



**HAL**  
open science

## Signatures-and-sensitivity-based multi-criteria variational calibration for distributed hydrological modeling applied to Mediterranean floods

Ngo Nghi Truyen Huynh, Pierre-André Garambois, François Colleoni, Pierre  
Javelle

### ► To cite this version:

Ngo Nghi Truyen Huynh, Pierre-André Garambois, François Colleoni, Pierre Javelle. Signatures-and-sensitivity-based multi-criteria variational calibration for distributed hydrological modeling applied to Mediterranean floods. 2022. hal-03781526v2

**HAL Id: hal-03781526**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03781526v2>**

Preprint submitted on 21 Mar 2023 (v2), last revised 31 Aug 2023 (v4)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Signatures-and-sensitivity-based multi-criteria variational calibration for distributed hydrological modeling applied to Mediterranean floods

Ngo Nghi Truyen Huynh<sup>a</sup>, Pierre-André Garambois<sup>a</sup>, François Colleoni<sup>a</sup> and Pierre Javelle<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>INRAE, Aix Marseille Université, RECOVER, 3275 Route Cézanne, Aix-en-Provence 13182, France

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Hydrological modeling  
Hydrological signatures  
Variational data assimilation  
Multi-objective optimization  
Pareto-optimal solution  
Variance-based sensitivity analysis

## ABSTRACT

Classical calibration methods in hydrology typically rely on a single cost function computed on long-term streamflow series. Even when hydrological models achieve acceptable scores in NSE and KGE, imbalances can still arise between overall model performance and its ability to simulate flood events, particularly flash floods. Enhancing multi-criteria calibration methods with multi-scale signatures to improve distributed flood modeling remains a challenge. In this study, the potential of hydrological signatures computed continuously and at the scale of flood events, are employed within various multi-criteria calibration approaches to attain a more efficient hydrological model. We present a novel sensitivity and signatures-based calibration framework, implemented in the variational data assimilation algorithm of SMASH platform, which we apply to 141 catchments mostly located in the French Mediterranean region. Our approach involves computing several signatures, including flood event signatures, using an automated flood segmentation algorithm. We select suitable signatures for constraining the model based on their global sensitivity with the input parameters. We then perform two multi-criteria calibration strategies using the selected signatures, including a single-objective optimization approach, which transforms the multi-criteria problem into a single-objective function, and a multi-objective optimization approach, which uses a simple additive weighting method to select an optimal solution from a set of non-inferior solutions. Our results show significant improvements in both calibration and temporal validation metrics, especially for flood signatures, demonstrating the robustness and delicacy of our signatures-based calibration framework for enhancing flash flood forecasting systems.

## 1. Introduction

Numerical hydrological models are used extensively to simulate catchments responses to atmospheric signals and are a key component of floods forecasting systems where accuracy in terms of peak location, amplitude and timing is crucial. As a matter of facts, hydrological models, whatever their complexity and spatialization, consist in more or less empirical representations of flows through watersheds compartments and contain parameters that cannot be inferred directly from the available observations but can only be meaningfully estimated through a calibration procedure (e.g. Gupta et al. (2006); Vrugt et al. (2008)). Such procedures aim to improve the model capability in reproducing the available observations of hydrological responses dynamics by optimizing model parameters.

Nevertheless, the whole construction process of a hydrological model is faced with the issue of equifinality: distinct model structures and/or parameter sets can lead to similar (in a sense to be defined) simulations. The equifinality concept has been popularized in hydrology by Beven (1993) while the issues of uncertainty in determining

✉ ngo-nghi-truyen.huynh@inrae.fr (N.N.T. Huynh); pierre-andre.garambois@inrae.fr (P. Garambois); francois.colleoni@inrae.fr (F. Colleoni); pierre.javelle@inrae.fr (P. Javelle)  
ORCID(s): 0000-0001-5078-3865 (N.N.T. Huynh)

42 environmental model structures and estimating their parameters were known (e.g. Beck (1987); Yeh (1986)). For a  
43 given hydrological model structure, the calibration of its parameters is in general an ill-posed inverse problem with  
44 non unique solutions and the definition of an optimization algorithm and of a calibration metric is an essential modeling  
45 decision. Indeed, it determines how hydrological information is seen and learn in the calibration process and it can  
46 substantially affect the quality and consistency of model simulations.

47 In hydrology, most calibration approaches attempt to optimize input parameters of a model such that they result in  
48 a minimal misfit between simulated and observed discharge. Nevertheless, because no single metric can exhaustively  
49 represent this misfit, the calibration of a hydrological model is "inherently multi-objective" as remarked by Gupta  
50 et al. (1998). Several performance metrics have been proposed over the past decades in the literature for hydrological  
51 modeling. The classical quadratic Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) Nash and Sutcliffe (1970) (cf. Appendix A.1) has  
52 been used for long time. The Kling–Gupta (KGE) (cf. Appendix A.2) proposed in Gupta et al. (2009) and based  
53 on a decomposition of the NSE has also become widely used. Other metrics, in form of signature measures (see  
54 review in McMillan (2021)), have been proposed in the literature for model evaluation (e.g. Yilmaz et al. (2008)) and  
55 used in model optimization (e.g. Roux et al. (2011); Shafii and Tolson (2015); Mostafaie et al. (2018); Sahraei et al.  
56 (2020); Wu et al. (2021) and references therein). Hydrological signatures can be used to derive application-specific  
57 metrics such as for high flows in Mizukami et al. (2019) or Roux et al. (2011). Moreover, hydrological signatures are  
58 a useful tool to effectively evaluate models and diagnose the role of their components in explaining the discrepancy  
59 between the simulated and observed behavior (Gupta et al., 2009), especially when combined with global sensitivity  
60 analysis (Horner, 2020). Nonetheless, there is still a need for automated methods capable of computing signatures on  
61 observed and modeled hydrological responses, at multiple time scales with the underlying difficulties of consistent  
62 segmentation of flood events as highlighted in Tarasova et al. (2018), of computing global sensitivity analysis of  
63 simulated signatures with respect to the model parameters (Horner, 2020), and finally of performing signature based  
64 parametric optimization.

65 Although the concept of flood event is widely used in hydrology, there is no clear consensus on approaches for  
66 flood detection from continuous streamflow time series, as pointed out in Tarasova et al. (2018). Several studies have  
67 suggested segmentation algorithms for detecting flood events (refer to the references in Tarasova et al. (2018)). For  
68 instance, Li et al. (2022); Astagneau et al. (2021) used simple segmentation methods respectively involving fixed time  
69 windows before and after rainfall events or discharge thresholds to detect events. Meanwhile, Tarasova et al. (2018)  
70 developed an algorithm incorporating, baseflow separation technique (see also Pelletier and Andréassian (2020)),  
71 rainfall attribution methods and an iterative procedure to identify single-peak components of multiple-peak events.  
72 In this study, we propose an automated segmentation algorithm, consisting of, peak detection in discharge series,  
73 catchment rainfall time series analysis through a combination of rainfall gradients and rainfall energy criterion, which

74 enables a robust determination of flood start time on contrasted catchment-floods, and a classical baseflow separation  
75 for determining the end of an event.

76 Hydrological calibration problems that incorporate multiple metrics, including multi-scale signatures, can be  
77 considered as multi-criteria optimization problems. Generally, three categories of methods are employed for solving  
78 multi-criteria optimization problems in various domains: (i) transforming the multi-criteria problem into a single-  
79 objective optimization problem (Ross et al., 2015; El-Ghandour and Elbeltagi, 2014; Veluscek et al., 2015); (ii)  
80 obtaining a non-inferior solution set (Pareto front) by solving the multi-objective optimization problem (Khorram et al.,  
81 2014; Tavakkoli-Moghaddam et al., 2011; Torres-Treviño et al., 2011); (iii) selecting a unique solution after obtaining  
82 the Pareto optimal solution set by adding constraints based on specific preferences (Chibeles-Martins et al., 2016; Wu  
83 et al., 2015). The state-of-the-art in multi-criteria optimization in hydrology is commonly accomplished through the  
84 first two approaches mentioned earlier. For instance, a simple approach on the choice of calibration metrics for flood  
85 modeling, including NSE, weighted KGEs, and annual peak flow bias, has been proposed for daily mHm and VIC  
86 models on 492 US catchments by Mizukami et al. (2019). For event-based flash flood modeling at high resolution, a  
87 metric that accounts for the shape of flash flood hydrographs, particularly their timing and maximum peak flow, has  
88 been studied in Roux et al. (2011). Nevertheless, generalizing these methods for multi-scale signatures and integrating  
89 them into variational data assimilation algorithms remain significant challenges. Research on calibration with multi-  
90 objective functions to generate a set of non-dominated solutions has also been conducted, as seen in studies by Yapó  
91 et al. (1998); Guo et al. (2014); Oliveira et al. (2021); Mostafaie et al. (2018). However, the selection of an optimal  
92 solution from the non-dominated set has not received much attention. Our goal in this work is to comprehensively  
93 investigate all feasible multi-criteria optimization methods using a more general approach. This research will address  
94 4 aspects that have received relatively little attention in prior studies: (i) the need for an automated segmentation method  
95 applicable to large contrasted catchment-floods samples and capable to capture hydrological information at the scale of  
96 flash flood events; (ii) a global analysis of simulated errors across various hydrological signatures and their sensitivity  
97 with the model parameters; (iii) the need for a more intelligent approach to select the Pareto optimal solution in the  
98 case of optimization with multi-objective functions; and (iv) the computation of the cost function based on signatures  
99 within variational data assimilation algorithms.

100 In this work, we focus on multi-criteria calibration metrics with single-objective functions and with multi-objective  
101 functions for uniform parameters, then a multi-criteria calibration with single-objective function for distributed  
102 parameters of a distributed model aimed at flood modeling. Note that multi-objective optimization is a widely used  
103 method for multi-criteria calibration, which attempts to simultaneously minimize multi-objective functions to obtain  
104 a set of optimal solutions (also called Pareto solution) rather than a single solution. To address such a optimization


105 problem in the present context, where the optimization of multiple conflicting objectives is often encountered, multi-  
106 objective genetic algorithms (MOGA) have been shown to be effective (Murata et al., 1995). Compared to multiple  
107 gradient descent algorithms (Désidéri, 2012; Mercier et al., 2018), MOGAs do not require gradient information and  
108 are therefore suitable for a wide range of objective functions. Instead, they rely on crossover and mutation operators,  
109 making them effective regardless of the nature of the problem functions. Non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm  
110 (NSGA), suggested by Deb et al. (2002), is a well known MOGA for solving multi/many-objective optimization  
111 problems, including fast and elitist approach (Deb et al., 2002). Namely, a fast sorting algorithm helps optimizing  
112 the computational complexity (even with a large population size) arising from the non-dominated sorting procedure in  
113 every generation. In the bargain, NSGA possesses a diversity preservation property, based on a sharing function  
114 method, that prevents the loss of good solutions involved in the mating process. Recently, NSGA has also been  
115 implemented in the *pymoo* Python library (Blank and Deb, 2020), that is used in the present study thanks to the  
116 Python interface of our SMASH platform.

117 This study proposes an improved signature-based calibration approach for hydrological models. The approach  
118 employs hydrological signatures computed at the scale of flood events to enhance multi-criteria calibration. The  
119 proposed algorithm originally combines automated segmentation of flood events and signatures computation within  
120 a variational data assimilation (VDA) algorithm from Jay-Allemand et al. (2020) enabling high dimensional spatially  
121 distributed calibration, now with multi-criteria metrics adapted to floods. Classical global calibration algorithms have  
122 also been upgraded that way. These upgrades, including new cost functions and adjoint model update, have been  
123 implemented into the SMASH platform, which solvers are differentiable. Using the proposed algorithms, we investigate  
124 over a quite large dataset of Mediterranean flash floods the parametric sensitivity of a parsimonious distributed  
125 hydrological model for a large array of signatures from the literature, as well as the benefit of using a signature-based  
126 flood specific metric in calibration, and especially in performing variational spatially distributed optimization which  
127 has seldom been done to our best knowledge.

128 The remaining sections of this paper are organized as follows: section 2 describes our methodology for computing  
129 various hydrological signatures and our multi-criteria calibration algorithms, along with an overview of the SMASH  
130 forward model. In section 3, we present and analyze our results on signatures and calibration, including a summary of  
131 the data and numerical experiments. Finally, in section 4, we conclude our work and outline potential future directions.

