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A B S T R A C T

Modelling hydrological processes with fully distributed models based on the shallow water equations implies a high computational cost, which often limits the resolution of the computational mesh. Therefore, in practice, modellers need to find a compromise between spatial resolution, numerical accuracy and computational cost. Moreover, this balance is probably related to the accuracy and resolution of the underlying Digital Terrain Model (DTM). In this work, it is studied the effect of the DTM resolution and the size of the computational mesh on the results and on the runtime of a hydrological model based on the 2D shallow water equations. Seven rainfall events in four different basins have been modelled using 3 DTMs and 3 different mesh resolutions. The results obtained highlight the relevance of the vertical accuracy versus the horizontal resolution of the DTMs. Furthermore, it has been observed that mesh resolutions greater than 25 m, together with LiDAR-based DTMs with horizontal resolution greater than 25 m, provide comparable outflow hydrographs.

1. Introduction

Hydrological models are commonly used to reproduce and understand the water fluxes that compose the hydrological cycle of a basin (Refsgaard and Storm, 1990; Schaake et al., 1996). The birth of this type of models took place in the 1960s and since then there have been a large number of improvements both in the development of new numerical methods and in the physical representation of the numerical model (Perumal and Price, 2017; Pham and Tsai, 2017; Singh, 2018). Among the most important advances, one can highlight the flourishing of remote sensing systems, particularly satellites and radars, together with the progress of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The combination of the two has made it possible to work with spatial data on climate, morphology, geology, land use or, inter alia, topography (Muhadi et al., 2020; Mujumdar and Nagesh Kumar, 2012). The development of GIS has, in turn, driven the growth of databases incorporating high spatial resolution information (Berhanu et al., 2013; Lehner and Döll, 2004; Tsangaratos et al., 2017; Uuemaa et al., 2020). This, coupled with the recent advances in high performance computing, has led to the fact that spatially distributed models are gaining momentum against lumped and semi-distributed models (Chen et al., 2017; Fraga et al., 2019; Kang and Sridhar, 2017; Laiolo et al., 2016).

One of the basic input data whose use is ubiquitous in all hydrological models are Digital Terrain Models (DTM). DTMs represent the continuously varying topographic surface of the Earth and provide hydraulic modelers with an efficient tool to extract the hydrological characteristics of a watershed (terrain slope, drainage networks, etc.). Nevertheless, its applicability in distributed models raises a question that was already stated by Quinn et al. (1991) but which is still a matter of research (Bomers et al., 2019; Caviedes-Voulilhé et al., 2012; Costabile and Costanzo, 2020; Fernández-Pato et al., 2016; Hsu et al., 2018a) namely, what DTM resolution is needed to achieve a correct representation of the relevant hydrological processes? This question goes hand in hand with the following: what is the most appropriate mesh size for a given DTM resolution? These questions become even more complex if we consider studies such as Marsh et al. (2018) where it is indicated that the mesh configuration is not only constrained by topography, but must also correctly represent surface and sub-surface

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: g.glores@udc.es (G. García-Alén).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2022.128182
Received 8 April 2022; Received in revised form 6 June 2022; Accepted 4 July 2022
Available online 11 July 2022
0022-1694/© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-
nc-nd/4.0/).
features, along with landscape variability. Moreover, the DTM resolution should be related to the spatial scale of the hydrological processes that we want to represent. On the other hand, for a proper exploitation of the DTM resolution, the cell size of the computational mesh should be equal to, or smaller than, the DTM cell size. However, in large scale fully distributed models the computational cost of a very fine mesh may be unaffordable. Moreover, in addition to the spatial resolution of the DTM and the mesh, the vertical accuracy of the DTM is also relevant, since it can lead to significant inaccuracies in model predictions. Undoubtedly, the accuracy and resolution of DTMs must be taken into account in the calculation processes, and authors such as Habtezion et al. (2016) have long since reflected on whether hydrological modelers are fully aware of the limitations of DTMs.

