Assessment of Mathematical Modeling Techniques for Predicting Climate Change Impacts on Water Availability and Quality: A SWAT-SEIR Framework Validation Study

NYONGESA FATUMA NANDAHA[1], ANDANJE MULAMBULA[2], MARTHA MUTHONI KONJE[3]
[1, 2]*Department of Mathematics, Kibabii University, Kenya*
[3]*Department of Biological Sciences, Environmental and Natural Resources, Kibabii University, Kenya*

Abstract- ***Accurate prediction of climate change impacts on water resources requires robust mathematical modeling techniques with validated performance across multiple scales. This study assesses the accuracy and reliability of the integrated SWAT-SEIR modeling framework for predicting water availability and quality under changing climate conditions in the Lake Victoria Basin. Model validation employed comprehensive statistical measures including Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency, coefficient of determination, and uncertainty analysis across 15-year datasets. Results demonstrate excellent predictive accuracy with NSE values of 0.85 for streamflow, 0.63 for total nitrogen, and 0.67 for dissolved oxygen during independent validation periods. Temporal transferability analysis achieved correlation coefficients of 0.89 for monthly predictions. Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis revealed prediction uncertainties of ±18% for water availability and ±25% for water quality under baseline conditions. The integrated framework outperformed traditional SWAT-only approaches by 23% for water quality predictions while maintaining comparable hydrological accuracy. Cross-validation confirmed model reliability with consistent performance across wet, normal, and dry periods. These findings establish the SWAT-SEIR framework as a reliable tool for climate change impact assessment in tropical water systems.***

Indexed Terms- ***Model Validation, Predictive Accuracy, Uncertainty Quantification, Climate Impact Assessment***

I. INTRODUCTION

Mathematical modeling has become indispensable for understanding and predicting climate change impacts on water resources, with model accuracy and reliability being critical for informed decision-making. The increasing complexity of climate-water interactions necessitates robust validation frameworks that assess model performance across temporal, spatial, and process dimensions (Moriasi et al., 2015).

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change emphasizes model validation importance in climate impact assessments, noting that prediction reliability directly influences adaptation strategy effectiveness (IPCC, 2022). In tropical regions like the Lake Victoria Basin, where climate variability is high and observational data are often limited, rigorous model validation becomes critical for establishing confidence in predictive capabilities (Ogega et al., 2023).

Traditional hydrological models have been extensively validated for water quantity predictions, but integrated frameworks combining quantity and quality dynamics face additional validation challenges. The complexity of coupled systems requires comprehensive assessment approaches evaluating not only individual component performance but also system-level behavior (Tan et al., 2020).

Model validation encompasses accuracy assessment through statistical metrics, reliability evaluation through transferability testing, and uncertainty quantification through probabilistic analysis. Recent advances emphasize independent validation datasets, cross-validation techniques, and multi-criteria evaluation approaches (Bennett et al., 2013).

The Lake Victoria Basin presents unique validation challenges due to complex climate patterns, diverse land use types, and varying data availability. Previous validation studies in tropical Africa have shown mixed results, with some models performing well for specific components while struggling with integrated system representation (Githui et al., 2009).

This study addresses the critical need for comprehensive validation of integrated modeling frameworks by assessing the accuracy and reliability of the SWAT-SEIR model for predicting climate change impacts on water availability and quality through multiple validation approaches including temporal transferability, spatial representativeness, and uncertainty quantification.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Model Validation Frameworks

Hydrological model validation has evolved from simple correlation analysis to comprehensive multi-criteria assessment frameworks. Moriasi et al. (2015) established standardized guidelines using Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency, percent bias, and ratio of root mean square error to standard deviation, providing quantitative measures accounting for timing, magnitude, and variability.

Temporal transferability testing evaluates models calibrated on one period using independent datasets to assess predictive reliability under different climatic conditions. Klemeš (1986) framework advocates split-sample testing, proxy-basin testing, and differential split-sample testing to evaluate model robustness.

Uncertainty quantification has become increasingly important, with frameworks like SUFI-2 providing probabilistic assessment recognizing that deterministic predictions are insufficient for decision-making under uncertainty (Abbaspour et al., 2015).

2.2 Integrated Model Validation

Validation of integrated hydrological-water quality models presents additional complexity compared to single-component models. Multi-objective validation approaches optimize model performance across multiple criteria simultaneously, recognizing trade-offs between different outputs (Krause et al., 2005).

Climate change impact models face unique validation challenges due to non-stationarity assumptions and limited future observations. Proxy-basin validation and space-for-time substitution offer solutions by validating models across climatic gradients representing future conditions (Vormoor et al., 2018).

2.3 Validation in Data-Scarce Environments

Tropical regions face particular validation challenges due to limited observational data and irregular monitoring networks. Remote sensing data increasingly supplement ground-based observations, providing spatially distributed information while introducing additional uncertainties (Sheffield et al., 2018).

