DISCLAIMER: This review was prepared as part of graduate program course work at Wageningen University, and has been produced under supervision of Ryan Teuling. The review has been posted because of its good quality, and likely usefulness to the authors and/or editor. This review was not solicited by the journal.

Review of "Increasing water stress in Chile evidenced by novel datasets of water availability, land use and water use" by Boisier, J. P., Alvarez-Garreton, C., Marinao, R., & Galleguillos, M.

Kyra Boek

I. SUMMARY, CONTRIBUTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The manuscript by Boisier et al. assesses water stress in Chile from the mid-20th century to the end of the 21st century under various scenarios, specifically focusing on the megadrought from 2010 to 2022. The authors developed spatially distributed national-scale datasets on hydroclimatic data, water availability, land use, and water use. They used these to calculate the Water Stress Index (WSI) for all major basins to quantify the intensity of water stress during past, present, and future time periods. Findings indicate high to extreme water stress in semi-arid regions during the megadrought, with future projections indicating worsening conditions due to increased water consumption and reduced availability. The study suggests using the WSI for effective water security assessment and adaptation planning.

The novelty of this research lies in its integration of newly created high-resolution datasets with long-term projections, providing an overview of water stress in Chile. This is interesting, as not many papers focus on water stress in a whole country (but rather in a regional or basin-specific context); especially not a country that is a large as Chile. If successful, this approach can inform national-scale policymaking and improve water management strategies across varying climate zones.

The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language that effectively communicates complex concepts. The structure is logical, making it easy to follow the progression of the research and its findings. The figures are displayed clearly, enhancing the understanding of the data and results.

In principle, the study fits the scope of HESS, as it uses an interdisciplinary approach to look at spatial and temporal characteristics of water resources in Chile and gives concrete examples of socio-economic impacts of water stress. The use of novel datasets also contributes to the advancement of hydrological modelling. However, the use of these novel datasets in the context of the WSI – a simple index which is typically used on a continental or global scale – may reduce the robustness of the study's outcomes, especially given the lack of model validation and sensitivity analysis. Therefore, while this study provides a comprehensive initial indication of water stress in Chile, I believe there are several potential shortcomings that might need to be addressed before final publication in HESS. In addition, I will discuss several smaller issues and suggestions that I encountered during my study of the manuscript and that I believe could benefit the authors in improving their work.

II. GENERAL COMMENTS

Firstly, I question the applicability of the WSI at a national scale in this study. While commonly used for continental or global assessments (e.g. Gosling & Arnell, 2013; Pfister & Bayer, 2013), its use on regional or national scales is limited. When used on smaller scales, the WSI typically focuses on specific contexts, such as food security (Gheewala et al., 2014) or cross-region comparisons (Milano et al., 2013). However, this study goes further by suggesting the WSI can inform policy, but as Milano et al. (2013) note, sub-regional studies with local stakeholder input and detailed catchment data are essential for effective water management. The WSI can compare future water stress across regions but provides only a rough indication of stress, missing key regional differences in water use, governance, and access, which are key for effective water management. Although the authors suggest that water security goals can be achieved through metrics like the WSI (p1, line 27; p22, line 498), they do not specify which complementary metrics are necessary for a complete assessment. To strengthen the study, the authors could discuss the limitations of the WSI and recommend using more detailed hydrological models (e.g., SWAT, VIC) and additional metrics to better address regional variability.

The study also lacks model validation and sensitivity analysis for the WSI and key variables. Validating the WSI output against (independent) previous estimates – for example by using the Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency or Kling-Gupta Efficiency – would improve the scientific contribution. Validating the output of the current model to those obtained in previous studies that followed similar methodologies would provide insights into the consistency and reliability of the model under different conditions. For instance, the assessment by Ferreira et al. (2023) on precipitation and hydrological droughts in South America and work by Alvarez-Garreton et al. (2022) in which the WSI was calculated across 277 basins in Chile could serve as valuable references. Additionally, the study by Perveen and James (2011) on the scale invariance of water stress and scarcity indicators provides a critical perspective on the robustness of these indicators across different spatial scales, highlighting the need for such validation.

Furthermore, the results of the WSI are not supported by a sensitivity analysis, leaving it unclear how variations in water availability, land use, or water demand affect the final WSI values. Adding a sensitivity analysis would give a clearer understanding of the model's reliability under different conditions. An example of how to implement such a sensitivity analysis can be found in the paper by Milano et al. (2013), where a regional sensitivity analysis is performed. The authors could add this analysis either in the methodology section or as part of the results, explaining the specific assumptions tested and the range of variability explored.