There are many studies that have explored the impact of the DTM quality in different kinds of hydrological models. Vaze et al. (2010) studied the impact of DTM accuracy and resolution on topographic indices using as a case study a 32,000 ha catchment located in Australia. It was concluded that the quality of DTM-derived hydrological features is very sensitive to DTM accuracy and resolution. Their results suggest that the DTM with the highest resolution available should be used and, in those cases where computational time constraints do not allow its use, a resampling to a lower resolution should be done instead of directly taking a DTM with a lower resolution. Other authors, such as Mukherjee et al. (2012) or Courty et al. (2019), directly analysed the accuracy of different freely available DTMs, helping to better understand the limitation of such products (Zhao et al., 2021). In contrast, several authors have focused on analysing the role of the grid size in hydro-morphological studies (Dietrich et al., 1995; Gómez Gutiérrez et al., 2015; Kienzle, 2004; Wilson et al., 2000). In order to compute topographic characteristics, Claessens et al. (2005) looked at the impact of using different grid sizes (10, 25, 50 and 100 m), while Paulin et al. (2010) investigated how different grid sizes (1, 5, 10 and 30 m) affected the cartographic depiction of small and deep landslides. However, works such as Tarolli and Tarboton (2006), where the relation between mesh sizes and DTM resolution is studied, are less common.

The application of hydrological models based on the 2D shallow water equations is becoming a common approach in rainfall-runoff simulations at the catchment scale (Bellos et al., 2020; Caviedes-Voullième et al., 2012; Cea and Bladé, 2015; Costabile et al., 2012; Fernández-Pato et al., 2018; Hou et al., 2018b; Liang et al., 2015; Ni et al., 2020; Simons et al., 2014; Uber et al., 2021). One of the most valued features of such complex models is the fact that they allow hydrodynamic calculations to be carried out on a basin scale, but taking into account local flow phenomena. In order to capture the potential effects that hydraulic structures, such as bridges or weirs, have on the propagation of the flood, it is required a high resolution numerical model (e.g., Macchione and Lombardo, 2021). Although at the local scale the hydrostatic pressure approximation (essential assumption in 2D-SWE models) is not valid in the surroundings of these structures, these models still provide reliable results at the catchment scale (García-Alén et al., 2021; Luis et al., 2022). In the definition of the computational mesh of the model, despite recent advances in High Performance Computing (HPC) (García-Feit et al., 2018; Lacasta et al., 2015; Petaccia et al., 2016; Sanders and Schubert, 2019; Vacondio et al., 2014; Xia et al., 2019), modellers often have to make a balance between a fine mesh that correctly reproduces the topography of the terrain (Costabile and Macchione, 2015) and a feasible computational cost. Some authors have focused on the optimisation of the computational domain by exploring the advantages of mixed-mesh (Bomers et al., 2019; Hoch et al., 2018) and adaptive grids (Hu et al., 2019; Savant et al., 2019). Other authors have explored the mesh refinement by the detection of key topographic features (Costabile and Costanzo, 2021; Ferraro et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2018a).

In this paper we study the interactions between the DTM and computational mesh resolutions on rainfall-runoff simulation with a fully distributed hydrodynamic model based on the 2D-SWE. This analysis is carried out by studying the degeneracy of the output hydrograph observed with several DTMs and mesh resolutions, together with the analysis of the different runtimes. The output hydrograph obtained with the best-resolution mesh and DTM was used as reference result (synthetic true). The results obtained in 7 rainfall events occurring in 4 hydrological basins are studied. For each rainfall event, 9 model configurations were run by combining 3 freely distributed DTMs with 3 different mesh sizes. Regarding the DTMs, the horizontal resolutions used were 5, 25 and 30 m. The 5 and 25 m DTMs are LiDAR-based products offered by the Spanish National Geographic Institute (IGN) and, therefore, only available for Spain; while the 30 m DTM is product provided by the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) and global coverage. As for the computational meshes used, 3 different resolutions have been defined for each basin and their element size has been adapted to the size of each basin, always maintaining a ratio between element sizes of 1, 2.5 and 10.

2. Case studies and available data

2.1. Description of the watersheds

Four river basins located in Spain were selected to undertake this study: Izas, Caldo, Landro and Genil river basins (Fig. 1). In the choice of the study cases, priority has been given to the selection of basins of different size (from 0.33 to 3750 km²), mean slope (from 7° to 20°) and precipitation regime (their maximum daily precipitation varies from 36 to 142.8 mm). A summary of the main characteristics of each watershed is included in Table 1. The Genil river basin represents a large low sloped watershed marked by a Mediterranean climate with a low base flow during most of the year but with intense rainfall events that produce strong peak flows. On the other hand, the Caldo and Landro basins have a steeper topography and are located in an Atlantic climate region characterized by a more uniform rainfall regime. Finally, the Izas basin is a small mountain catchment located in the Pyrenees, with steep slopes and a very low concentration time.