Regional parameter transfer and similarity-based validation approaches leverage information from well-monitored basins with similar characteristics, requiring careful consideration of basin similarity criteria and uncertainty propagation (Parajka et al., 2013).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Validation Framework

The validation framework employed multi-tiered assessment across temporal, spatial, and process dimensions. Temporal validation used split-sample testing with calibration period (2005-2014) and independent validation period (2015-2019). Additional transferability was assessed across wet (2010-2013), normal (2007-2009), and dry (2014-2016) periods.

Spatial validation assessed performance across five sub-basins within Budalangi watershed representing different elevation zones, land use patterns, and climatic conditions.

3.2 Statistical Performance Metrics

Model accuracy was evaluated using established metrics. Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency assessed overall performance:

$$NSE = 1 - [\Sigma(Q_{obs,i} - Q_{sim,i})^2] / [\Sigma(Q_{obs,i} - \bar{Q}_{obs})^2]$$

Coefficient of determination evaluated linear correlation:

$$R^2 = [\Sigma(Q_{obs,i} - \bar{Q}_{obs})(Q_{sim,i} - \bar{Q}_{sim})]^2 / [\Sigma(Q_{obs,i} - \bar{Q}_{obs})^2 \Sigma(Q_{sim,i} - \bar{Q}_{sim})^2]$$

Percent bias quantified average prediction tendency:

$$PBIAS = [\Sigma(Q_{obs,i} - Q_{sim,i}) / \Sigma(Q_{obs,i})] \times 100\%$$

3.3 Uncertainty Analysis

Comprehensive uncertainty analysis employed SUFI-2 framework with Monte Carlo simulation using 2,000 parameter realizations. Prediction uncertainty was quantified using P-factor and R-factor:

P-factor = (Observations within 95% prediction band) / (Total observations)

R-factor = (Average prediction band width) / (Data standard deviation)

3.4 Comparative Analysis

Model performance was compared against SWAT-only configuration, regression models, and persistence forecasts using Kling-Gupta Efficiency:

$$KGE = 1 - \sqrt{[(r-1)^2 + (\alpha-1)^2 + (\beta-1)^2]}$$

where r = correlation coefficient, α = ratio of standard deviations, β = ratio of means.

3.5 Cross-Validation

K-fold cross-validation (k=5) assessed model stability by partitioning data into five subsets, iteratively using four for calibration and one for validation. Leave-one-out cross-validation evaluated sensitivity to individual data points.

Multi-scale validation assessed performance across temporal scales (daily, monthly, annual) and spatial scales (sub-basin, basin) with scale-specific metrics evaluating different model behavior aspects.

IV. RESULTS

4.1 Temporal Validation Performance

The SWAT-SEIR model demonstrated excellent temporal validation performance. Monthly streamflow validation (2015-2019) achieved NSE = 0.85, R^2 = 0.89, PBIAS = -11.7%, meeting "very good" performance criteria. Daily streamflow validation achieved NSE = 0.71, R^2 = 0.78, representing "satisfactory" performance.

Water quality validation achieved satisfactory performance: total nitrogen (NSE = 0.63, R^2 = 0.71, PBIAS = +22.3%), total phosphorus (NSE = 0.59, R^2 = 0.68, PBIAS = -31.4%), dissolved oxygen (NSE = 0.67, R^2 = 0.74, PBIAS = +18.9%).

Temporal transferability analysis revealed consistent performance across climatic periods: wet period (NSE = 0.82 streamflow, 0.61 water quality), normal period (NSE = 0.79 streamflow, 0.58 water quality), dry period (NSE = 0.76 streamflow, 0.55 water quality).

4.2 Spatial Validation Results

Spatial validation across five sub-basins demonstrated satisfactory transferability with NSE values ranging from 0.62 to 0.78 for streamflow. Water quality validation ranged from NSE = 0.51 to 0.69, with four of five achieving satisfactory performance.

Upper catchment areas (elevation > 1,500m) achieved higher performance (NSE = 0.75-0.78) than lower areas (NSE = 0.62-0.68). Forested areas showed best performance (NSE = 0.77), followed by agricultural areas (NSE = 0.71).

Regional validation using neighboring basins achieved NSE = 0.68 for streamflow and NSE = 0.54 for water quality, demonstrating moderate transferability beyond the calibration domain.

4.3 Uncertainty Quantification

Uncertainty analysis revealed well-constrained prediction bounds with P-factor = 0.82 and R-factor = 0.61 for streamflow. Water quality achieved P-factor = 0.74 and R-factor = 0.73, indicating higher but acceptable uncertainty.

Monte Carlo analysis revealed prediction uncertainties of ±18% for water availability and ±25% for water quality under baseline conditions, increasing to ±35% for water availability and ±45% for water quality under extreme climate scenarios.

Parameter uncertainty contributed 65% of total uncertainty, model structure uncertainty 25%, and input data uncertainty 10%, indicating parameter estimation as the dominant uncertainty source.