## 132 **2. Methodology**

133 We propose a novel calibration strategy that leverages hydrological signatures and their sensitivity analysis in  
134 combination with the optimization algorithms discussed above. Our approach is illustrated in Fig. 1 and addresses the  
135 challenges of model calibration in the presence of multiple objectives and complex hydrological processes.



**Figure 1:** Flowchart of the multi-criteria calibration process using hydrological signatures. The different cost functions are denoted by  $j_d$ ,  $j_c$  and  $j_f$ , while the corresponding optimal weights are denoted by  $\delta_d$ ,  $\delta_c$  and  $\delta_f$ . The notations used in the cost function will be explained in 2.4.

136 The computations of the signatures are first performed to quantify their sensitivities with the model parameters  
 137 following Horner (2020). These computations involve performing both whole-period-based analysis to obtain contin-  
 138 uous signatures and event-based analysis to capture the most significant events (flood event signatures). Through this  
 139 analysis, we gain a more meaningful understanding of the parametric sensitivity, not just for discharge but also for other  
 140 factors that need to be considered as part of our minimization criterion. Furthermore, we evaluate the sensitivity of  
 141 signature error using variance-based sensitivity analysis (Sobol indices) to determine the most appropriate signatures  
 142 for multi-criteria optimization. Based on these results, we conduct a multi-criteria optimization with single-objective  
 143 or multi-objective functions, utilizing suitable hydrological signatures to improve the simulation performance.

144 The numerical algorithms proposed here are implemented in Python, on top of SMASH Fortran platform that  
 145 is interfaced in Python (Jay-Allemand et al., 2022a) making accessible its forward-inverse algorithms (forward  
 146 hydrological models, SBS and VDA Jay-Allemand et al. (2020) calibration algorithms) and internal variables.

147 The following subsections of this section detail the different elements of our methodology: 2.1 defines the  
 148 hydrological model structure, the objective function and the proposed calibration algorithms; 2.2 explains which  
 149 signatures are computed and how, including a description of the proposed hydrograph segmentation algorithm; 2.3  
 150 describes the method for computing global sensitivities of simulated hydrological signatures; 2.4 details the formulation  
 151 of the multi-criteria cost functions including multi-scale signatures and the multi-objective optimization problems.

## 152 2.1. SMASH: An overview of the forward model and calibration algorithms

153 SMASH is a computational software framework dedicated to *Spatially distributed Modelling and ASsimilation for*  
 154 *Hydrology*. It aims to tackle flexible spatially distributed hydrological modeling, signatures and sensitivity analysis,  
 155 as well as high dimensional inverse problems using multi-source observations. This model is designed to simulate  
 156 discharge hydrographs and hydrological states at any spatial location within a basin and reproduce the hydrological

157 response of contrasted catchments, especially aiming at floods and low-flows modeling, by taking advantage of spatially  
 158 distributed meteorological forcings, physiographic data and hydrometric observations.

First, the forward spatially distributed hydrological modeling problem is formulated as follows. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a 2D spatial domain (catchment) and  $t > 0$  be the physical time. A regular lattice  $\mathcal{R}_\Omega$  covers  $\Omega$  and  $D(x)$  is the drainage plan obtained from terrain elevation processing. The number of active cells within a catchment  $\Omega$  is denoted  $N_x$ . Then the hydrological model is a dynamic operator  $\mathcal{M}$  mapping observed input fields of rainfall and evapotranspiration  $\mathbf{P}(x, t')$ ,  $\mathbf{E}(x, t')$ ,  $\forall (x, t') \in \Omega \times [0, t]$  onto discharge field  $Q(x, t)$  such that:

$$Q(x, t) = \mathcal{M}[\mathbf{P}(x, t'), \mathbf{E}(x, t'), \mathbf{h}(x, 0), \boldsymbol{\theta}(x), t], \forall x \in \Omega, t' \in [0, t] \quad (1)$$

159 with  $\mathbf{h}(x, t)$  the  $N_s$ -dimensional vector of model states 2D fields and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  the  $N_p$ -dimensional vector of model parameters  
 160 2D fields. In the following,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is also called control vector in optimization context.


161 Then the forward hydrological model structure is defined as follows. In this study, a parsimonious 6 parameters  
 162 model structure from Colleoni et al. (2022) is used (Fig. 2). For a given cell  $i$  of coordinates  $x \in \Omega$ , in the proposed  
 163 model S6, four reservoirs  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_r$  and  $\mathcal{T}_l$  of respective capacity  $c_i$ ,  $c_p$ ,  $c_{tr}$  and  $c_{tl}$ , are considered for simulating,  
 164 respectively, the interception, the production of runoff and its transfer within a cell. Their state vector is denoted  
 165  $\mathbf{h}(x, t) \equiv (\mathbf{h}_i(x, t), \mathbf{h}_p(x, t), \mathbf{h}_{tr}(x, t), \mathbf{h}_r(x, t), \mathbf{h}_{tl}(x, t))^T$ , and the parameter vector of SMASH model structure S6 is  
 166  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(x) \equiv (c_i(x), c_p(x), c_{tr}(x), c_r(x), ml(x), c_{tl}(x))^T$ . Hence the size of state vector is  $N_s \times N_x$  and the size of parameter  
 167 vector that is optimized in the following is  $N_p \times N_x$ . Considering tens of cells or more over a simulated catchments  
 168 domain  $\Omega$ , the calibration of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is a high dimensional inverse problem. All details related to hydrological model operator  
 169 and model description are explained in Colleoni et al. (2022). The numerical model operates at hourly time step  $dt = 1h$   
 170 and on a regular grid at  $dx = 1km$ .

171 Now, the calibration problem and optimization algorithms are presented, starting by the definition of a multi-criteria  
 172 objective function enabling to account for multi-scale signatures.

In order to calibrate the hydrological model based on the simulated and observed discharge at gauged cells  $x_k \in \Omega$ ,  $k \in 1, \dots, Ng$ , denoted as  $Q_k(t)$  and  $Q_k^*(t)$ , respectively, we define the objective convex function as shown in Eq. 2.

$$J(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = J_{obs}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \alpha J_{reg}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (2)$$

where the observation cost function  $J_{obs} = \frac{1}{N_g} \sum_{k=1}^{N_g} J_k^*$  measuring the misfit, via several adapted metrics that can include signatures as detailed later, between simulated and observed discharge. In this study,  $N_g = 1$ , that is for single gauge optimization. Note that simulated discharge  $Q_k(t) = \mathcal{M}[\mathbf{P}(x, t'), \mathbf{E}(x, t'), \mathbf{h}(x, 0), \boldsymbol{\theta}(x)], \forall x \in \Omega_k, t' \in [0, t]$  with  $\Omega_k \subset \Omega$  denoting the spatial domain including all upstream cells of a gauge at  $x_k$ , depends on the control



**Figure 2:** Distributed hydrological modeling with SMASH platform. Model fields from top to bottom: meteorological inputs, parameters, internal and output flux maps (left). Pixel scale and pixel-to pixel flow operators of SMASH model structure S6 studied (right). *Source:* Colleoni et al. (2022).

vector  $\theta$  via the hydrological model  $\mathcal{M}$  (Eq. 1). The second term in Eq. (2) is weighted by  $\alpha$  and set as a classical Thikhonov regularization  $J_{reg} = \left\| \mathbf{B}^{-1/2} (\theta - \theta^*) \right\|_{L^2}^2$  with  $\mathbf{B}$  the background error covariance, and  $\theta^*$  the first guess/background on  $\theta$ . We set  $\alpha = 10^{-4}$  for the spatially distributed optimizations presented in this study,  $\alpha = 0$  otherwise if  $\theta \equiv \bar{\theta}$ , and  $\mathbf{B}$  is simply defined from  $\sigma_\theta$  the vector of mean deviations of  $\theta$ , as done in Jay-Allemand et al. (2020). The optimal estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  of the model parameter set can be obtained by minimizing the objective function  $J$  in Eq. 1, subject to an additional bound constrain on the model parameters, which can be expressed as Eq. 3.

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta_{min} \leq \theta \leq \theta_{max}} J(\theta) \quad (3)$$

173 This inverse problem 3 is tackled with different global optimization algorithms considering a spatially uniform  
 174 control, that is low dimensional optimization problems. For instance, optimization algorithms such as: Step-By-  
 175 Step (SBS) (steepest descent algorithm summarized in Edijatno (1991)), Nelder–Mead and Genetic Algorithms  
 176 (GA) can be applied in this scenario. Next, a spatially distributed control vector is sought with a VDA algorithm  
 177 (Jay-Allemand et al., 2020) adapted to such high dimensional hydrological optimization problems. Considering a  
 178 spatially distributed control vector  $\theta(x)$ , its optimization is performed with the L-BFGS-B algorithm (limited-memory  
 179 Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno bound-constrained (Zhu et al., 1997)) adapted to high dimension. This algorithm  
 180 requires the gradient of the cost function with respect to the sought parameters  $\nabla_\theta J$ , that is obtained by solving the  
 181 adjoint model. This numerical adjoint model has been generated with the automatic differentiation engine TAPENADE



182 (Hascoet and Pascual, 2013) applied to the SMASH source code including the new models structures and validated  
183 with standard gradient test. The background value  $\theta^*$ , used as a starting point for the optimization problem and in the  
184 regularization term, is set as in Jay-Allemand et al. (2020), i.e. as  $\bar{\theta}$ , a spatially uniform global optimum determined with  
185 a simple global-minimization algorithm from a uniform first guess  $\bar{\theta}^*$ . Given mildly non linear hydrological models  
186 as those considered in this study, this calibration approach is pertinent and sensitivity to priors is limited as shown in  
187 Jay-Allemand et al. (2020).

## 188 2.2. Signatures computation

189 Several signatures describing and quantifying properties of discharge time series are introduced in view to analyze  
190 and calibrate hydrological models (an exhaustive list is given in Appendix B). Signatures are denoted as  $S_i$ ,  $i \in 1..N_{crit}$ ,  
191 with  $N_{crit}$  being the number of different signature types considered. These signatures allow for the description of  
192 various aspects of the rainfall-runoff behavior, such as flow distribution (e.g. based on flow percentiles), flow dynamics  
193 (Le Mesnil, 2021), flow separation (Nathan and McMahon, 1990; Lyne and Hollick, 1979), and flow timing, among  
194 others. A so-called continuous signature is a signature that can be computed over the entire study period. Flood event  
195 signatures on the other hand focus on the behavior of the high-flows that are observed in flash flood events (Fig. 3). In  
196 this way, event segmentation algorithm is crucially needed before computing the flood event signatures.

197 We propose here an automated segmentation algorithm for detecting flood events with the aid of the rainfall  
198 gradient, rainfall energy and baseflow separation (Algorithm 1). First, we identify event peak discharges using a peak  
199 detection algorithm, which allows for several parameters to be set, such as minimum peak height (mph) or minimum  
200 distance between two successive peaks (mpd), among others (Duarte and Watanabe, 2021). For instance, we consider  
201 events that exceed the 0.995-quantile of the discharge as important events (mph criterion), and events are considered  
202 to be distinct if they are separated by at least 12 hours (mpd criterion). Subsequently, we determine the starting and  
203 ending dates for each event. The starting date of the event is considered to be the moment when the rain starts to increase  
204 dramatically, which is sometime 72 hours before the peak discharge. To calculate this, we compute the gradient of the  
205 rainfall and choose the peaks of rainfall gradient that exceed the 0.8-quantile. These peaks correspond to the moments  
206 when there is a sharp increase in rainfall. However, we also require an additional criterion called the "energy criterion",  
207 which takes into account the "rainfall energy" for a more robust detection of flood start time. The rainfall energy is  
208 computed as the sum of squares of the rainfall observed in a 24-hour period, counted from 1 hour before the peak of  
209 rainfall gradient. The starting date is the first moment when the rainfall energy exceeds 0.2 of the maximal rainfall  
210 energy observed in the 72-hour period before the peak discharge, based on the gradient criterion. Finally, we aim to  
211 find the ending date by using baseflow separation. We compute the difference between the discharge and its baseflow  
212 from the peak discharge until the end of study period (which lasts for 10 days from the starting date of the event). The

213 ending date is the moment when the difference between the discharge and its baseflow is minimal in a 48-hour period,  
 214 counted from 1 hour before this moment. Note that these values are adapted to the basins and flood scales studied.

---

**Algorithm 1** Hydrograph segmentation algorithm

---

For each catchment, considering 2 time series  $(T, Q)$  and  $(T, P)$  where:

$T = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is time (by hour),


$Q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$  is the discharge and

$P = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  is the rainfall.