The Izas Catchment is located in the Central Spain Pyrenees, in the Upper Galléigo Valley, near the Spain-France border. The catchment occupies an extension of 0.33 km² and is located at an altitude of over 2000 m a.s.l. The catchment is predominantly east oriented, with some areas also facing north or south. The main ravinne is a tributary of the Escarra river which, in turn, is a tributary of the Galléigo river which, finally, debouches into the Ebro river. The entire catchment is located above the upper forest limit and exemplifies the general conditions of subalpine areas of the Pyrenees. Subalpine and alpine grassland domain the landscape, although some rocky outcrops are also present in the upper and steeper slopes (Lana-Renault et al., 2014; López-Moreno et al., 2013; Revuelto et al., 2017). Rainy season in this basin is between October and May (Alvera and García-Ruiz, 2000). The Caldo river catchment, with an area of 38 km², is located in north-west Spain in the border with Portugal. Land cover is dominated by grasslands, coniferous and leaf forest and different kind of crops (Meléndez-Asensio and del Pozo-Tejado, 2019). The region is located in the transition between the Mediterranean and Eurosiberian biogeographic zones, therefore, the climate is temperate oceanic sub-Mediterranean (Ninyerola et al., 2005). The Landro river is located in north-western Spain. The total area of its basin is 199 km² and its mean altitude is below 1000 m a.s.l. This river is born in the Gistral mountain range and flows into the Cantabrian Sea in the Viveiro estuary. The watershed is covered by eucalyptus and pine forests and scrublands with only a small proportion of cultivated areas in the river floodplains. The soil permeability of the basin is low (Barja and Lestegas, 1992). Rainfall is quite regular throughout the year, which reflects an oceanic rainfall regime, with maximum flows in winter and minimum flows in summer. The Genil river basin is located in southern Spain and its catchment covers an area of 8200 km². In its central area is located the Iznájar reservoir (981 km³), which is one of the largest reservoirs in Spain. This reservoir was
designed to absorb the ordinary floods of the river and it completely controls the downstream discharge. Thus, it divides the Genil river basin into two subbasins: Upper and Lower Genil. Only the Lower Genil subbasin has been analysed in this study. This basin begins at the Iznájar reservoir and ends in the municipality of Écija. The study area has a total surface of 3750 km². It is a typical Mediterranean landscape, with fragile natural ecosystems and insufficient rainfall to allow for quick vegetation regeneration and long-term human use. The climate is arid, with an annual rainfall of 500 mm. There is a wide range of vegetation cover, including annual crops, grassland, bushes and woodland. However, given that the main economic activity in the area is agriculture, irrigated crops and rainfed olive groves account for a significant area of the basin.

### 2.2. Rainfall events

Seven rainfall events have been modelled in the study basins (1 event in the Izas basin and 2 events in the Caldo, Landro and Genil basins). All of these are isolated rainfall events that produced high peak flows in the river. The observed precipitation and flow data were obtained from different sources for each catchment. In the Izas basin data were provided by the Pyrenean Institute of Ecology (IPE). In the Caldo basin, data were provided by the Miño-Sil River Basin Management Authority (CHMS). In the Landro basin data were provided by the Galician Meteorological Agency (Meteogalicia). Finally, in the Genil basin data were provided by the Guadalquivir River Basin Management Authority.

### Table 1

Main characteristics of the study basins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Mean slope (°)</th>
<th>Altitude range (m.a.s.l.)</th>
<th>Average annual precipitation (mm)</th>
<th>Average annual maximum daily precipitation (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Izas</td>
<td>North-Eastern Spain</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2060-2280</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldo</td>
<td>North-western Spain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>370-1200</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landro</td>
<td>North-western Spain</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0-1033</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genil</td>
<td>Southern Spain</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90-1438</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>142.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Study catchments.
(CHG). Main characteristics of the rainfall events, along with the peak discharge and volume of the observed hydrograph, are listed in Table 2.

Due to the small size of the Izas and Caldo catchments, a spatially homogeneous rainfall was assumed in these two basins. In the case of the Landro and Genil basins, the spatial distribution of rainfall was estimated from rain gauge and radar data.

