



Global sensitivity analysis of a SWAT model: comparison of the variance-based and moment-independent approaches

Farkhondeh Khorashadi Zadeh (1), Fanny Sarrazin (2), Jiri Nossent (1,3), Francesca Pianosi (2), Ann van Griensven (1,4), Thorsten Wagener (2,5), and Willy Bauwens (1)

(1) Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Department of Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium, (2) Department of Civil Engineering, University of Bristol, University Walk, BS81TR, Bristol, UK, (3) Flanders Hydraulics Research, Department of Mobility and Public Works, Flemish Government, Antwerp, Belgium, (4) UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education, Core of Hydrology and Water Resources, The Netherlands, (5) Cabot Institute, Royal Fort House, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1UJ, UK

Uncertainty in parameters is a well-known reason of model output uncertainty which, undermines model reliability and restricts model application. A large number of parameters, in addition to the lack of data, limits calibration efficiency and also leads to higher parameter uncertainty. Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) is a set of mathematical techniques that provides quantitative information about the contribution of different sources of uncertainties (e.g. model parameters) to the model output uncertainty. Therefore, identifying influential and non-influential parameters using GSA can improve model calibration efficiency and consequently reduce model uncertainty.

In this paper, moment-independent density-based GSA methods that consider the entire model output distribution – i.e. Probability Density Function (PDF) or Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) - are compared with the widely-used variance-based method and their differences are discussed. Moreover, the effect of model output definition on parameter ranking results is investigated using Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) and model bias as example outputs. To this end, 26 flow parameters of a SWAT model of the River Zenne (Belgium) are analysed. In order to assess the robustness of the sensitivity indices, bootstrapping is applied and 95% confidence intervals are estimated. The results show that, although the variance-based method is easy to implement and interpret, it provides wider confidence intervals, especially for non-influential parameters, compared to the density-based methods. Therefore, density-based methods may be a useful complement to variance-based methods for identifying non-influential parameters.