1. Detecting peaks that exceed the 0.995-quantile of the discharge, that can be considered as important events:  
 $E = (t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  s.t.  $q_i > \text{Quant}_{0.995}(Q)$
2. For each event  $t_j \in E$ :
  - (a) Determining a starting date based on the “rainfall gradient criterion” and the “rainfall energy criterion”:
    - i. Selecting rainfalls gradient those exceed its 0.8-quantile, considered as the “rainfall events”:  
 $RE = (t_k)_{t_k \in (t_j - 72, t_j)}$  s.t.  $\nabla P(t_k) > \text{Quant}_{0.8}(\nabla P([t_j - 72, t_j]))$
    - ii. Defining the rainfall energy function:  
 $f(t_x) = \|(p_x - 1, \dots, p_x + 23)\|_2$   
 then the starting date is the first moment the rainfall energy exceeds 0.2 of the maximal rainfall energy:  
 $sd = \min(t_s)_{t_s \in RE}$  s.t.  $f(t_s) > 0.2 \|(f(t_j - 72), \dots, f(t_j))\|_\infty$
  - (b) Determining an ending date based on discharge baseflow  $Qb = \text{Baseflow}(Q)$ :  
 $ed = \arg \min_{t_e} \sum_{t=t_e-1}^{t_e+47} |(Q - Qb)(t)|$  s.t.  $t_j \leq t_e \leq sd + 10 \times 24$

*Remark.* If there exists  $m + 1$  ( $m > 0$ ) consecutive events  $(sd_u, ed_u), \dots, (sd_{u+m}, ed_{u+m})$  occurring “nearly simultaneously”, that means all of these events occur in no more than 10 days:  $ed_{u+m} < sd_u + 10 \times 24$ , then we merge these  $m + 1$  events into a single event  $(sd_u, ed_{u+m})$ .

---



**Figure 3:** Example of flood events detected from hydrograph using the segmentation algorithm.

215 **2.3. Signatures sensitivity**

To perform a calibration process with hydrological signatures, it is important to investigate the sensitivity of simulated signatures with the model parameters, to guide the potential selection of the signatures which should be used to calibrate the model. The sensitivity analysis enables us to examine how the variation of a given output/signature

can be apportioned to a variation in model inputs (Saltelli, 2002). If some signatures are not sensitive with the model parameters, then it may not have any significant impact to optimize an objective function based on these signatures. In this context, we consider a hydrological model  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $m$  spatially uniform parameters  $\bar{\theta} \equiv (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$ . Then the simulated value of a signature  $S_i$ , calculated from the simulated discharges via a discharge-to-signature mapping  $f_i$ , is represented as  $S_i^s \equiv f_i \circ \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{h}, \bar{\theta})$ . We are interested in Sobol indices called first-order and total-order. The first- (depending on  $\theta_j$ ) and total- (depending on  $\theta_{\sim j}$ , i.e. all parameters except  $\theta_j$ ) Sobol indices of the simulated signature  $S_i^s$  are respectively defined as follows:

$$s_i^{(1j)} = \frac{\mathbb{V}[\mathbb{E}[S_i^s | \theta_j]]}{\mathbb{V}[S_i^s]} = \frac{V_j}{V} \quad \text{and} \quad s_i^{(Tj)} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}[S_i^s | \theta_{\sim j}]]}{\mathbb{V}[S_i^s]} = 1 - \frac{\mathbb{V}[\mathbb{E}[S_i^s | \theta_{\sim j}]]}{\mathbb{V}[S_i^s]} = 1 - \frac{V_{\sim j}}{V}$$

216 where  $V_j$  (respectively,  $V_{\sim j}$ ) is the variance of the expectation of output signature  $S_i^s$  conditioned by the input parameter  
 217  $\theta_j$  (respectively,  $\theta_{\sim j}$ , i.e. all sampled inputs except  $\theta_j$ ). To estimate these indices, Azzini et al. (2021) proposed a  
 218 method based on the Saltelli generator (Saltelli, 2002), which is implemented in the *SALib* Python library (Iwanaga  
 219 et al., 2022; Herman and Usher, 2017). This method, that is shown to be relatively accurate in a recent benchmark (Puy  
 220 et al., 2022), allows us to estimate the first-, second- and total-order variance-based sensitivity indices using Monte  
 221 Carlo simulations. However, in our specific application with high-dimensional parameter spaces, we have encountered  
 222 significant challenges in estimating the second-order variance-based sensitivity indices due to their computationally  
 223 intensive nature (Saltelli, 2002; Campolongo et al., 2011). To achieve accurate results, a large number of Monte Carlo  
 224 simulations are required, which can be time-consuming and computationally demanding. Therefore, for the purpose of  
 225 this study, we focus on estimating the first- and total-order Sobol indices, which provide a sufficiently efficient means  
 226 of capturing information about interaction effects while retaining an acceptable computational cost.

## 227 2.4. Multi-criteria calibration using hydrological signatures

228 This section defines the calibration objective functions and how they account for the multi-scale signatures that are  
 229 provided by the segmentation algorithm detailed previously.

First, we define cost function parts corresponding respectively to classical metrics, continuous signatures and event based signatures. Let us consider a classical objective function  $j_d$ , which is the dominant criterion (or the most constrained criterion) in case of multi-criteria optimization, an objective function  $j_c$  combining continuous-signatures-based cost functions, and  $j_f$  combining flood-event-signatures-based cost functions. Then, the cost function to be minimized, denoted  $J$ , can be defined as Eq. 4.

$$J \equiv \begin{cases} \delta_d j_d + \delta_c j_c + \delta_f j_f & \text{for single-objective optimization,} \\ (j_d, j_c, j_f) & \text{for multi-objective optimization} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

230 where  $\delta_d, \delta_c, \delta_f$  are the corresponding optimization weights in the first case. Keep in mind that we take into account the  
 231 use of signatures in both cases but the first case is a single-objective optimization while the second is a multi-objective  
 232 optimization.

233 Then we detail how each cost function part is computed from signatures. For each signature  $S_i$ , denote by  $S_i^o$  and  
 234  $S_i^s$  the observation and simulation respectively. The set of continuous and flood event signatures denoted  $N_c$  and  $N_f$   
 235 respectively. Then, the components  $j_d, j_c$  and  $j_f$  can be defined as follows:

236 •  $j_d \equiv 1 - NSE$  or  $1 - KGE_{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}$  with varying weights  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  (see Appendix A.2). This metric  $j_d$  is considered  
 237 as a constraining objective function for selecting an optimal solution from non-inferior solutions in case of  
 238 multi-objective optimization (see Appendix C.3).

239 •  $j_c \equiv \begin{cases} \sum_{S_i \in N_c} \sigma_{S_i} j_c^{S_i}, & \text{for single-objective multi-criteria optimization;} \\ (\{j_c^{S_i}\}_{S_i \in N_c}), & \text{for multi-objective optimization} \end{cases}$

240 where  $j_c^{S_i} \equiv \left| \frac{S_i^s}{S_i^o} - 1 \right|$  is the objective function based on continuous signature  $S_i$  and  $\sigma_{S_i}$  is the corresponding  
 241 optimization weight of  $S_i$  in case of single-objective function.

242 •  $j_f \equiv \begin{cases} \sum_{S_i \in N_f} \sigma_{S_i} j_f^{S_i}, & \text{for single-objective multi-criteria optimization;} \\ (\{j_f^{S_i}\}_{S_i \in N_f}), & \text{for multi-objective optimization.} \end{cases}$

In this case, and in the context of global optimization in time,  $j_f^{S_i} \equiv \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{e=1}^{N_E} \left| \frac{S_{i,e}^s}{S_{i,e}^o} - 1 \right|$  defines the scalar  
 objective function related to flood signature  $S_i \in N_f$  over the  $N_E$  events selected with the segmentation method  
 described in Algorithm 1. Otherwise, to perform a season-based optimization on flood event signatures, we can  
 compute for the events occurring in the selected season. For example, for a Spring-based optimization:

$$j_{f, spring}^{S_i} \equiv \frac{1}{\dim \mathcal{SP}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{SP}} \left| \frac{S_{i,e}^s}{S_{i,e}^o} - 1 \right| \text{ s.t. } \forall e \in \mathcal{SP} \subset \{1, \dots, N_E\}, S_{i,e} \text{ occurs in Spring.}$$

Finally, these cost functions enable to formulate, after the single objective calibration problem 3, the following  
 multi-objectives calibration problems. The optimization problems taking into account signatures via the cost function  
 defined in Eq. 4 can be developed as Eq. 5 for a single-objective optimization, and as Eq. 6 for a multi-objective  
 optimization.

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \delta_d j_d(\theta) + \delta_c \sum_{S_i \in N_c} \sigma_{S_i} \left| \frac{S_i^s(\theta)}{S_i^o(\theta)} - 1 \right| + \delta_f \sum_{S_i \in N_f} \sigma_{S_i} \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{e=1}^{N_E} \left| \frac{S_{i,e}^s(\theta)}{S_{i,e}^o(\theta)} - 1 \right| \quad (5)$$

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \left( j_d(\theta), \left\{ \left| \frac{S_i^s(\theta)}{S_i^o(\theta)} - 1 \right| \right\}_{S_i \in N_c}, \left\{ \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{e=1}^{N_E} \left| \frac{S_{i,e}^s(\theta)}{S_{i,e}^o(\theta)} - 1 \right| \right\}_{S_i \in N_f} \right) \quad (6)$$

243 While the minimization problem with single-objective function 5 is accessible for both global and distributed  
 244 calibration methods, performing a multi-objective optimization as problem 6 is sophisticated for distributed calibration  
 245 considering a spatially distributed control vector adapted to a high dimensional hydrological optimization problems,  
 246 and requiring a lot of cost gradient information. In global calibration with multi-objective optimization approaches, a  
 247 set of feasible solutions can be found instead of a unique optimal solution in single-objective optimization (Appendix  
 248 C). In such a way, a so-called Pareto front contains non-inferior solutions (Appendix C.1) and thus a method is proposed  
 249 for selecting an optimal solution from the Pareto as depicted in Appendix C.3.

250 Note that the objective functions  $j_c$  and  $j_f$  related to continuous and flood signatures have also been implemented  
 251 in Fortran. This implementation imposes strict positivity of their components ( $j_c^{S_i}$  and  $j_f^{S_i}$ ) numerically to ensure  
 252 that the total cost  $J$  remains convex and differentiable. The numerical adjoint model has been also re-derived as  
 253 needed by the variational calibration algorithm (refer to section 2.1). The cost function based flood event signatures  
 254  $j_f$  can be computed thanks to a temporal mask of corresponding flood events selected by the segmentation algorithm,  
 255 implemented in the Python, and passed to the Fortran via the wrapped interface.

### 256 3. Data and numerical results analysis

257 This section first presents the catchment-flood dataset used in this study. Next, flow signatures are analyzed via the  
 258 comparison of observed and simulated signatures, in terms sensitivity with parameters, and finally some are selected  
 259 for signature-based model calibration. The last part analyzes the performances of model calibration with classical and  
 260 signature-based metrics.


#### 261 3.1. Catchment information and data sources

262 A relatively large dataset of catchment-floods mostly located in the French mediterranean region is used. This  
 263 dataset stems from Jay-Allemand (2020) and contains time series of hydro-meteorological variables and time invariant  
 264 catchment attributes for four high rainfall-flow areas in France, identified as study areas of the PICS research project<sup>1</sup>. It  
 265 encompasses 141 catchments including 23 outlet gauges, which are mostly located in the French Mediterranean region  
 266 (Fig. 4). This is a subset of a larger dataset of 4,190 French catchments from INRAE-HYCAR research unit (Brigode  
 267 et al., 2020; Delaigue et al., 2020). The hydrological model inputs consist of observation data, covering a period of  
 268 about 13 years (2006 to 2019), that includes hourly distributed discharge and rainfall. Discharge data are collected by

---

<sup>1</sup><https://pics.ifsttar.fr>

269 the French Ministry of Environment covering the period of the forcing data and have been extracted from the (Hydro)  
 270 platform<sup>2</sup>. The rainfall grids are the radar observation reanalysis ANTILOPE J+1 provided by Météo-France at a  
 271 grid resolution of 1 km<sup>2</sup> (Champeaux et al., 2009). The potential evapotranspiration (PET) is obtained by applying a  
 272 simple formula (Oudin et al., 2005) to SAFRAN<sup>3</sup> (Quintana-Seguí et al., 2008) temperature grids at 8 km resolution an  
 273 empirically disaggregated at hourly time step and 1 km spatial resolution, i.e. at the same spatio-temporal resolution  
 274 than rainfall. Note that observation data, rainfall grids and discharge time series, over the selected catchments have few  
 275 missing data as detailed in Table 1, so that it can be neglected when performing the computations and analysis in this  
 276 study. Table 1 contains catchment information such as the river name, surface, code, number of upstream gauges, and  
 277 missing rates in the outlet gauges. Raster maps, at 1 km resolution, of upstream drained area and D8 flow directions  
 have been obtained by processing fine DEM provided by IGN (Institut Geographique National).