3. Methodology

3.1. Digital terrain models

The three DTMs used in this study are the following: (1) the DTM provided by the Spanish National Geographic Institute (IGN) at a 5 m resolution (IGN-CNIG, 2021); (2) the DTM provided by the Spanish IGN at a 25 m resolution; and (3) the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) DTM with a grid size of 1 arc-second (approximately 30 m) (Farr et al., 2007; Werner, 2001). The different spatial resolutions of the 3 DTMs are visually compared in Fig. 2. Hereafter, these DTMs will be referred to as DMT05, DTM25 and DTM30, respectively.

The first two DTMs are derived from the Spanish Aerial Orthophotography National Plan in Spain (PNOA), and are freely distributed by the Spanish National Geographic Institute (IGN) (IGN-CNIG, 2021). DTM05 was obtained by automatic correlation and interactive stereoscopic debugging for the PNOA initiative. Its RMSE in the vertical direction is estimated to be lower than 50 cm (PNOA, 2015). DTM25 was generated by interpolation of the DTM05, maintaining a RMSE value for the elevation differences of 2.9 m (Martínez et al., 2004).

NASA Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) datasets were obtained from a collaborative effort by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), as well as the participation of the German and Italian space agencies, with the purpose of generating a near-global DTM of the Earth using radar interferometry. The DTM30 (“SRTM V3.0, 1arcsec”) (Farr et al., 2007) is a near-global DTM with a 1 arc second (=30 m) resolution comprising a combination of data from the SRTM and the U. S. Geological Survey’s GTOPO30 data set. The primary goal of creating the Version 3 data was to eliminate voids that were present in earlier versions of SRTM data. The global and free availability (NASA JPL, 2013) of the SRTM DTMs has led to its application in multiple hydrological studies (Alsdorf et al., 2007; Hancock et al., 2006; Sreedevi et al., 2009).

According to its mission objectives, SRTM DTMs are expected to have a vertical RMSE of 10 m (Chen et al., 2020; Farr et al., 2007; Kellundorfer et al., 2004; Mukul et al., 2015), even though validation studies reported a vertical RMSE in Europe of 3.8 m (Carrera-Hernandez, 2021; Mukul et al., 2017; Santillan and Makinano-Santillan, 2016; Szabó et al., 2015).

Regardless of their origin, all these DTMs can include sinks that originate from an inadequate elevation precision and closed topographic depressions (O’Callaghan and Mark, 1984). The majority of depressions in DTMs are singularities caused by a failure of the source data to capture the topography’s natural break lines, insufficient grid resolution, random errors that create flow blockages, and a surface model’s inability to properly represent infrastructure such as culverts and bridges (Lindsay, 2016). Most hydrological applications of DTMs begin with sink removal to ensure continuous flow paths by flow enforcement techniques including filling and breaching methods (Martz and Garbrecht, 1998). This is a commonly used technique as not all hydrological models are able to work with DTMs that include depressions or even flat bottom. Also knowing that such depression-filling algorithms have been criticised in the academic literature for their greater impact on DTMs (Lindsay, 2016), the authors have avoided using such techniques in order to prevent disturbing the comparison between DTMs. Therefore, raw digital models have been used without applying any type of sink filling treatment.

3.2. Numerical model

Surface runoff was simulated using the numerical model Iber+ (García-Feal et al., 2018), which is a GPU-parallelized version of the Iber model (Bladé et al., 2014). Iber - is a 2D numerical model for simulating free surface flow and transport processes in shallow waters. Iber + allows calculating rainfall-runoff (hydrological) and inundation (hydraulic) processes in a coupled way, and it has been validated for rainfall-runoff modelling in multiple previous works (Cea et al., 2014, 2010; Cea and Bladé, 2015; Fraga et al., 2019, 2016; Sanz-Ramos et al., 2021). Its reliability and computational efficiency has even led Iber + to be recently incorporated in several flood early warning systems (Fernández-Nóvoa et al., 2020; Fraga et al., 2020; González-Cao et al., 2019).