A second general comment concerns the use of the Hargreaves-Samani (HS) formula to estimate potential evapotranspiration (PET). Since this formula is primarily based on temperature, this raises concerns about its suitability for projecting future PET under changing climate conditions. Previous studies (e.g. Alexandris et al., 2008; Temesgen et al., 2005; De Souza Nóia Júnior et al., 2019) show that the HS method tends to systematically overestimate PET by up to 20%, particularly in regions with high average temperature, wind speed, or relative humidity. This overestimation is a critical issue when using the HS formula for long-term projections, as the projected increase in temperature may lead to an overestimation of future drought conditions. While the authors adjust for wind biases and align HS with the Penman-Monteith (PM) formula, uncertainties remain, particularly for long-term trend projections. I suggest adopting the PM method or conducting an uncertainty analysis to assess the reliability of HS estimates. Although Appendix B validates the ET simulations, it doesn't fully address how the corrected HS method performs over time, especially under future climate conditions. A validation process using the same datasets and temporal scales as the analysis would enhance confidence in the projections.

The authors should also clarify whether the novel land and water use datasets were cross validated with independent datasets to enhance the credibility of the findings. Additionally, including uncertainty ranges for key variables, such as precipitation and water demand, would further strengthen the results by providing a clearer understanding of potential limitations and the confidence in the model's outcomes.

Finally, the study does not clarify whether water availability is estimated based on hydrological years or calendar years. This distinction is important since omitting storage changes between years can lead to inaccuracies in estimating water availability, particularly in regions where hydrological processes are influenced by large seasonality. Other studies on droughts (e.g. Xiao et al., 2017; Yuan et al., 2024) use hydrological years (or water years) to ensure that as much as possible of the surface runoff during that (hydrological) year is attributable to the precipitation during the same hydrological year. I would advise to use hydrological years for the hydrological balance (Section 2.3, p6-7), or to explain the use of calendar years. Given Chile's diverse climate, the authors should consider whether a single hydrological year is appropriate nationwide or if region-specific years should be applied. At a minimum, a brief discussion on this issue, with suggestions for future research, would improve the study's clarity.

III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Firstly, I randomly fact-checked some of the statements made by the authors. The results of this check can be found in the following two specific comments.

i. WSI threshold value

The use of the value of 0.4 (or 40%, line 41-42, p2) to indicate water-stressed regions seems arbitrary, as some studies use a value of 0.2-0.4 to indicate moderate water stress (e.g. Milano et al., 2013; Gosling & Arnell, 2013) or even 0.1-0.5 (Gheewala et al., 2014). Oki and Kanae (2006) describe 0.4 as "a reasonable, although not definitive, threshold value." In the current paper, the threshold of 0.4 seems to be definitive, but the authors should clarify that this is not the case. While in line 499-500 (p22) the authors say that "regarding the WSI, stress levels are well-defined worldwide in relation to their impacts on watersheds," the five references that are listed to support this statement do not carry the same information:

- Falkenmark, 2013a: this paper talks about water stress in relation to climate change on national and regional scale, but it does not mention WSI levels nor their impact on the watershed-scale.
- Falkenmark, 2013b: this paper also talks about consequences of water stress, but again it does not mention the WSI (or any other index).
- Rockstrom et al., 2014: although the WSI is mentioned (as Falkenmark Index), the paper does not mention stress levels in relation to their impact on watersheds. General problems regarding water scarcity are listed, but it seems like the WSI is used to give a general idea of water stress worldwide rather than a national-scale/watershed-scale indicator.
- Oki and Kanae, 2006: this paper uses the WSI on a global scale.
- Grafton et al., 2012: this paper is not listed in the reference section at all.

A simple solution to this problem is to include a discussion on the value of 0.4 as a threshold, and to remove the statement that WSI stress levels are well-defined worldwide in relation to their impacts on watersheds. Moreover, if the authors still wish to use the paper by Grafton et al., 2012, they should include this paper in the reference section.

ii. Total water use in Chile at present

In line 348-349 (p14), the authors state: "Considering both consumptive and non-consumptive uses, the total water use in Chile is estimated to be around 100 km^3 per year at present. This value is similar to, albeit slightly higher than, other independent estimates." I checked the three references that were used for this statement.

- DGA, 2017: this document is written in Spanish but if I am not mistaken, I would say that based on "Cuadro 4.17-1" and "Cuadro 4.17-2", p47 & 48, the total water use is over 160 km^3/year (sum of "Demanda Consuntiva 2015" and "Demanda No Consuntiva 2015" (consumptive and non-consumptive demand)). These numbers are based on a calculation of the water demand per district.
- Fundacion Chile: Based on table 5, the "registered" water consumption is 3.335,44 m3/s which corresponds roughly to 105 km^3/y. This is the water consumption based on the Water Use Rights as mentioned in the current paper, so the actual water consumption is likely much higher than that.
- FAO and UN Water, 2021: This source only shows water stress per continent so I am not sure where they found a specific number for Chile.