**Figure 4:** Spatial distribution of 141 catchments of the PICS dataset, consisting of 23 outlet gauges and 118 upstream gauges on the map of France with four regions denoted by different colors.

278

### 279 3.2. Sensitivity analysis and selection of signatures for model calibration

280 To start with, the relative error is analyzed between observed signatures and simulated ones with a model calibrated  
 281 using SBS algorithm and spatially uniform parameters. Table 2 shows that some hydrological signatures with a  
 282 significant simulation error such as:  $Cfp2$ ,  $Cfp10$ ,  $Cfp50$ ,  $Elt$  and  $Epf$  that could be better constrained with a  
 283 signature-based calibration process as investigated in next subsection (a list of all studied signatures with corresponding  
 284 notations is presented in Appendix B).

285 Next, we survey the global sensitivity of these signatures with the model parameters. We considered over 10,000  
 286 spatially uniform sets of the 6 model parameters, sampled using Saltelli generator (Saltelli, 2002) to estimate the  
 287 total-order Sobol indices across 23 gauged catchments (catchments downstream outlets of the dataset). Based on the

<sup>2</sup><http://www.hydro.eaufrance.fr/>

<sup>3</sup>"Système d'Analyse Fournissant des Renseignements Atmosphériques à la Neige" in French

**Table 1**

General information about 23 outlet gauges of the PICS data. Code, river name, surface, missing rate of rainfall (respectively, discharge) in outlet gauge during the period 2006-2019, and number of upstream are represented by the columns from left to right.

Code	River name	Surface ( $km^2$ )	Missing rates (%)	Total upstream gauges
H3201010	Le Loing	2302	0.14 (3.68)	8
V3524010	La Cance	381	0.14 (4.31)	3
V3744010	Le Doux	621	0.14 (4.02)	2
V4154010	L'Eyrieux	649	0.14 (7.38)	3
V5064010	L'Ardèche	2264	0.14 (4.22)	9
V5474015	La Cèze	1112	0.14 (3.76)	6
V7164015	Le Gardon	1093	0.14 (16.62)	10
Y1232010	L'Aude	1828	0.14 (3.74)	11
Y1364010	Le Fresquel	935	0.14 (3.74)	4
Y1415020	L'Orbiel	242	0.14 (3.74)	2
Y1564010	L'Orbieu	589	0.14 (3.77)	3
Y1605050	La Cesse	251	0.14 (4.64)	1
Y2332015	L'Hérault	2208	0.14 (7.22)	12
Y2584010	L'Orb	1336	0.14 (4.04)	11
Y3204040	Le Lez	168	0.14 (15.55)	3
Y3444020	Le Vidourle	503	0.14 (7.97)	4
Y3534010	Le Vistre	496	0.14 (4.42)	1
Y4624010	Le Gapeau	535	0.14 (3.79)	6
Y5312010	L'Argens	2512	0.14 (5.08)	10
Y5444010	La Giscle	201	0.14 (9.96)	2
Y5534030	La Siagne	492	0.14 (5.30)	5
Y5615030	Le Loup	289	0.14 (3.79)	1
Y6434010	L'Estéron	442	0.14 (7.70)	1

288 results presented in Table 3, it can be observed that the non conservative water exchange parameter  $ml$  and the transfer  
289 parameter  $c_{tr}$  exhibit the highest sensitivities to the studied signatures, both in terms of first-order and total-order. Our  
290 analysis suggests that these two parameters have the most significant impact on the output signatures as a result of  
291 their interactions with other inputs. This is in coherence with highest sensitivities found for soil depth and subsurface  
292 flow parameters of an event flash flood model found in Garambois et al. (2013, 2015) on some catchments of the  
293 present set. Conversely, we found that parameters such as the interception  $c_i$  and the production of runoff  $c_p$  have  
294 little to no impact on the simulated signatures. We also observed that continuous signatures exhibit lower sensitivities  
295 than flood-event signatures in both first-order and total-order effects. Furthermore, constraining hydrological model by  
296 flood event signatures along with a classical calibration metric (e.g.  $1 - NSE$  or  $1 - KGE$ ), which is based primarily  
297 on continuous records of streamflow, is ideal to balance the model between the global score and the performance on  
298 flood events. We select for example the peak flow, denoted as  $Ep_f$ , which is one of flood event signatures having both  
299 significant relative error and high sensitivity, to perform multi-criteria calibration methods. Note that multi-criteria  
300 optimization methods with multiple signatures are absolutely reachable but will not be shown in this study for sake of  
301 brevity and simplify results analysis.

**Table 2**

Relative error between simulated and observed signatures of the same model structure calibrated either with  $1 - NSE$  or  $1 - KGE$  by SBS algorithm for global optimization. The values (in the form of . [., .]) in each case represent respectively the median, mean and standard deviation of a signature over gauged catchments.

Notation	Signature type	Relative error on simulated signature	
		Cal. with $j_d^{NSE}$	Cal. with $j_d^{KGE}$
Crc	Continuous runoff coefficients	0.14 [0.28, 0.38]	0.16 [0.3, 0.46]
Crchf		0.24 [0.35, 0.35]	0.26 [0.4, 0.45]
Crclf		0.15 [0.3, 0.44]	0.15 [0.33, 0.54]
Crch2r		0.23 [0.4, 0.68]	0.22 [0.38, 0.69]
Cfp2		0.72 [3.99, 21.14]	0.76 [5.99, 29.98]
Cfp10	Flow percentiles	0.52 [2.64, 8.8]	0.52 [2.87, 9.42]
Cfp50		0.29 [0.49, 0.85]	0.2 [0.52, 0.99]
Cfp90		0.21 [0.37, 0.96]	0.18 [0.38, 0.99]
Eff	Flood flow	0.23 [0.32, 0.31]	0.19 [0.31, 0.37]
Ebf	Base flow	0.22 [0.33, 0.39]	0.22 [0.33, 0.41]
Erc	Flood event runoff coefficients	0.2 [0.28, 0.26]	0.18 [0.27, 0.26]
Erchf		0.23 [0.32, 0.31]	0.19 [0.31, 0.37]
Erclf		0.22 [0.33, 0.39]	0.22 [0.33, 0.41]
Erch2r		0.12 [0.19, 0.2]	0.13 [0.2, 0.24]
Elt		Lag time	0.48 [0.96, 1.25]
Epf	Peak flow	0.28 [0.38, 0.35]	0.25 [0.36, 0.41]

302 Note also that global sensitivity analysis can be performed with local derivatives based approaches. A link between  
303 global Sobol indices and local derivatives has been proposed by Sobol and Kucherenko (2010) (refer also to Lamboni  
304 et al. (2013)). Global sensitivity matrices in three dimensions (sample size, parameters number, time) and sensitivity  
305 statistics, based on local derivatives computed by finite differences have been proposed in Gupta and Razavi (2018);  
306 Razavi and Gupta (2019) for geophysical models and applied to HBV-SASK lumped hydrologic model. Note that the  
307 variational data assimilation algorithm upgraded in the present work uses accurate local (in parameter space) cost  
308 function gradients, global in time and spatially distributed, computed with the adjoint method. Such method enables  
309 to compute accurate spatial sensitivity maps even for high dimensional parameter spaces (e.g. Monnier et al. (2016))  
310 and deepening sensitivity analysis with our differentiable and spatially distributed hydrological model, along with  
311 accounting for sensitivity indices into the VDA algorithm, is a very interesting direction intentionally left for further  
312 research.

### 313 3.3. Performance comparison of classical and signature-based calibration metrics

314 In this section, we compare the performance of different calibrated models obtained using spatially uniform  
315 and distributed optimization methods with different calibration metrics including signature based ones. For spatially  
316 uniform calibration methods, we aim to compare different calibration metrics including classical single-objective  
317 optimization (CSOO), signature-based single-objective optimization (SSOO) and signature-based multi-objective  
318 optimization (SMOO). For spatially distributed calibration methods, two strategies selected for comparison are CSOO  
319 and SSOO. In both spatially uniform or distributed calibration scenarios, the models are calibrated on 23 outlet gauges



**Table 3**

Median across gauged catchments of first- (respectively, total-) order variance-based sensitivity indices of the studied signatures to the model parameters.

Signature	Model parameter					
	$c_i$	$c_p$	$c_{rr}$	$c_{ll}$	$c_r$	$ml$
Crc	-0.0 (0.0001)	-0.0004 (0.0004)	0.1336 (1.2998)	0.0006 (0.0002)	-0.0 (0.0)	0.1167 (1.3778)
Crchf	0.0038 (0.0103)	0.0268 (0.1155)	0.3739 (0.8506)	0.0153 (0.0123)	0.0367 (0.1513)	0.2245 (0.7919)
Crclf	-0.0 (0.0001)	-0.0004 (0.0003)	0.1299 (1.3018)	0.0006 (0.0001)	-0.0 (0.0)	0.1142 (1.3844)
Crch2r	-0.0004 (0.0017)	0.0193 (0.0255)	0.1014 (0.1426)	0.1099 (0.2055)	0.1833 (0.2449)	0.3984 (0.5481)
Cfp2	0.0014 (0.056)	0.0002 (0.0024)	0.1283 (1.6008)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.001)	-0.0026 (1.2871)
Cfp10	-0.0 (0.0001)	-0.0002 (0.0001)	0.128 (1.3353)	0.0002 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.092 (1.3922)
Cfp50	-0.0001 (0.0001)	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1267 (1.315)	0.0005 (0.0001)	0.0 (0.0)	0.1043 (1.3933)
Cfp90	-0.0002 (0.0001)	-0.0006 (0.0015)	0.1329 (1.2483)	0.001 (0.0006)	-0.0001 (0.0002)	0.1512 (1.3817)
Eff	0.0002 (0.0059)	0.0699 (0.1939)	0.306 (0.7807)	0.0242 (0.022)	0.0321 (0.1389)	0.1872 (0.7303)
Ebf	-0.0001 (0.001)	0.0014 (0.0159)	0.144 (1.1914)	0.0018 (0.0019)	-0.0002 (0.0056)	0.162 (1.3146)
Erc	-0.0001 (0.0015)	0.0076 (0.0314)	0.18 (1.1633)	0.0028 (0.0031)	-0.0001 (0.0011)	0.1705 (1.2433)
Erchf	0.0002 (0.0059)	0.0699 (0.1939)	0.306 (0.7807)	0.0242 (0.022)	0.0321 (0.1389)	0.1872 (0.7303)
Erclf	-0.0001 (0.001)	0.0014 (0.0159)	0.144 (1.1914)	0.0018 (0.0019)	-0.0002 (0.0056)	0.162 (1.3146)
Erch2r	0.0057 (0.0099)	0.0123 (0.0426)	0.0873 (0.2124)	0.0256 (0.0552)	0.4387 (0.5797)	0.1171 (0.2255)
Elt	-0.0002 (0.0116)	-0.0004 (0.0293)	0.0043 (0.087)	0.0009 (0.0048)	0.8832 (0.953)	0.0127 (0.0568)
Epf	-0.0008 (0.0026)	0.0357 (0.1235)	0.2505 (0.9199)	0.0081 (0.0074)	0.1099 (0.2632)	0.1257 (0.8049)

of the PICS data on the calibration period 2006-2013. The validation of calibrated models performances is done in space and time following the three setups:

- on 23 outlet gauges on the validation period 2013-2019 (temporal validation, T\_Val),
- on 118 upstream gauges on the calibration period 2006-2013 (spatial validation, S\_Val),
- on 118 upstream gauges on the validation period 2013-2019 (spatio-temporal validation, S-T\_Val).