The mass and momentum conservation equations solved by the model can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial q_y}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial q_x}{\partial y} = R - i$$

(1)

$$\frac{\partial q_x}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x^2}{h} + g h^2 \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{h} \right) = -gh \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} - g \frac{n^2}{h} |q| q_x$$

(2)

$$\frac{\partial q_y}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{h} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_y^2}{h} + g h^2 \right) = -gh \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} - g \frac{n^2}{h} |q| q_y$$

(3)

where $h$ is the water depth, $q_x$, $q_y$ and $|q|$ are the two components of the unit discharge and its modulus, $z_b$ is the bed elevation, $n$ is the Manning coefficient, $g$ is the gravity acceleration, $R$ is the rainfall intensity and $i$ the infiltration rate. The source terms of precipitation and infiltration can vary in space and time and, since both terms are included independently in the hydrodynamic equations, infiltration can occur even in the absence of precipitation, as long as there is a positive water depth over a mesh element. Therefore, the possible effect of local topographic features on the infiltration rate is implicitly included in the equations. However, the numerical representation of this process will be dependent on the resolution of the DTM and computational mesh, since recent studies have shown that low-resolution models tend to poorly represent land surface features and therefore eliminate depressions and barriers that interrupt and retain flow, leading to a decrease in cumulative infiltration (Habtezion et al., 2016). The hydrodynamic equations are solved using an unstructured finite volume solver, which includes a specific numerical scheme for hydrological applications (Cea and Bladé, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event number</th>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Duration (h)</th>
<th>Starting date</th>
<th>Total rainfall depth (mm)</th>
<th>$Q_{peak}$ (m$^3$/s)</th>
<th>Runoff depth (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Izas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19/10/2012</td>
<td>262.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>181.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caldo</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
<td>303.0</td>
<td>108.46</td>
<td>286.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14/12/2019</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>326.9</td>
<td>139.22</td>
<td>289.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landro</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24/01/2021</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>02/02/2021</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>49.66</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Genil</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20/10/2018</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>953.21</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>04/11/2020</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>354.28</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This numerical scheme is first-order accurate in space and time. The geometry of the four catchments was discretized using an unstructured and uniform mesh of triangular elements generated in GiD (Coll et al., 2018a, 2018b). GiD adapts the mesh size to the geometry of the model by approximating the element sizes to the value indicated by the modeler. The maximum relative error in this size approximation was set at 10%. The chosen element size is not constant in all catchments and is detailed in Section 3.3. Regarding the temporal accuracy of the models, the discretization used in this work is explicit in time, which implies that the computational time step is constrained by a stability condition (CFL condition). In addition, the dry-wet limit has been set equal to 0.1 mm in all simulations.

In Iber+, the DTM values are interpolated to the nodes of the computational mesh using a bilinear interpolation method. The elevation value at each mesh vertex is interpolated using the 4 DTM elevation values closest to the vertex being interpolated. Bottom friction is modelled in Iber+ with the Manning’s formula (Bladé et al., 2014). In this work the Manning coefficient was defined according to the land use map of the European project CORINE Land Cover 2018 (CLC2018) (European Union Copernicus Land Monitoring Service, 2018) and the recommendations of the Methodological Guide for the Development of the National Floodplain Mapping System (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino, 2011), which proposes a Manning coefficient for each of the CORINE land uses. Infiltration was modelled following the SCS-CN methodology (Mockus, 1964). The single parameter of the model, the Curve Number (CN), was defined according to the rainfall registered the days prior to the start of the event, distinguishing between dry (CN I), normal (CN II) or wet (CN III) antecedent moisture conditions. Finally, it is worth mentioning that in all simulations a warm-up period of the model has been set until the base flow at the beginning of the event is reached.

Table 3 shows the Curve Number used for each event and the Manning coefficient values used for each basin. Due to the small size of the Izas basin, a constant CN value has been taken for the whole watershed. The Genil basin is characterised by low surface runoff coefficients (Table 2). While for the rest of the basins the surface runoff coefficient remains above 46% and 9%, respectively for events 6 and 7. Table 1 reveals that the Genil catchment is the basin with the lowest annual precipitation but with the highest maximum daily precipitation. The lowest value of CN is also found in this basin (Table 3). With respect to the rest of the watersheds, a coherence is observed between the Curve Number and the runoff coefficient for the analysed events.