If my conclusions based on these documents are correct, the authors can omit the problem by stating that the value is *lower* than other independent estimates.

iii. Research questions

The research questions could be more specific. Instead of "What have been the historical water stress levels of the basins in Chile?" (p3, line 78), it could specify: "What have been the historical water stress levels of the major basins in Chile according to the Water Stress Index (WSI)?" In the second research question (p4, line 78-79), it is asked what the drivers of changes in water stress levels are. While the authors look at climatic and anthropogenic drivers, they do not specifically look at factors such as population growth and technological advances. Therefore, I suggest to specify the drivers that this study looks at. E.g., "What have been the climatic and anthropogenic drivers of changes in these levels?" or: "What have been the drivers of changes in water stress levels in Chile, and how have factors such as climate change, land use, and water use contributed to these changes?"

iv. Final remarks

The term "significant(ly)" occurs 21 times. This word suggests that these claims have statistical validation, but this is usually not the case. Consider replacing this word with terms like "substantial(ly)" or "notable(ly)" where appropriate (e.g., p14, line 353; p17, line 392; p18, line 436; p20, line 460)

p1, line 1: the use of the word "evidenced" in the title conveys the idea that the increase in water stress is not merely observed but backed by strong, concrete data. In my opinion, this level of certainty is insufficient supported by the research methodology. A simple solution to this problem is to replace "evidenced by" by a term like "indicated by" or "revealed through". This way, the title still reflects that the study sheds light on the issue but does not claim to provide absolute evidence.

p1, line 13: Clarify why the term "megadrought" is used, as it is not explained in the introduction.

p1, line 15: the authors mention that water-intensive agriculture raises questions about the contributions of water extraction to high stress levels. However, they do not come back to this question. Therefore, I think it would make more sense to ask about the contribution of water consumption, as this is what the paper is largely about. Alternatively, the authors could mention the answer to this original question in the conclusion section.

p1, line 15: "the contributions (…) *on* high water stress levels"; should be "to".

p1, line 26: using the WSI to assess "one" of the several aspects of water security seems like a vague description; what aspect of water security is assessed with the WSI?

p2, line 32: while this definition is important, the opening of the introduction could be stronger by starting with a statement related to water security to catch the reader's attention.

p2, line 41-42: the authors could consider providing a table with an overview of WSI thresholds (no/high/extreme water stress).

p3, line 65: "decade-long drought", what type of drought is referred to? E.g. hydrological/meteorological/socio-economic/…

p3, line 67: what is meant by Water Use Rights?

p3, line 72: Groundwater overexploitation is mentioned as an important contributor to water stress, but it is not fully addressed in the paper. Consider including it in the discussion or conclusion.

p4, Table 1, line 96: "irrigation fraction (I_V) fraction"; the word "fraction" appears twice.

p6, line 162: "To ensure accurate seasonal representation, (…)"; does this also include important weather phenomena like El Niño?

p6, line 164: TN should be T_N (in subscript).

p7, line 183: "account" should be "accounts".

p7, line 193: "Long-term land-use dynamics *is* (…)"; should be "are".

p7, line 193-194: "many other factors"; could the authors give an example?

p9, line 245: "is" should be "are".

p9, line 247: Subscript "IR" unclear (it looks like eIR now).

p9, line 250: UNC,LU should be $U_{NC,LU}$ (in subscript).

p10, line 286: "regions in the globe" should be "regions of the globe"

p12, Figure 2: the color used to indicate a ΔP of +25 and -25 mm/yr are too similar. This problem can be solved by making the values above 0 greener (rather than yellow).

p12, line 311: the authors refer to Fig. 2 but this should be Fig. 3.

p13, line 311-313: "The spatially distributed CR2MET dataset shows a precipitation decline consistent with observations, a match that matters given the subsequent use of this dataset for basin-scale assessments." Is this statement based on a statistical test or purely on visual analysis? The authors say that it matters that the observations match the CR2MET data, but this statement would be stronger if they could show that these datasets show significant correlation.

p13, line 319-328: Could the Andes Cordillera also explain discrepancies between this study and others, given the hydroclimatic effects noted earlier (p2, lines 49-50)?

p15, line 372 and 373: “litters” should be “litres” or “liters”.

p23, line 524: “water-demand” should be “water demand” to match other occurrences of this term in the document.

p24, Table 2: in the first scenario description, “(2020-2020)” should be “(2000-2020)”

p25, line 568: “near 30% reduction” should be “nearly a 30% reduction”.

p25, line 586-591: the conclusion could be slightly improved by concluding with a strong final statement, e.g. something along the lines of "Achieving long-term water security in Chile will require not only better governance and infrastructure but also a commitment to sustainable water use practices across all sectors. This study provides critical insights into how such goals can be realized."