### 3.3.1. Spatially uniform calibrations with NSGA

We first perform global calibrations using NSGA for two single-objective-function-based approaches and one multi-objective-function-based approach. Table 4 displays the mean of different objective functions for calibration and validation (with 3 validation metrics), and for 3 optimization criteria (CSOO, SSOO and SMOO) with various cost functions. In CSOO, we interpret that the model calibrated with  $J_d^{KGE} = 1 - KGE$  produces a better result on the peak flow  $J_f^{Epj}$ , compared to the one calibrated with  $J_d^{NSE} = 1 - NSE$ . This explains why KGE criterion is more robust than NSE for constraining a hydrological model, since it is built on the decomposition of NSE (Gupta et al., 2009), which emphasizes relative importance of several hydrological features. This finding is consistent with that of Mizukami et al. (2019). The authors calibrated daily models over numerous US catchments with multiple metrics, including NSE, weighted KGEs, annual peak flow bias (APFB), and they found that KGE resulted in better estimates of annual peak flows than NSE. Additionally, the best reproduction of annual peak flows was achieved with APFB, but this was at the expense of other high flow metrics.

**Table 4**


Calibration, temporal, spatial and spatio-temporal validation metrics with spatially uniform calibrations with three strategies (CSOO, SSOO, SMOO) and global algorithms (SBS or NSGA), (optimal fit for  $cost = 0$ ). The mean of calibration and validation cost values for different objective functions are displayed for each calibration metric - mean is computed over the catchment set: over the 23 outlet gauges for Cal and T\_Val, over the remaining 118 upstream gauges for S\_Val and S-T\_Val.

Method	Calibration metric	$\overline{j_d^{NSE}}$				$\overline{j_d^{KGE}}$				$\overline{j_f^{Epf}}$			
		Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val	Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val	Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val
CSOO	$j_d^{NSE}$	0.274	0.277	0.901	0.616	0.239	0.369	0.687	0.736	0.279	0.324	0.387	0.357
	$j_d^{KGE}$	0.352	0.330	1.048	0.795	0.183	0.323	0.665	0.721	0.267	0.280	0.379	0.344
SSOO	$j_d^{NSE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$	0.447	0.418	1.056	0.889	0.377	0.476	0.759	0.853	0.014	0.189	0.346	0.372
	$j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$	0.551	0.431	1.259	0.956	0.335	0.443	0.777	0.833	0.017	0.209	0.337	0.358
SMOO	$\{j_d^{NSE}, j_f^{Epf}\}$	0.341	0.351	1.020	0.845	0.271	0.420	0.703	0.803	0.087	0.215	0.336	0.391
	$\{j_d^{KGE}, j_f^{Epf}\}$	0.456	0.409	1.163	0.821	0.243	0.368	0.683	0.724	0.048	0.182	0.316	0.389


337 Using event signatures in addition to classical continuous metrics in SSOO, we found that simulated peak flow is  
 338 highly improved in terms of relative error (about 15-18 times and 1.4-1.7 times on average, respectively, for calibration  
 339 and temporal validation) while classical calibrated metrics are significantly deteriorated (about 1.4-1.6 times and 1.4-  
 340 1.5 times on average, respectively, for calibration and temporal validation). This may arise from imbalances between  
 341 global score and performance in simulating flood event signature. To address this issue, careful consideration of  
 342 the optimization weights assigned to objective functions is necessary in order to achieve a balance between model  
 343 performance on short and long-term series. It should be noted that this approach can be time-consuming, as it requires  
 344 numerous simulations to determine the appropriate optimization weights for the objective functions, typically using a  
 345 L-curve approach. Alternatively, the use of global calibration algorithms, which do not require gradient information  
 346 and can be solved using lower-dimensional optimization problems, can also address these imbalances through the  
 347 application of a multi-objective optimization approach. This approach offers the advantage of keeping acceptable levels  
 348 of deterioration of NSE and KGE while significantly improving the simulation of peak flow as shown by multi-objective  
 349 SMOO results in Fig. 5 and 6.

350 However, this global multi-objective optimization algorithm is not capable to deal with high dimensional control  
 351 vectors and the spatially uniform parameter setup here (under-parameterization) led to unsatisfactory results in spatial  
 352 and spatio-temporal validation metrics. Therefore, a distributed calibration approach, such as using our VDA algorithm  
 353 accounting for signatures, could improve the model performances. This approach maintains the same optimization  
 354 weights as described above, and its performance will be evaluated in the subsequent section.

355 As shown in Fig. 7, the corresponding optimal parameters obtained using various optimization strategies are  
 356 presented. Based on our preliminary analysis, it is evident that the distribution over studied catchments of  $c_r$  has an  
 357 important difference when performing traditional calibration (CSOO) and multi-criteria calibration methods (SSOO  
 358 and SMOO). We recall that  $c_r$  is the routing parameter in our conceptual design (Fig. 2), so it has a crucial role in



**Figure 5:** Comparison, with spatially uniform parameters, of calibration and validation metrics (optimal fit for  $cost = 0$ ) for three optimization approaches (CSOO, SSOO, SMOO) by constraining  $1 - NSE$  in case of global algorithms (SBS or NSGA). From left to right: calibration (Cal), temporal validation (T\_Val), spatial validation (S\_Val) and spatio-temporal validation (S-T\_Val).




**Figure 6:** Comparison, with spatially uniform parameters, of calibration and validation metrics (optimal fit  $cost = 0$ ) for three optimization approaches (CSOO, SSOO, SMOO) by constraining  $1 - KGE$  in case of global algorithms (SBS or NSGA). From left to right: calibration (Cal), temporal validation (T\_Val), spatial validation (S\_Val) and spatio-temporal validation (S-T\_Val).

359 producing the peak flow  $Ep_f$ . Additionally, the sensitivity analysis in Table 3 has indicated that  $c_r$  is one of the three  
 360 parameters explaining most of the sensitivity of the peak flow.

361 The above result on the importance of lateral flow components in a flood hydrological model is in coherence  
 362 with existing works, for example as shown in Garambois et al. (2013) on few catchments-flood events used in the  
 363 present study, in addition to high sensitivity to subsurface flow parameter (see also Douinot et al. (2018)) the temporal  
 364 sensitivity of kinematic wave compound friction parameters in a distributed flash flood model increases with flood  
 365 magnitude. Improving hydraulic meaningfulness of hydrological models is an important topic since it can improve  
 366 floods discharge modeling in high resolution catchment-flood models (e.g. Bout and Jetten (2018); Li et al. (2021);

367 Kirstetter et al. (2021) with shallow water models and simplifications) but also improve internal state-flux coherence  
 368 and realism as required for instance to assimilate remote sensing observables of river surface such as height and width  
 369 (e.g. Paiva et al. (2011); Pujol et al. (2020, 2022)).



**Figure 7:** Analysis of spatially uniform calibrated parameters over the whole catchment sample. In each scatterplot, the first column present the distribution of a parameter for 3 optimization strategies (CSOO, SSOO, SMOO) using  $j_d^{NSE}$ , whereas the strategies in the second column use  $j_d^{KGE}$  as the dominant (or constrained) objective function. The boundary conditions of the model parameters are given in Appendix D.

### 370 3.3.2. Spatially distributed calibrations with VDA algorithm


371 Now, spatially distributed calibrations with the VDA algorithm using multi-criteria cost function including  
 372 signatures are performed. We employ SSOO technique for a distributed calibration using L-BFGS-B algorithm  
 373 provided a first guess by SBS algorithm. In overall, all of obtained scores in Table 5 are significantly enhanced compared  
 374 to the uniform calibration method, thanks to spatially distributed control vectors granting more flexibility to reproduce  
 375 observed discharge. Instead of a sharp decline of  $j_f^{Epj}$  as above, this relative error slightly decreases about 1.5 times  
 376 (from about 0.25 down to 0.16) in calibration and from about 0.32 down to 0.28 in temporal validation, but instead,  
 377 the scores (NSE and KGE) are slightly reduced in calibration and have an inappreciable deterioration in temporal  
 378 validation. So in this case, we do not have imbalances between the model performances on short and long-term series  
 379 when employing SSOO. We observe clearly in Fig. 8 and 9 that the error of simulated pick flow is significantly reduced  
 380 while the deterioration level of the scores remains tolerable, particularly in calibration and temporal validation.

381 Ultimately, the scoring metrics are computed on 111 flood events picked from 23 outlet gauges (by segmentation  
 382 method depicted in Algorithm 1) on the calibration period. The results plotted in Fig. 10 show that, in distributed  
 383 calibration, the score of constrained calibration metric is not decreased but even improved from 0.80 (respectively,  
 384 0.71) up to 0.83 (respectively, 0.78) in median for NSE (respectively, KGE). It indicates that the optimum of the model  
 385 parameters has moved to another location that produces a better performance in simulating flood events by slightly  
 386 reducing the scores in simulating the low-flow.


**Table 5**

Calibration, temporal, spatial and spatio-temporal validation metrics with spatially distributed control vectors. The mean of calibration and validation cost values for different objective functions are displayed for each calibration metric.

Method	Calibration metric	$\overline{j_d^{NSE}}$				$\overline{j_d^{KGE}}$				$\overline{j_f^{Epj}}$			
		Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val	Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val	Cal	T_Val	S_Val	S-T_Val
CSOO	$j_d^{NSE}$	0.221	0.244	0.655	0.596	0.233	0.355	0.553	0.597	0.274	0.334	0.381	0.376
	$j_d^{KGE}$	0.239	0.231	0.802	0.702	0.140	0.292	0.617	0.701	0.226	0.295	0.365	0.364
SSOO	$j_d^{NSE}/2 + j_f^{Epj}/2$	0.251	0.241	0.831	0.639	0.231	0.305	0.586	0.612	0.183	0.298	0.392	0.383
	$j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epj}/2$	0.297	0.245	0.964	0.671	0.190	0.300	0.617	0.647	0.152	0.271	0.376	0.387




**Figure 8:** Comparison, with spatially distributed parameters, of calibration and validation metrics (optimal fit  $cost = 0$ ) for two optimization approaches (CSOO, SSOO) by constraining  $1 - NSE$  in case of distributed calibration. From left to right: calibration (Cal), temporal validation (T\_Val), spatial validation (S\_Val) and spatio-temporal validation (S-T\_Val).



**Figure 9:** Comparison, with spatially distributed parameters, of calibration and validation metrics for two optimization approaches (CSOO, SSOO) by constraining  $1 - KGE$  in case of distributed calibration. From left to right: calibration (Cal), temporal validation (T\_Val), spatial validation (S\_Val) and spatio-temporal validation (S-T\_Val).

387 Regarding to the parameter space, Table 6 presents statistical analysis of the spatially uniform parameter sets  
 388 obtained using 4 calibration metrics for the studied catchments. Comparing to the spatially distributed optimal



**Figure 10:** Comparison of scoring metrics computed on 111 events picked from 23 outlet gauges on the calibration period 2006-2013 for the five optimization strategies, by constraining  $1 - NSE$  (left) and  $1 - KGE$  (right).

389 parameters in Table 7, we interpret that the mean of distributed parameters over all catchments in the 4 cases  
 390 (corresponding to 4 calibration metrics) is globally coherent to the distribution of the first guess. Several parameters are  
 391 almost spatially uniform (e.g. the non conservative water exchange parameter  $ml$  has a small distributed deviation in  
 392 median (respectively, in average) over all catchments 0.01 (respectively, 0.05) (calibrated with  $j_d^{NSE}$ ) compared to its  
 393 distributed mean in median (respectively, in average)  $-0.59$  (respectively,  $-4.98$ ). Conversely, the transfer parameter  
 394  $c_{tl}$  has a great distributed deviation (in median over all catchments) 193.72 compared to its distributed average 347.87,  
 395 that also has a massive difference to its distributed median 114.79. Fig. 11 illustrates the spatially distributed optimal  
 396 parameters at the largest catchment (the Argens River), for a distributed calibration with  $j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$ .

397 Reducing the over-parameterization in distributed hydrological models calibration problems through spatial  
 398 constrains while enhancing regional parameters consistency remains a key issue, especially for flash flood prediction  
 399 at ungauged locations (e.g. classical post-regionalization in Garambois et al. (2015) on French Mediterranean flash  
 400 floods). This issue can be tackled with calibration approaches accounting for physiographic descriptors through  
 401 regularizations (e.g. De Lavenne et al. (2019); Jay-Allemand et al. (2022b) in multi-gauges calibration problems)  
 402 or through pre-regionalization mappings, such as the multi-scale parameter regionalization approach (MPR) from  
 403 Samaniego et al. (2010), used for example in Mizukami et al. (2017). In addition to exploiting the information of  
 404 multi-scale signatures in calibration with the present VDA algorithm, the use of a pre-regionalization scheme, i.e.  
 405 "strong constrains" in the forward model in form of a mapping between physiographic covariables and conceptual  
 406 hydrological parameter fields, represent an interesting perspective for future research.

**Table 6**


Uniform optimal parameters calibrated by SBS algorithm with 4 calibration metrics for each catchment on its outlet gauge. The values (in the form of  $[\cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$ ) in each case represent respectively the median, mean and standard deviation of the optimal parameter values over all catchments of the dataset.