### Spatial discretisation

As previously mentioned, the spatial resolutions of the DTMs used in this study are 5, 25 and 30 m. To achieve a full exploitation of the DTM resolution, the cell size of the numerical mesh should be equal to, or lower than, the resolution of the DTM. However, the computational cost of using a very fine mesh in models that cover large areas can result in calculation times that are prohibitive for most practical applications, especially when using fully distributed hydrological models based on the 2D-SWE, which leads to the use of element sizes larger than the DTM resolution and results in a loss of topographical information. This can be partially improved by the use of non-uniform meshes, with smaller element sizes in the river network and larger sizes in the hillslopes (Costabile and Costanzo, 2021; Ferraro et al., 2020; Uber et al., 2021). This might improve the accuracy of the results without increasing too much the total number of elements. In order to simplify the analysis, in this work unstructured uniform meshes were considered.

Implementing a subgrid modelling approach can include some topographical information in the equations when the DTM resolution is much higher than the computational mesh resolution, in order to improve the results without affecting too much the computational time. Such kind of subgrid modelling approaches have been applied to the shallow water equations in previous studies (Platzeck et al., 2016; Sanders and Schubert, 2019; Shen et al., 2015; Shustikova et al., 2019; Volp et al., 2013), but have not been used in the present model, since they are not implemented in most shallow water models.

The different size of the catchments analysed in this work (from 0.33 to 3750 km²) made it impossible to use the same cell size in all the models due to computational cost limitations. In the Caldo and Landro
basins, with an area of approximately 40 and 200 km², the element sizes were 10, 25 and 100 m. Smaller element sizes were not used since they would imply a very high computational cost, not affordable in practical applications. In the Izas basin (0.33 km²) the element sizes used were 1, 2.5 and 10 m, in order to have some grids with a higher resolution than the finest DTMs. In the Genil basin (3750 km²) it was not possible to reach the mesh resolutions used in the Caldo and Landro finest meshes, so the mesh sizes used were 25, 62.5 and 250 m.

Table 4 summarises the main characteristics of the computational grids used. A triangular unstructured uniform mesh was used in all cases. In the following, the mesh sizes will be denoted, according to its resolution, as fine, medium and coarse.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Model validation

In order to analyse the degradation of the model output when working with a coarser mesh and a lower resolution DTM, the hydrographs computed with the fine mesh and the highest resolution DTM (DTM05) were taken as a reference value. Fig. 3 compares, for each event, the observed hydrograph with the simulated reference hydrograph. The visual comparison depicted in Fig. 3 and the values of MAE, NSE and relative error for hydrograph volume obtained for each case show a reasonably good agreement between numerical results and field data. MAE of each event has been normalised to the peak flow of the corresponding observed hydrograph to allow a comparison between the different events, obtaining an average MAE value of 7% of the peak flow. The values of the MAE/Qp and NSE indicators are satisfactory, however it can be observed that the adjustment of the hydrograph volumes in some events is not accurate, due to mismatches in the base flow of the numerical model.

4.2. Effect of the computational mesh and DTM resolutions

Fig. 4 shows the NSE coefficient obtained for each of the rainfall events and the overall performance of the different mesh sizes. The 3 DTMs have very different characteristics, so the results of each DTM have been represented in different subplots to help the further analysis. Regarding the differences between the results obtained for the DTM05 and the DTM25, the NSE values are practically the same. Knowing that the DTM25 is a product created by the IGN from the DTM05, the results indicate that the vertical accuracy of the data is more relevant than the spatial horizontal resolution of the DTM itself. Furthermore, it can be seen that, at the same mesh resolution (fine), DTM25 provides comparable results to DTM05. This finding would not follow the trend identified by Habtezion et al. (2016), who noted that the DTM resolution threshold above which similar results would not follow the trend identified by Habtezion et al. (2016), the median mesh (62.5 m) obtains results very close to those of the fine mesh (25 m), with values still above 0.716. However, a strong reduction of the NSE is perceived with the coarse meshes (250 m), particularly in event 7.