IV. REFERENCES

Adler, R.; Wang, J.J.; Sapiano, M.; Huffman, G.; Chiu, L.; Xie, P.P.; Ferraro, R.; Schneider, U.; Becker, A.; Bolvin, D.; Nelkin, E.; Gu, G.; and NOAA CDR Program (2016). Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Climate Data Record (CDR), Version 2.3 (Monthly). National Centers for Environmental Information. http://doi.org/10.7289/V56971M6

Alexandaris, S.; Stricevic, R.; Petkovic, S. (2008). Comparative analysis of reference evapotranspiration from the surface of rainfed grass in central Serbia calculated by six empirical methods against the Penman-Monteith formula. *Eur. Water*, *21*, 17–28

Alvarez-Garreton, C., Boisier, J. P., Billi, M., Lefort, I., Marinao, R., & Barría, P. (2022). Protecting environmental flows to achieve long-term water security. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *328*, 116914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116914

De Souza Ferreira, G. W., Reboita, M. S., Ribeiro, J. G. M., & De Souza, C. A. (2023). Assessment of Precipitation and Hydrological Droughts in South America through Statistically Downscaled CMIP6 Projections. *Climate*, *11*(8), 166. https://doi.org/10.3390/cli11080166

De Souza Nóia Júnior, R., Fraisse, C. W., Cerbaro, V. A., Karrei, M. a. Z., & Guindin, N. (2019). Evaluation of the Hargreaves-Samani Method for Estimating Reference

DGA. (2017). Estimación de la demanda actual, proyecciones futuras y caracterización de la calidad de los recursos hídricos en Chile. SIT 419. Realizado por: Unión temporal de proveedores Hídrica Consultores SPA y Aquaterra ingenieros LTDA.

Falkenmark, M. (2013a). Adapting to climate change: towards societal water security in dry-climate countries. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, *29*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2012.721714

Falkenmark, M. (2013b). Growing water scarcity in agriculture: future challenge to global water security. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *371*(2002), 20120410. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2012.0410

FAO: El estado de los recursos de tierras y aguas del mundo para la alimentación y la agricultura - Sistemas al límite. (2021). https://doi.org/10.4060/cb7654es

Fundacion Chile: Radiografia del Agua: Brecha y Riesgo Hidrico en Chile. (2018). https://escenarioshidricos.cl/publicacion/radiografia-del-agua-brecha-y-riesgo-hidrico-en-chile

Gheewala, S., Silalertruksa, T., Nilsalab, P., Mungkung, R., Perret, S., & Chaiyawannakarn, N. (2014). Water footprint and impact of water consumption for food, feed, fuel crops production in Thailand. *Water*, *6*(6), 1698–1718. https://doi.org/10.3390/w6061698

Gosling, S. N., & Arnell, N. W. (2013). A global assessment of the impact of climate change on water scarcity. *Climatic Change*, *134*(3), 371–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0853-x

Milano, M., Ruelland, D., Fernandez, S., Dezetter, A., Fabre, J., Servat, E., Fritsch, J., Ardoin-Bardin, S., & Thivet, G. (2013). Current state of Mediterranean water resources and future trends under climatic and anthropogenic changes. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, *58*(3), 498–518. https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.774458

Oki, T., & Kanae, S. (2006). Global hydrological cycles and world Water Resources. *Science*, *313*(5790), 1068–1072. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1128845

Pfister, S., & Bayer, P. (2013). Monthly water stress: spatially and temporally explicit consumptive water footprint of global crop production. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *73*, 52–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.11.031

Rockström, J., Falkenmark, M., Allan, T., Folke, C., Gordon, L., Jägerskog, A., Kummu, M., Lannerstad, M., Meybeck, M., Molden, D., Postel, S., Savenije, H., Svedin, U., Turton, A., & Varis, O. (2014). The unfolding water drama in the Anthropocene: towards a resilience-based perspective on water for global sustainability. *Ecohydrology*, *7*(5), 1249–1261. https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.1562

Temesgen, B., Eching, S., Davidoff, B., & Frame, K. (2005). Comparison of Some Reference Evapotranspiration Equations for California. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 131*(1), 73-84. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9437(2005)131:1(73)

Xiao, M., Koppa, A., Mekonnen, Z., Pagán, B. R., Zhan, S., Cao, Q., Aierken, A., Lee, H., & Lettenmaier, D. P. (2017). How much groundwater did California's Central Valley lose during the 2012–2016 drought? *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*(10), 4872–4879. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017gl073333

Yuan, R., Xu, R., Zhang, H., Qiu, C., & Zhu, J. (2024). Satellite-Derived indicators of drought severity and water storage in estuarine reservoirs: a case study of Qingcaosha Reservoir, China. *Remote Sensing*, *16*(6), 980. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs16060980