Parameter	Calibration metric			
	$j_d^{NSE}$	$j_d^{NSE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$	$j_d^{KGE}$	$j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$
$c_i$	14.71 [20.3, 26.22]	16.93 [20.83, 26.48]	17.6 [27.15, 33.07]	17.27 [30.17, 35.83]
$c_p$	169.99 [291.17, 434.58]	146.04 [310.14, 505.68]	151.87 [286.79, 483.33]	141.56 [289.69, 466.99]
$c_{ir}$	171.76 [286.6, 269.5]	162.66 [313.49, 304.83]	266.32 [431.2, 355.04]	267.21 [436.83, 360.62]
$c_{il}$	347.87 [812.15, 1274.12]	250.42 [1366.73, 2789.22]	383.51 [1413.93, 2749.35]	262.89 [1337.96, 2795.16]
$c_r$	41.32 [52.63, 34.05]	40.94 [50.97, 30.97]	41.33 [51.2, 30.29]	40.24 [50.2, 27.58]
$ml$	-0.59 [-4.98, 8.21]	0.0 [-3.81, 7.34]	-0.0 [-3.62, 7.31]	-0.0 [-3.28, 6.39]

**Table 7**

Analysis of spatially distributed parameter sets of the models corresponding to 4 calibration metrics. First, spatial median ( $\tilde{\cdot}$ ), average ( $\bar{\cdot}$ ) and standard deviation ( $\sigma_{\cdot}$ ) for each parameter field are calculated for each catchment, then their median, mean and standard deviation over all catchments are represented in the form of  $[\cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$ .

Parameter	Calibration metric			
	$j_d^{NSE}$	$j_d^{NSE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$	$j_d^{KGE}$	$j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$
$\tilde{c}_i$	15.45 [20.22, 26.34]	10.91 [20.14, 26.75]	17.6 [27.19, 33.16]	17.3 [30.32, 36.05]
$\bar{c}_i$	14.71 [20.3, 26.22]	16.93 [20.83, 26.48]	17.6 [27.15, 33.07]	17.27 [30.17, 35.83]
$\sigma_{c_i}$	0.22 [0.91, 1.46]	0.07 [1.13, 4.16]	0.13 [0.57, 1.28]	0.05 [0.82, 3.09]
$\tilde{c}_p$	161.81 [286.05, 435.48]	145.79 [314.19, 518.0]	156.65 [288.75, 476.53]	148.27 [296.94, 485.79]
$\bar{c}_p$	169.99 [291.17, 434.58]	146.04 [310.14, 505.68]	151.87 [286.79, 483.33]	141.56 [289.69, 466.99]
$\sigma_{c_p}$	38.52 [60.58, 59.64]	8.95 [37.57, 44.15]	31.08 [53.49, 57.35]	12.03 [46.82, 102.47]
$\tilde{c}_{ir}$	174.6 [287.44, 270.08]	158.48 [317.5, 311.03]	266.09 [429.0, 353.73]	267.12 [447.27, 372.32]
$\bar{c}_{ir}$	171.76 [286.6, 269.5]	162.66 [313.49, 304.83]	266.32 [431.2, 355.04]	267.21 [436.83, 360.62]
$\sigma_{c_{ir}}$	13.88 [28.84, 35.82]	3.23 [25.3, 57.2]	5.68 [24.28, 60.74]	1.45 [24.39, 74.56]
$\tilde{c}_{il}$	114.79 [675.7, 1276.32]	127.09 [1322.22, 2806.59]	180.63 [1332.45, 2784.42]	146.96 [1322.17, 2803.08]
$\bar{c}_{il}$	347.87 [812.15, 1274.12]	250.42 [1366.73, 2789.22]	383.51 [1413.93, 2749.35]	262.89 [1337.96, 2795.16]
$\sigma_{c_{il}}$	193.72 [355.92, 433.62]	34.67 [139.21, 252.41]	69.91 [222.54, 388.17]	31.82 [61.87, 81.06]
$\tilde{c}_r$	41.37 [52.08, 34.42]	41.37 [52.08, 34.42]	41.37 [52.08, 34.42]	41.37 [52.08, 34.42]
$\bar{c}_r$	41.32 [52.63, 34.05]	40.94 [50.97, 30.97]	41.33 [51.2, 30.29]	40.24 [50.2, 27.58]
$\sigma_{c_r}$	4.66 [6.01, 5.04]	1.45 [5.17, 10.17]	3.01 [5.31, 10.29]	1.34 [5.08, 13.82]
$\tilde{ml}$	-0.59 [-4.98, 8.21]	0.0 [-3.72, 7.42]	0.0 [-3.61, 7.31]	-0.0 [-3.27, 6.39]
$\bar{ml}$	-0.59 [-4.98, 8.21]	0.0 [-3.81, 7.34]	-0.0 [-3.62, 7.31]	-0.0 [-3.28, 6.39]
$\sigma_{ml}$	0.01 [0.05, 0.09]	0.0 [0.17, 0.73]	0.02 [0.05, 0.09]	0.0 [0.08, 0.34]



**Figure 11:** Spatially distributed optimal parameters ( $\hat{\theta}(x) \equiv (c_i(x), c_p(x), c_{ir}(x), c_r(x), ml(x), c_{il}(x))^T$ ) for the Argens River basin, obtained by minimizing  $j_d^{KGE}/2 + j_f^{Epf}/2$ .

## 407 **4. Conclusion**

408 In this study, we enhanced the calibration process of the conceptual distributed hydrological model SMASH  
409 for Mediterranean floods by incorporating hydrological signatures and various multi-criteria optimization strategies.  
410 Firstly, we computed and analyzed both continuous signatures and flood event signatures. Subsequently, we used  
411 sensitivity analysis to select appropriate signatures for constraining the model. Finally, we performed signatures-based  
412 multi-criteria optimization approaches, which demonstrated their robustness and reliability in improving simulated  
413 peak flood events without significantly compromising the NSE and KGE. Notably, for distributed calibration, the  
414 model constrained by the signature performed better in simulating flood events and achieved higher NSE and KGE  
415 scores compared to the model calibrated without using signatures. These results highlight the superiority of signature-  
416 based calibration approaches, particularly in flash flood prediction. Furthermore, we compared the parameter spaces  
417 of different models to provide insights into the optimal transition from traditional calibration approaches to signature-  
418 based calibration methods.

419 Our proposed calibration strategy addresses the need for an intelligent approach to model calibration in the presence  
420 of multiple objectives and complex hydrological processes. This approach offers a new perspective on calibration  
421 that accounts for not only classical discharge metrics but also multi-scale hydrological signatures that can provide  
422 a more comprehensive assessment of model performance. This approach could be reinforced via the use of multi-  
423 source information such as from remotely sensed data products and of multi-gauge streamflow series in regionalization  
424 problems. The segmentation algorithm could be tested on larger flood samples, also including catchment rainfall  
425 moments (Zoccatelli et al., 2011; Emmanuel et al., 2015) describing rainfall patterns for floods analysis (e.g. Garambois  
426 et al. (2014); Saharia et al. (2021)) and in order to prepare learning sets for training hybrid flood modeling-correction  
427 approaches.

428 Future work will aim to (i) upgrade the variational calibration algorithm with Bayesian approach in context of  
429 equifinality and with penalization based on global sensitivity metrics that could be derived from local derivatives,  
430 including for spatially distributed controls using adjoint model, and also with improved spatial constrains through  
431 physiographic descriptors-to-parameters fields mappings (pre-regionalization); as well as to (ii) perform extended tests  
432 and analysis on larger samples of catchments and signatures, with complementary data using various model structures.



## 433 **A. Classical calibration metrics in hydrology**

### 434 **A.1. Nash–Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE)**

$$NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=0}^T (Q(t) - Q^*(t))^2}{\sum_{t=0}^T (Q^*(t) - \overline{Q^*})^2}$$

435 where  $Q(t)$  is the simulated discharge at time  $t$ ,  $Q^*(t)$  is the observed discharge at time  $t$  and  $\overline{Q^*}$  is the mean observed  
436 discharge.

### 437 **A.2. Kling–Gupta efficiency (KGE)**

$$KGE = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha(r - 1)^2 + \beta\left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^*} - 1\right)^2 + \gamma\left(\frac{\mu}{\mu^*} - 1\right)^2}$$

438 where  $r$  is the linear correlation between observations and simulations,  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma^*$  are the standard deviation in  
439 simulations and observations, respectively,  $\mu$  and  $\mu^*$  are the mean discharge in simulations and observations,  
440 respectively, and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are the optimization weight parameters.

## 441 **B. List of studied signatures**

442 Denote  $P(t)$  and  $Q(t)$  are the rainfall and runoff at time  $t \in \mathbf{U}$ , where  $\mathbf{U}$  is the study period. Then  $Qb(t)$  and  $Qq(t)$   
443 are the baseflow and quickflow computed using a classical technique for streamflow separation (please refer to Lyne  
444 and Hollick (1979) and Nathan and McMahon (1990) for more details).

### 445 **B.1. Continuous signatures**

446 The continuous signatures are calculated over the entire study period as Table 8.

### 447 **B.2. Flood event signatures**

448 For an event occurring in  $\mathbf{E} \subset \mathbf{U}$ , the flood event signatures are calculated as Table 9.

## 449 **C. Multi-objective optimization with spatially uniform control vectors**

We look into multi-objective optimization for a global calibration of spatially uniform parameters of the distributed  
model  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e. a low dimensional control  $\overline{\theta}$ . The multi-objective calibration is simply defined as the optimization

**Table 8**

List of all studied continuous signatures.

Notation	Signature	Description	Formula	Unit
Crc	Runoff coefficients	Coefficient relating the amount of runoff to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in U} Q(t) dt}{\int^{t \in U} P(t) dt}$	-
Crchf		Coefficient relating the amount of high-flow to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in U} Qq(t) dt}{\int^{t \in U} P(t) dt}$	-
Crclf		Coefficient relating the amount of low-flow to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in U} Qb(t) dt}{\int^{t \in U} P(t) dt}$	-
Crch2r		Coefficient relating the amount of high-flow to the amount of runoff	$\frac{\int^{t \in U} Qq(t) dt}{\int^{t \in U} Q(t) dt}$	-
Cfp2	Flow percentiles	2%, 10%, 50% and 90%-quantiles from flow duration curve	$\text{quantile}(Q(t), 0.02)$	mm
Cfp10			$\text{quantile}(Q(t), 0.1)$	
Cfp50			$\text{quantile}(Q(t), 0.5)$	
Cfp90			$\text{quantile}(Q(t), 0.9)$	

**Table 9**

List of all studied flood event signatures.

Notation	Signature	Description	Formula	Unit
Eff	Flood flow	Amount of quickflow in flood event	$\int^{t \in E} Qq(t) dt$	mm
Ebf	Base flow	Amount of baseflow in flood event	$\int^{t \in E} Qb(t) dt$	mm
Erc	Runoff coefficients	Coefficient relating the amount of runoff to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in E} Q(t) dt}{\int^{t \in E} P(t) dt}$	-
Erchf		Coefficient relating the amount of high-flow to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in E} Qq(t) dt}{\int^{t \in E} P(t) dt}$	-
Erclf		Coefficient relating the amount of low-flow to the amount of precipitation received	$\frac{\int^{t \in E} Qb(t) dt}{\int^{t \in E} P(t) dt}$	-
Erch2r		Coefficient relating the amount of high-flow to the amount of runoff	$\frac{\int^{t \in E} Qq(t) dt}{\int^{t \in E} Q(t) dt}$	-
Elt	Lag time	Difference time between the peak runoff and the peak rainfall	$\arg \max_{t \in E} Q(t) - \arg \max_{t \in E} P(t)$	h
Epf	Peak flow	Peak runoff in flood event	$\max_{t \in E} Q(t)$	mm

problem:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n} (j_1(\theta), \dots, j_m(\theta)) \quad (7)$$

450 where  $\theta$  is the  $n$ -dimensional vector of model parameters in the feasible space  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $j_1, \dots, j_m$  are the  $m$  single-  
 451 objective functions to be simultaneously minimized.