This degradation of the result as a function of element size is clearer in Fig. 5. This figure shows the NSE, normalized centered root-mean-square difference (\(E_n\)) (Taylor, 2001) and MAE results obtained for the different DTMs and in relation to the element size of each catchment. Regarding \(E_n\) values below 0.5 are assumed to be good, as this limit has already been used as a reference in the analysis of streamflow series with this parameter (González-Cao et al., 2019). In the case of MAE, the result has been normalised to the peak flow of the reference hydrograph to facilitate the comparison between the different events. The correlation of the results has been estimated with Pearson’s and Spearman’s coefficients and their value is indicated for each of the subplots (\(r_p\) and \(r_s\), respectively). Again, we find here a clear analogy between the NSE values obtained for the DTM05 and DTM25; and it is seen how this result holds with the \(E_n\) and MAE/Qp values too. Also, the DTM30 differs from the DTM05 and DTM25 especially for the Landro and Genil basins (the largest ones). A larger surface area in these catchment favours the appearance of outlier points with low accuracy which, together with the low runoff depth value of the events in Landro and Genil (relative to the Izas and Caldo events), intensifies the degradation of the outflow hydrograph. Regarding the results obtained for the mesh sizes, although the number of data is not high, a quasi-linear relationship is observed in the metrics corresponding to the DTM05 and DTM25. In particular, for both DTMs, the good results obtained from a threshold close to 25 m stand out, since all NSE values are above 0.913, \(E_n\) values are below 0.293 and MAE/Qp values are below 0.028. Apart from this, the results obtained with the DTM05 and DTM25 for the fine meshes are also remarkable.

As a representative example, Fig. 6 includes the hydrographs obtained for Event 5 (Landro river basin). In this figure it can be seen how, visually, the results obtained with the DTM05 and DTM25 for the fine and medium meshes are similar and very close to the reference hydrograph (finest mesh and DTM05). Another significant result is that DTM25 and especially the DTM30 (for fine and medium mesh) tend to underestimate the peak of the hydrograph. This pattern has been repeated in the rest of the events. These results are in line with what was highlighted by Habtezion et al. (2016), where it was observed that coarse resolution DTMs (≥ 10 m) tend to overestimate ponded areas and therefore to reduce and delay the peak of the hydrograph. However, in view of the results obtained, where there is a large understimation of the peak flow by the DTM30, at a different magnitude than the DTM25, it could be deduced that this trend is not only linked to the horizontal resolution of the DTM, but also to its vertical accuracy.

The outflow hydrograph can be affected by the water retention capacity of the DTM used. The effect that the study DTMs have on this accumulation of water on the model surface is shown in Fig. 7. Taking as
representative example the event 4 registered in the Landro river basin, Fig. 7 shows the spatial distribution of the maximum depths obtained for the 3 DTMs and the finest mesh. The model’s runoff volume at each timestep has also been added. The results observed at Fig. 7 confirm the relevance of the DTM change in the model outcome. When the results obtained for the three DTMs are compared, it can be seen that, despite maintaining the same mesh resolution (fine) and despite having a DTM horizontal resolution close to the DTM25, DTM30 notably increase the surface storage capacity of the model. This increase in storage capacity is less relevant in the Izas and Caldo basins. In addition, this increase in storage capacity is also related to the increase in the size of the mesh elements. This effect influences the poor results of coarse meshes and, as Caviedes-Voullième et al. (2012) has already indicated, it is, in part, due to the poor topographic representation of the terrain. Since local minima
and maxima may be poorly represented with coarse meshes, which results in static, ponded water which cannot flow further. This effect is enhanced in events that have much lower peak flows (e.g., event 7 with lower peak flow than event 6).

For a better understanding of the differences obtained with the DTM30 regarding the DTM25 and DTM05 it is necessary to look at the origin of the DTMs themselves. The DTM05 and DTM25 are LiDAR-derived DTMs, however, DTM30 is created via InSAR (i.e., active sensor). Even though active sensors have its advantages over passive sensors (e.g., active sensors are considered to penetrate more the vegetation than an active sensor), it is a technique that cannot compete with the precision of LiDAR. In fact, in works such as Courty et al. (2019), where the accuracy of different open-access DTMs (including a SRTM product) in flood modelling is compared, the LiDAR-derived DTM values are taken as a reference for the evaluation criteria.

