a, wind speed presented stilling phenomenon at 77% (205/266) stations across China with an average temporal trends at -0.011 m s$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$. Across China, in agreement with our study, downward trends in $u$ have been widely reported. Similar decreasing trends from -0.004 m s$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$ to -0.017 m s$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$ in near-surface $u$ have been widely observed across the globe over the last 30-50 years (i.e., since ~1960s to ~1980s) for a range of mid-latitude regions (McVicar et al. [3] their Table 4). As showed in Figure 2 and Figure 3a, large declines were found in northern China, while central and south-central China have the least change in $u$. Except for Tibetan Plateau, the results are consistent with report by Guo et al. [4]. The precise cause of the stilling is uncertain [5], the explained for this phenomena lies in two aspects: (1) changes of land surface roughness (e.g., increasing vegetation cover and urbanization); and (2) influences resulting from the climate changes (e.g., weakening of the East Asian winter and summer monsoons). E.g., Guo et al. [4] stratified China 652-station database into rural and large-urban cases, and deduced that urbanization strengthened $u$. While Li et al. [24], using 12 stations to study the greater Beijing Area during 1960-2008, suggested that urbanization contributed one-fifth of the regional mean declining trend about $-0.05$ m s$^{-1}$ (10 a)$^{-1}$, and also noted that changes in strong winds (i.e., wind extremes and winter winds) are influenced by large-scale climatic change. As pointed by Chen et al. [25], the warm and cold Arctic Oscillation and El Nino-Southern Oscillation phases have significant influence on probability distribution of wind speeds, and thus internal climate variability is a major source of both interannual and long-term variability. The weakening of the East Asian winter and summer monsoons is the cause for the distinct decreases of wind speed over the whole China [21,23]. Furthermore, sharp step in $u$ correspond well with the positive and negative phases of the interdecadal Pacific oscillation [22].
4.2 Aerodynamic Effects of the Stilling in Wind Speed

Changes in \( E_{\text{pan}} \) caused by aerodynamics changes are larger than that caused by radiative components in most of regions of China (8 of 10) (Table 1). Declines in \( u \) play an important role in controlling the changes in \( E_{\text{pan},A} \) than that resulting from vapour pressure deficit and air temperature (Showed in Figure 5 and Table 1). Consistent with our results, changes in \( u \) is the main cause for changes in \( E_{\text{pan}} \), \( E_{\text{pan}} \) \([19]\), and \( ET_{\text{p}} \) \([27]\) in China due to its significant downward trend and high sensitivity. Stilling reduced \( E_{\text{pan}} \) \([1, 28, 29]\), \( ET_{\text{a}} \) \([30]\) and \( ET_{\text{p}} \) \([31]\) rate, and has been regarded as important factor in explaining \( E_{\text{pan}} \) paradox \([1,3]\), which means it is important to consider all four primary meteorological variables (being \( u \), atmospheric humidity, radiation and \( T_a \)) \([3]\). As \( u \) exerting greater influence on energy-limited water yielding catchments than water-limited ones, it is vital to incorporate other factors to assess the impacts of evaporation demand on long term water resources \([3]\). Changes in \( u \) combining with other meteorological variables led to larger changes in \( E_{\text{pan}} \) in water-limited regions in northwest and North China (i.e., NWRB, SRB, LRB and HHRB) than that in energy-limited regions in South and central China (i.e., YzRB, PRB, SWRB and SERB) (showed in Table 1 and Figure 5). That indicated it is really hard to define the influence for the changes in \( u \) on water resources when involving the actual evapotranspiration and streamflow in different regions. As pointed by McVicar et al. \([32]\), impacts of stilling on actual evapotranspiration and streamflow are situation dependent.

5. Conclusion

Changes of \( u \) during 1959-2000 from 266 stations across China presented an average decreasing trend of -0.012 m s\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\). There are 154 (among 205 negative trends stations) stations presenting significant decreasing trends at 99\% confidence level while only 19 (among 61 positive trends stations) stations presenting significant increasing trends at 99\% confidence level. Stilling in China was similar to the decrease reported over other terrestrial surface, which can explain the evaporation paradox.

Using a fully physical model (the improved Penpen model), we assessed the \( E_{\text{pan}} \) trends, and then quantified the aerodynamic effects resulting from the \( U^* \), \( D^* \) and \( T^* \). Stilling was the main cause for controlling the trends in \( E_{\text{pan}} \) in most of part of China, especially in the west and north of China. Our results suggest that stilling can reduce evaporation demand, and inevitably alter the water resources especially in the energy-limited regions, which should be put to further investigation incorporating with other factors.
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