### 452 C.1. Pareto front

453 In single-objective optimization, the Pareto optimal solution is unique (in terms of objective space) but in multi-  
 454 objective problem, it common to have several solutions that can not be defined which one is the best. If the optimization  
 455 problem is non-dominated, or non-inferior (each objective function is its own entity, so no individual can be better off  
 456 without making at least one individual worse off), then we call that Pareto optimality, or Pareto efficiency. A Pareto  
 457 front (in terms of parameter space) is a set of all Pareto efficient solutions that need to be estimated. Let us consider  
 458 two feasible solutions:  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{O}$ . Then,  $\theta_1$  is said to Pareto dominate  $\theta_2$  if the following properties hold:

459 1.  $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j_i(\theta_1) \leq j_i(\theta_2)$ ;

460 2.  $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j_i(\theta_1) < j_i(\theta_2)$ .

461 We call  $\mathcal{P}$  the Pareto set representing all of Pareto solutions. By definition, a Pareto solution  $\theta^* \in \mathcal{P}$  of problem 7 must  
462 fill the two following conditions:

463 1.  $\nexists \theta' \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathcal{P}, \exists i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j_i(\theta') < j_i(\theta^*)$ ;

464 2.  $\nexists \theta'' \in \mathcal{P}, \theta''$  dominates  $\theta^*$ .

465 The first statement indicates that there does not exist other point in the feasible space that reduces at least one objective  
466 function while keeping others unchanged, so the Pareto set is the optimal set. The second says that, no other point exists  
467 in the Pareto set that decreases one objective function without increasing another one, so it is impossible to distinguish  
468 any solution as being better than the other in the Pareto set. Fig. 12 illustrates this for a simple problem where we have  
469 2-objective functions  $j_1, j_2$ . The Pareto front (in terms of objective space) represents all of non-dominated optimal  
470 solutions. It implies that, it is impossible to move from any point in the feasible space and simultaneously decrease the  
two objective functions without violating a constraint.




Figure 12: Illustration of Pareto front in terms of objective space.

471

## 472 C.2. Overview of GA

473 GA is a “heuristic algorithm” (or search heuristic) in optimization, inspired by the Theory of Natural Evolution,  
474 whose selection operators include “crossover” and “mutation”. Basically, the process of a GA and a MOGA consist of  
475 the following 3 phases:

476 1. *Population initialization*. The population is randomly initialized based on the problem range and constraint. The  
477 size of the population determines also the number of solutions, called “pop-size”.

478 2. *Parents selection (sorting)*. A fitness function is defined to calculate the fitness score (also called Pareto ranking  
479 in multi-objective optimization) that determines how fit an individual is to the problem. Then, the fitness score  
480 decides the probability of selecting an individual as a parent to reproduce offspring population.

481 3. *Mating*. For each pair of parent to be mated, new offspring are created by exchanging the genes of parents  
 482 among themselves (crossover operator). To maintain the diversity within the population and prevent premature  
 483 convergence, some of the bits in the gene of certain new offspring can be flipped with a low random probability  
 484 (mutation operator). Offspring are created until their pop-size is equal to the pop-size of previous generation.

### 485 C.3. Selection of an optimal solution from Pareto front

486 We aim to select an optimal solution that is acceptable for every objective within a constraint on principal objective  
 487 function. Many strategies can be chosen to perform such a selection (e.g. based on the sensitivity ratio that is the ratio  
 488 of the average variabilities of a certain non-inferior solution to the corresponding value of the objective function in  
 489 the Pareto front (Wang et al., 2017), or the Euclidean distance from the ideal solution (Wang and Rangaiah, 2017)).  
 490 A simple additive weighting (SAW) method in Wang and Rangaiah (2017) can be used in our case by adding a  
 491 normalization operator and assigned weightage for the objective functions.

492 Considering an objective matrix  $(f_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ , where  $m$  is the number of non-dominated solutions,  $n$  is the  
 493 number of objective functions. Then each row  $i$  represents the  $i^{th}$  solution set of the Pareto front and each column  
 494  $j$  represents all non-inferior solutions of the  $j^{th}$  objective function. Denote  $c$  be the index of the classical objective  
 495 function (for example  $1 - NSE$  or  $1 - KGE$ ), which is the most constrained function to find a unique optimal solution  
 496 from Pareto front. This algorithm is detailed in the following three phases:

1. Objective matrix normalization  $(F_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ :

$$F_{ij} = \frac{f_j^+ - f_{ij}}{f_j^+ - f_j^-} \text{ where } f_j^+ = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} f_{ij} \text{ and } f_j^- = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} f_{ij}$$

2. Assigning weightage for normalized objective matrix  $(G_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ :

$$G_{ij} = w_j \times F_{ij} \text{ where } w_j = \begin{cases} e^d, & \text{if } j = c \\ e - e^d, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } d = f_c^+ - f_c^-$$

3. Finding optimal solution  $\theta$ :

$$\theta = (f_{k1}, \dots, f_{kn}) \text{ where } k = \arg \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n G_{ij} \right).$$

## 497 D. Calibration bounds

498 The parameter vector of SMASH model structure S6 is  $\theta(x) \equiv (c_i(x), c_p(x), c_{tr}(x), c_r(x), ml(x), c_{II}(x))^T$  and bound  
 499 constrains used in optimization (Eq. 3) are set with values given in Table 10.

**Table 10**

Boundary conditions of SMASH 6-parameters model.

	$c_i$	$c_p$	$c_{tr}$	$c_r$	$ml$	$c_{it}$
Lower boundary	1	1	1	1	-20	1
Upper boundary	100	2000	1000	200	5	10000

## 500 Acknowledgments

501 The authors greatly acknowledge SCHAPI-DGPR and METEO France for providing data used in this study. The  
 502 first author was supported by funding from SCHAPI-DGPR and ANR grant ANR-21-CE04-0021-01 (MUFFINS  
 503 project, "MULTiscale Flood Forecasting with INnovating Solutions").

## 504 CRediT authorship contribution statement

505 **Ngo Nghi Truyen Huynh:** research plan, conceptualization, software and numerical result, analysis, draft prepara-  
 506 tion, final redaction. **Pierre-André Garambois:** research methodology, conceptualization, analysis, draft preparation,  
 507 final redaction, supervision, project administration, funding aquisition. **François Colleoni:** conceptualization, software  
 508 and numerical results, analysis, final redaction. **Pierre Javelle:** research methodology, conceptualization, analysis, final  
 509 redaction, funding aquisition.

## 510 References

- 511 Astagneau, P.C., Bourgin, F., Andréassian, V., Perrin, C., 2021. When does a parsimonious model fail to simulate floods? learning from the  
 512 seasonality of model bias. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 66, 1288–1305. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2021.1923720>,  
 513 doi:10.1080/02626667.2021.1923720, arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2021.1923720>.
- 514 Azzini, I., Mara, T.A., Rosati, R., 2021. Comparison of two sets of monte carlo estimators of sobol' indices. *Environmental Modelling & Software*  
 515 144, 105167.
- 516 Beck, M.B., 1987. Water quality modeling: a review of the analysis of uncertainty. *Water resources research* 23, 1393–1442.
- 517 Beven, K., 1993. Prophecy, reality and uncertainty in distributed hydrological modelling. *Advances in water resources* 16, 41–51.
- 518 Blank, J., Deb, K., 2020. pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in python. *IEEE Access* 8, 89497–89509.
- 519 Bout, V., Jetten, V., 2018. The validity of flow approximations when simulating catchment-integrated flash floods. *Journal of hydrology* 556,  
 520 674–688.
- 521 Brigode, P., Génot, B., Lobligeois, F., Delaigue, O., 2020. Summary sheets of watershed-scale hydroclimatic observed data for france. URL:  
 522 <https://doi.org/10.15454/UV01P1>, doi:10.15454/UV01P1.
- 523 Campolongo, F., Saltelli, A., Cariboni, J., 2011. From screening to quantitative sensitivity analysis. a unified approach. *Computer physics*  
 524 communications 182, 978–988.
- 525 Champeaux, J.L., Dupuy, P., Laurantin, O., Soulan, I., Tabary, P., Soubeyroux, J.M., 2009. Les mesures de précipitations et l'estimation des lames  
 526 d'eau à météo-france: état de l'art et perspectives. *La Houille Blanche* , 28–34.

527 Chibeles-Martins, N., Pinto-Varela, T., Barbosa-Póvoa, A.P., Novais, A.Q., 2016. A multi-objective meta-heuristic approach for the design and  
528 planning of green supply chains-mbsa. *Expert Systems with Applications* 47, 71–84.

529 Colleoni, F., Garambois, P.A., Javelle, P., Jay-Allemand, M., Arnaud, P., 2022. Adjoint-based spatially distributed calibration of a grid gr-based  
530 parsimonious hydrological model over 312 french catchments with smash platform. submitted .

531 De Lavenne, A., Andréassian, V., Thirel, G., Ramos, M.H., Perrin, C., 2019. A regularization approach to improve the sequential calibration of a  
532 semidistributed hydrological model. *Water Resources Research* 55, 8821–8839.

533 Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., Meyarivan, T., 2002. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary  
534 computation* 6, 182–197.

535 Delaigue, O., Génot, B., Lebecherel, L., Brigode, P., Bourgin, P.Y., 2020. Database of watershed-scale hydroclimatic observations in france. URL:  
536 <https://webgr.inrae.fr/base-de-donnees>.

537 Désidéri, J.A., 2012. Multiple-gradient descent algorithm (mgda) for multiobjective optimization. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 350, 313–318.

538 Douinot, A., Roux, H., Garambois, P.A., Dartus, D., 2018. Using a multi-hypothesis framework to improve the understanding of flow dynamics  
539 during flash floods. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 22, 5317–5340.

540 Duarte, M., Watanabe, R.N., 2021. Notes on Scientific Computing for Biomechanics and Motor Control. URL: [https://doi.org/10.5281/  
541 zenodo.4599319](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4599319), doi:10.5281/zenodo.4599319.

542 Edijatno, 1991. Mise au point d'un modele elementaire pluie-debit au pas de temps journalier. Ph.D. thesis. Universite Louis Pasteur, ENGEES,  
543 Cemagref Antony.

544 El-Ghandour, H.A., Elbeltagi, E., 2014. Optimal groundwater management using multiobjective particle swarm with a new evolution strategy.  
545 *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 19, 1141–1149.

546 Emmanuel, I., Andrieu, H., Leblois, E., Janey, N., Payrastra, O., 2015. Influence of rainfall spatial variability on rainfall–runoff modelling: benefit  
547 of a simulation approach? *Journal of hydrology* 531, 337–348.

548 Garambois, P.A., Larnier, K., Roux, H., Labat, D., Dartus, D., 2014. Analysis of flash flood-triggering rainfall for a process-oriented hydrological  
549 model. *Atmospheric research* 137, 14–24.

550 Garambois, P.A., Roux, H., Larnier, K., Castaings, W., Dartus, D., 2013. Characterization of process-oriented hydrologic model behavior with  
551 temporal sensitivity analysis for flash floods in mediterranean catchments. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* .

552 Garambois, P.A., Roux, H., Larnier, K., Labat, D., Dartus, D., 2015. Characterization of catchment behaviour and rainfall selection for flash flood  
553 hydrological model calibration: catchments of the eastern pyrenees. *Hydrological sciences journal* 60, 424–447.

554 Guo, J., Zhou, J., Lu, J., Zou, Q., Zhang, H., Bi, S., 2014. Multi-objective optimization of empirical hydrological model for streamflow prediction.  
555 *Journal of Hydrology* 511, 242–253.

556 Gupta, H.V., Beven, K.J., Wagener, T., 2006. Model calibration and uncertainty estimation. *Encyclopedia of hydrological sciences* .

557 Gupta, H.V., Kling, H., Yilmaz, K.K., Martinez, G.F., 2009. Decomposition of the mean squared error and nse performance criteria: Implications  
558 for improving hydrological modelling. *Journal of hydrology* 377, 80–91.

559 Gupta, H.V., Razavi, S., 2018. Revisiting the basis of sensitivity analysis for dynamical earth system models. *Water Resources Research* 54,  
560 8692–8717.

561 Gupta, H.V., Sorooshian, S., Yapo, P.O., 1998. Toward improved calibration of hydrologic models: Multiple and noncommensurable measures of  
562 information. *Water Resources Research* 34, 751–763.

563 Hascoet, L., Pascual, V., 2013. The tapenade automatic differentiation tool: Principles, model, and specification. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 39.  
564 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2450153.2450158>, doi:10.1145/2450153.2450158.

565 Herman, J., Usher, W., 2017. SALib: An open-source python library for sensitivity analysis. *The Journal of Open Source Software* 2. URL:  
566 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00097>, doi:10.21105/joss.00097.

567 Horner, I., 2020. Design and Evaluation of hydrological signatures for the diagnosis and improvement of a process-based distributed hydrological  
568 model. Ph.D. thesis. Université Grenoble Alpes.