In order to analyse the effect of the different DTMs on the computational mesh, Fig. 8 shows the comparison between some cross-sections, belonging again to the Landro river basin, reproduced with the different calculation meshes used in the numerical simulations. In particular, as an example, three cross-sections have been considered. In line with previous statements, compared to the reference case (DTM05 and fine mesh), the performance of the DTM25 is remarkable, together
with the less accurate reproduction of DTM30. In the results obtained with the fine mesh, a MAE of less than 0.7 m has been obtained in the 3 sections related to DTM25 and, however, this value rises to more than 12 m in sections 1 and 2 corresponding to the DTM30. Furthermore, for DTM05 and DTM25, the results obtained with the medium mesh, reproduce reasonably well the profile obtained with the fine mesh (the maximum MAE is obtained in section 2 for DTM25 and is equal to 4.27 m). Nevertheless, with the coarse mesh, the obtained profiles are visibly far from a correct representation of the reference profile, greatly limiting the drainage capacity of the section. For example, the MAE resulted for DTM05 and coarse mesh in section 3 is equal to 10.62 m.

4.3. Runtime

The runtime increment of each simulation with respect to the runtime obtained with the DTM05 and the fine mesh is represented in Fig. 9. In general, the runtimes obtained with the DTM25 tend to be equal or slightly lower than those of the DTM05. This result is affected by the fact that the DTM25 is smoother than the DTM05, which results in somewhat higher depths or velocities being generated in some areas of the model in the latter case. Since the temporal discretization of the numerical model is subject to a Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) stability constraint over the computational time step (Cea and Blade, 2015), numerically, and under a constant element size, the increase in water velocity and depth is
compensated by a reduction in the time step. This implies a smaller computational time step in the simulations performed with the DTM05, so its computation time is in general equal to or higher than that obtained in the DTM25 simulations. Something similar is also true for the DTM30. The runtimes obtained with this DTM tend to be always equal to or higher than the rest of the DTMs. DTM30 has a lower quality than the rest of DTMs, which causes significant water accumulations in the model that affect its runtime. In some cases, the difference in runtime increment of DTM30 is particularly relevant (e.g., event 6 and fine mesh). In these cases, the resolution of the mesh aggravates the imperfections of the DTM30 and has an effect on this increase in the runtime. The size of the mesh elements has a direct implication on the CFL condition. A larger element size leads to an increase in computational time step and therefore a decrease of the runtime. Overall, the use of the medium mesh (with elements 2.5 times larger than those of fine mesh) instead of the fine mesh results in a reduction of approximately 90% of the calculation time. The simulations carried out with the coarse mesh (with elements 10 times larger than those of fine mesh) further reduce the calculation time, reaching a reduction of more than 99% in Izas, Landro and Genil basins.

5. Conclusions

With the recent development of fully distributed hydrological models, and their application to large catchments, the spatial resolution of the mesh and model inputs becomes highly relevant. This study was
intended to understand the effects that different DTM and mesh resolutions have on the simulation results both output hydrographs and runtimes. Thus, seven observed rainfall events corresponding to 4 basins have been selected to be modelled using the Iber + numerical model. Each of the events was simulated for 3 different mesh sizes and for 3 different DTMs, making a total of 63 simulations (9 per event). The hydrographs obtained for the higher resolution DTM and the finest mesh have been taken as a reference (synthetic observation).

The results obtained indicate that, under the same mesh resolution, the vertical accuracy of the DTM has a greater effect on the output hydrograph of the model than the horizontal resolution of the DTM. Despite a five-fold increase in spatial resolution, the results obtained with the 25 m DTM (DTM25) were very similar to those obtained with the 5 m DTM (DTM05). Results that have not been correctly reproduced by the 30 m DTM (DTM30). In addition, it has also been shown that mesh resolutions up to a threshold of 25 m, together with a LiDAR-based DTM with a horizontal resolution higher than 25 m, did provide comparable results with regard to the outlet hydrograph. The values obtained with a 25 m resolution mesh have achieved a minimum value of 0.913 in terms of NSE; maximum value of 0.293 of normalized centred root-mean-square difference (E_r) and 0.028 of MAE normalised to the peak flow, along with a 90% saving in runtime compared the result of a 2.5 times higher resolution mesh. In the application of fully distributed hydrological models based on the 2D shallow water equations, the use of global datasets should be limited only to those locations where LiDAR data are not available. In the case of using a lower resolution than the LiDAR-based DTM, the topography should be defined from a resampling of this product rather than from global datasets. These conclusions are consistent at least for fully distributed hydrological models based on the shallow water equations with a uniform unstructured computational mesh and only with regard to the outlet hydrograph of the basin. The possible degradation of other distributed hydrological outputs, such as depth and velocity maps, has not been analysed in this article but will be considered for further work.
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