4.4 Comparative Performance

The integrated SWAT-SEIR framework outperformed benchmark approaches. Compared to SWAT-only configuration, the integrated model improved water quality predictions by 23% (NSE improvement from 0.48 to 0.63 for total nitrogen) while maintaining comparable hydrological accuracy.

Comparison with regression models showed 45% improvement in predictive accuracy. Kling-Gupta Efficiency revealed KGE = 0.78 for the integrated model versus KGE = 0.52 for regression approaches.

4.5 Cross-Validation Assessment

K-fold cross-validation demonstrated consistent performance with NSE ranging from 0.81 to 0.88 for streamflow and 0.58 to 0.67 for water quality. Low variance across folds (CV = 0.04 streamflow, CV = 0.08 water quality) indicated stable behavior and absence of overfitting.

Leave-one-out cross-validation identified three influential observations corresponding to extreme events, but model performance remained stable with their removal (NSE change < 0.03).

Multi-scale validation revealed optimal performance at monthly scales (NSE = 0.85) and annual scales (NSE = 0.94) for water balance, with reduced daily performance (NSE = 0.71). Spatial analysis showed optimal performance at sub-basin scales (10-500 km²).

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive validation study establishes the SWAT-SEIR integrated modeling framework as a reliable tool for predicting climate change impacts on water availability and quality in tropical environments. The model demonstrated excellent performance across multiple validation dimensions with particularly strong temporal transferability and acceptable uncertainty bounds.

Key validation findings confirm model accuracy with NSE = 0.85 for streamflow and NSE = 0.63-0.67 for water quality during independent validation periods. Temporal transferability demonstrated consistent performance across wet, normal, and dry periods, confirming reliability under varying climatic conditions essential for climate change applications.

Spatial validation established model robustness with satisfactory performance (NSE > 0.60) across diverse physiographic conditions. Regional transferability showed moderate success, supporting broader application potential while emphasizing local calibration value.

Uncertainty quantification revealed well-constrained prediction bounds (±18% water availability, ±25% water quality) under baseline conditions, with appropriately increased uncertainty under extreme scenarios. This characterization provides essential information for risk-based decision-making.

Comparative analysis demonstrated substantial improvements over traditional approaches, with 23% enhancement in water quality predictions and 45% improvement over regression models, justifying the integrated framework complexity.

Cross-validation confirmed model stability and absence of overfitting, supporting confidence in generalization capability. Scale-specific validation revealed optimal application domains including monthly to annual temporal scales and sub-basin to basin spatial scales.

The validated framework provides reliable foundation for climate change impact assessment with clearly defined performance characteristics and uncertainty bounds supporting confident application in policy and management contexts.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Apply SWAT-SEIR framework for monthly to annual predictions with highest confidence
2. Incorporate prediction uncertainty bounds (±18-25% baseline, ±35-45% extreme scenarios) in decision-making
3. Establish continuous validation protocols using real-time monitoring data
4. Extend validation to additional tropical basins for broader transferability assessment

REFERENCES

[1] Abbaspour, K. C., Rouholahnejad, E., Vaghefi, S., Srinivasan, R., Yang, H., & Kløve, B. (2015). A continental-scale hydrology and water quality model for Europe. *Journal of Hydrology*, 524, 222-237.

[2] Bennett, N. D., Croke, B. F., Guariso, G., Guillaume, J. H., Hamilton, S. H., et al. (2013). Characterising performance of environmental models. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 40, 1-20.

[3] Githui, F. W., Mutua, F. M., & Bauwens, W. (2009). Land-cover change impacts on runoff using SWAT: Nzoia catchment, Kenya. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 54(5), 899-908.

[4] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.

[5] Klemeš, V. (1986). Operational testing of hydrological simulation models. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 31(1), 13-24.

[6] Krause, P., Boyle, D. P., & Bäse, F. (2005). Comparison of different efficiency criteria for hydrological model assessment. *Advances in Geosciences*, 5, 89-97.

[7] Moriasi, D. N., Gitau, M. W., Pai, N., & Daggupati, P. (2015). Hydrologic and water quality models: Performance measures and evaluation criteria. *Transactions of the ASABE*, 58(6), 1763-1785.

[8] Ogega, O. M., Scoccimarro, E., Misiani, H., et al. (2023). Extreme climatic events intensify over Lake Victoria Basin under global warming. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 9729.

[9] Parajka, J., Merz, R., & Blöschl, G. (2013). Uncertainty and multiple objective calibration in regional water balance modelling. *Water Resources Research*, 49(1), 329-346.

[10] Sheffield, J., Wood, E. F., Pan, M., Beck, H., Coccia, G., et al. (2018). Satellite remote sensing for water resources management. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1, 217-231.

[11] Tan, M. L., Xiaoying, Y., & Haywoods, J. (2020). SWAT applications review for hydro-climatic extremes simulation. *Advances in Water Resources*, 143, 103662.

[12] Vormoor, K., Lawrence, D., Heistermann, M., & Bronstert, A. (2018). Climate change impacts on seasonality and generation processes of floods. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 22(4), 2395-2415.