569 Iwanaga, T., Usher, W., Herman, J., 2022. Toward SALib 2.0: Advancing the accessibility and interpretability of global sensitivity analyses.  
570 *Socio-Environmental Systems Modelling* 4, 18155. URL: <https://sesmo.org/article/view/18155>, doi:10.18174/sesmo.18155.

571 Jay-Allemand, M., 2020. Estimation variationnelle des paramètres d'un modèle hydrologique distribué. Ph.D. thesis. Aix-Marseille.

572 Jay-Allemand, M., Colleoni, F., Garambois, P.A., Javelle, P., Julie, D., 2022a. Smash - spatially distributed modelling and assimilation for hydrology:  
573 Python wrapping towards enhanced research-to-operations transfer. IAHS URL: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03683657>.

574 Jay-Allemand, M., Demargne, J., Garambois, P.A., Javelle, P., Gejadze, I., Colleoni, F., Organde, D., Arnaud, P., Fouchier, C., 2022b. Spatially  
575 distributed calibration of a hydrological model with variational optimization constrained by physiographic maps for flash flood forecasting in  
576 France. Technical Report. Copernicus Meetings.

577 Jay-Allemand, M., Javelle, P., Gejadze, I., Arnaud, P., Malaterre, P.O., Fine, J.A., Organde, D., 2020. On the potential of variational calibration for  
578 a fully distributed hydrological model: application on a mediterranean catchment. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 24, 5519–5538.

579 Khorram, E., Khaledian, K., Khaledyan, M., 2014. A numerical method for constructing the pareto front of multi-objective optimization problems.  
580 *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 261, 158–171.

581 Kirstetter, G., Delestre, O., Lagrée, P.Y., Popinet, S., Josserand, C., 2021. B-flood 1.0: an open-source saint-venant model for flash-flood simulation  
582 using adaptive refinement. *Geoscientific Model Development* 14, 7117–7132.

583 Lamboni, M., Iooss, B., Popelin, A.L., Gamboa, F., 2013. Derivative-based global sensitivity measures: General links with sobol'indices and  
584 numerical tests. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 87, 45–54.

585 Le Mesnil, M., 2021. Signatures Hydrologiques des Bassins Karstiques. Theses. Montpellier SupAgro. URL: [https://tel.](https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03578569)  
586 [archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03578569](https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03578569).

587 Li, K., Huang, G., Wang, S., Razavi, S., Zhang, X., 2022. Development of a joint probabilistic rainfall-runoff model for high-to-extreme flow  
588 projections under changing climatic conditions. *Water Resources Research* 58, e2021WR031557.

589 Li, Z., Chen, M., Gao, S., Luo, X., Gourley, J.J., Kirstetter, P., Yang, T., Kolar, R., McGovern, A., Wen, Y., et al., 2021. Crest-imap v1.0: A fully  
590 coupled hydrologic-hydraulic modeling framework dedicated to flood inundation mapping and prediction. *Environmental Modelling & Software*  
591 141, 105051.

592 Lyne, V., Hollick, M., 1979. Stochastic time-variable rainfall-runoff modelling, in: Institute of Engineers Australia National Conference, Institute  
593 of Engineers Australia Barton, Australia. pp. 89–93.

594 McMillan, H.K., 2021. A review of hydrologic signatures and their applications. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water* 8, e1499.

595 Mercier, Q., Poirion, F., Désidéri, J.A., 2018. A stochastic multiple gradient descent algorithm. *European Journal of Operational Research* 271,  
596 808–817.

597 Mizukami, N., Clark, M.P., Newman, A.J., Wood, A.W., Gutmann, E.D., Nijssen, B., Rakovec, O., Samaniego, L., 2017. Towards seamless large-  
598 domain parameter estimation for hydrologic models. *Water Resources Research* 53, 8020–8040.

599 Mizukami, N., Rakovec, O., Newman, A.J., Clark, M.P., Wood, A.W., Gupta, H.V., Kumar, R., 2019. On the choice of calibration metrics for  
600 “high-flow” estimation using hydrologic models. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 23, 2601–2614.

601 Monnier, J., Couderc, F., Dartus, D., Larnier, K., Madec, R., Vila, J.P., 2016. Inverse algorithms for 2d shallow water equations in presence of wet  
602 dry fronts: Application to flood plain dynamics. *Advances in Water Resources* 97, 11–24.

603 Mostafaie, A., Forootan, E., Safari, A., Schumacher, M., 2018. Comparing multi-objective optimization techniques to calibrate a conceptual  
604 hydrological model using in situ runoff and daily grace data. *Computational Geosciences* 22, 789–814.

605 Murata, T., Ishibuchi, H., et al., 1995. Moga: multi-objective genetic algorithms, in: *IEEE international conference on evolutionary computation*,  
606 IEEE Piscataway, NJ, USA. pp. 289–294.

607 Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe, J.V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models part i—a discussion of principles. *Journal of hydrology* 10,  
608 282–290.

609 Nathan, R.J., McMahon, T.A., 1990. Evaluation of automated techniques for base flow and recession analyses. *Water resources research* 26,  
610 1465–1473.

611 Oliveira, A.M., Fleischmann, A., Paiva, R., 2021. On the contribution of remote sensing-based calibration to model hydrological and hydraulic  
612 processes in tropical regions. *Journal of Hydrology* 597, 126184.

613 Oudin, L., Hervieu, F., Michel, C., Perrin, C., Andréassian, V., Anctil, F., Loumagne, C., 2005. Which potential evapotranspiration input for a  
614 lumped rainfall–runoff model?: Part 2 towards a simple and efficient potential evapotranspiration model for rainfall–runoff modelling. *Journal*  
615 *of hydrology* 303, 290–306.

616 Paiva, R.C., Collischonn, W., Tucci, C.E., 2011. Large scale hydrologic and hydrodynamic modeling using limited data and a gis based approach.  
617 *Journal of Hydrology* 406, 170–181.

618 Pelletier, A., Andréassian, V., 2020. Hydrograph separation: an impartial parametrisation for an imperfect method. *Hydrology and earth system*  
619 *sciences* 24, 1171–1187.

620 Pujol, L., Garambois, P.A., Finaud-Guyot, P., Monnier, J., Larnier, K., Mose, R., Biancamaria, S., Yesou, H., Moreira, D., Paris, A., et al., 2020.  
621 Estimation of multiple inflows and effective channel by assimilation of multi-satellite hydraulic signatures: The ungauged anabranching negro  
622 river. *Journal of Hydrology* 591, 125331.

623 Pujol, L., Garambois, P.A., Monnier, J., 2022. Multi-dimensional hydrological–hydraulic model with variational data assimilation for river networks  
624 and floodplains. *Geoscientific Model Development* 15, 6085–6113.

625 Puy, A., Becker, W., Piano, S.L., Saltelli, A., 2022. A comprehensive comparison of total-order estimators for global sensitivity analysis. *International*  
626 *Journal for Uncertainty Quantification* 12.

627 Quintana-Seguí, P., Le Moigne, P., Durand, Y., Martin, E., Habets, F., Baillon, M., Canellas, C., Franchisteguy, L., Morel, S., 2008. Analysis of  
628 Near-Surface Atmospheric Variables: Validation of the SAFRAN Analysis over France. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* 47,  
629 92. doi:10.1175/2007JAMC1636.1.

630 Razavi, S., Gupta, H.V., 2019. A multi-method generalized global sensitivity matrix approach to accounting for the dynamical nature of earth and  
631 environmental systems models. *Environmental modelling & software* 114, 1–11.

632 Ross, M., Abbey, C., Bouffard, F., Jos, G., 2015. Multiobjective optimization dispatch for microgrids with a high penetration of renewable generation.  
633 *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 6, 1306–1314.

634 Roux, H., Labat, D., Garambois, P.A., Maubourguet, M.M., Chorda, J., Dartus, D., 2011. A physically-based parsimonious hydrological model for  
635 flash floods in mediterranean catchments. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 11, 2567–2582.

636 Saharia, M., Kirstetter, P.E., Vergara, H., Gourley, J.J., Emmanuel, I., Andrieu, H., 2021. On the impact of rainfall spatial variability, geomorphology,  
637 and climatology on flash floods. *Water Resources Research* 57, e2020WR029124.

638 Sahraei, S., Asadzadeh, M., Unduche, F., 2020. Signature-based multi-modelling and multi-objective calibration of hydrologic models: Application  
639 in flood forecasting for canadian prairies. *Journal of Hydrology* 588, 125095.

640 Saltelli, A., 2002. Making best use of model evaluations to compute sensitivity indices. *Computer physics communications* 145, 280–297.



641 Samaniego, L., Kumar, R., Attinger, S., 2010. Multiscale parameter regionalization of a grid-based hydrologic model at the mesoscale. *Water*  
642 *Resources Research* 46.

643 Shafii, M., Tolson, B.A., 2015. Optimizing hydrological consistency by incorporating hydrological signatures  
644 into model calibration objectives. *Water Resources Research* 51, 3796–3814. URL: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014WR016520>,  
645 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR016520>,  
646 arXiv:<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2014WR016520>.

647 Sobol, I., Kucherenko, S., 2010. Derivative based global sensitivity measures. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2, 7745–7746.

648 Tarasova, L., Basso, S., Zink, M., Merz, R., 2018. Exploring controls on rainfall-runoff events: 1. time series-based event separation and temporal  
649 dynamics of event runoff response in germany. *Water Resources Research* 54, 7711–7732.

650 Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R., Azarkish, M., Sadeghnejad-Barkousaraie, A., 2011. A new hybrid multi-objective pareto archive pso algorithm for a  
651 bi-objective job shop scheduling problem. *Expert Systems with Applications* 38, 10812–10821.

652 Torres-Treviño, L.M., Reyes-Valdes, F.A., López, V., Praga-Alejo, R., 2011. Multi-objective optimization of a welding process by the estimation of  
653 the pareto optimal set. *Expert systems with applications* 38, 8045–8053.

654 Veluscek, M., Kalganova, T., Broomhead, P., Grichnik, A., 2015. Composite goal methods for transportation network optimization. *Expert Systems*  
655 *with Applications* 42, 3852–3867.

656 Vrugt, J.A., Ter Braak, C.J., Clark, M.P., Hyman, J.M., Robinson, B.A., 2008. Treatment of input uncertainty in hydrologic modeling: Doing  
657 hydrology backward with markov chain monte carlo simulation. *Water Resources Research* 44.

658 Wang, N., Zhao, W.J., Wu, N., Wu, D., 2017. Multi-objective optimization: a method for selecting the optimal solution from pareto non-inferior  
659 solutions. *Expert Systems with Applications* 74, 96–104.

660 Wang, Z., Rangaiah, G.P., 2017. Application and analysis of methods for selecting an optimal solution from the pareto-optimal front obtained by  
661 multiobjective optimization. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 56, 560–574.

662 Wu, H., Chen, B., Ye, X., Guo, H., Meng, X., Zhang, B., 2021. An improved calibration and uncertainty analysis approach using a multicriteria  
663 sequential algorithm for hydrological modeling. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1–14.

664 Wu, Y.K., Liu, C.C., Lur, Y.Y., 2015. Pareto-optimal solution for multiple objective linear programming problems with fuzzy goals. *Fuzzy*  
665 *Optimization and Decision Making* 14, 43–55.

666 Yapo, P.O., Gupta, H.V., Sorooshian, S., 1998. Multi-objective global optimization for hydrologic models. *Journal of hydrology* 204, 83–97.

667 Yeh, W.W.G., 1986. Review of parameter identification procedures in groundwater hydrology: The inverse problem. *Water resources research* 22,  
668 95–108.

669 Yilmaz, K.K., Gupta, H.V., Wagener, T., 2008. A process-based diagnostic approach to model evaluation: Appli-  
670 cation to the nws distributed hydrologic model. *Water Resources Research* 44. URL: <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007WR006716>,  
671 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2007WR006716>,  
672 arXiv:<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2007WR006716>.

673 Zhu, C., Byrd, R.H., Lu, P., Nocedal, J., 1997. Algorithm 778: L-bfgs-b: Fortran subroutines for large-scale bound-constrained optimization. *ACM*  
674 *Trans. Math. Softw.* 23, 550–560. URL: <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/journals/toms/toms23.html#ZhuBLN97>.

675 Zoccatelli, D., Borga, M., Viglione, A., Chirico, G., Blöschl, G., 2011. Spatial moments of catchment rainfall: rainfall spatial organisation, basin  
676 morphology, and flood response. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 15, 3767–3783.