Investigating Meteorological/Groundwater Droughts by Copula to Study Anthropogenic Impacts

Sina Sadeghfam

University of Maragheh, P.O. Box 55136-553, Maragheh, East Azerbaijan, Iran,

Rasa Mirahmadi

University of Maragheh, P.O. Box 55136-553, Maragheh, East Azerbaijan, Iran,

Rahman Khatibi (✉ gtev.rex@gmail.com)

GTEV-ReX Limited, UK

Rasoul Mirabbasi

Department of Water Engineering, Faculty of Agriculture, Shahrekord University, Iran;

Ata Allah Nadiri

University of Tabriz, 29 Bahman Boulevard, Tabriz, East Azerbaijan, Iran

Research Article

Keywords:

Posted Date: January 25th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1266387/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Abstract

A critical understanding of the water crisis of Lake Urmia is the key in this paper for a basin-wide investigation of its Meteorological (Met) droughts and Groundwater (GW) droughts through a data-driven modelling strategy using 21-years of data records. The challenge is to formulate a modelling strategy to discern anthropogenic impacts and resilience patterns. The strategy includes: (i) transforming the recorded timeseries into Met/GW drought indices; (ii) extracting their drought duration and severity; and (iii) deriving return periods of the maximum drought event through the copula method. Our strategy is heuristic and its novelty emerges from deriving return periods for both Met and GW droughts to discern anthropogenic impacts on GW droughts. The results underpin the need for a planning system yet to emerge for mitigating impacts and rectifying ongoing damages before they become irreparable. The collective outcomes of the results and our professional knowledge shed light: on the ways resilience in the basin is undermined in terms of subsidence problems, on impacting the environment by altering interconnectivities between the lake and watercourses, and on discerning the causes for aquifer depletions to be due to mismanagement but not of Met droughts. Already, migration from the basin area can be detected.

Introduction

A critical understanding of the water crisis of Lake Urmia is the key in this paper for a basin-wide investigation of its Meteorological (Met) droughts and Groundwater (GW) droughts through a data-driven modelling strategy using 21-years of data records. The challenge is to formulate a modelling strategy to discern anthropogenic impacts and resilience patterns. The strategy includes: (i) transforming the recorded timeseries into Met/GW drought indices; (ii) extracting their drought duration and severity; and (iii) deriving return periods of the maximum drought event through the copula method. Our strategy is heuristic and its novelty emerges from deriving return periods for both Met and GW droughts to discern anthropogenic impacts on GW droughts. The results underpin the need for a planning system yet to emerge for mitigating impacts and rectifying ongoing damages before they become irreparable. The collective outcomes of the results and our professional knowledge shed light: on the ways resilience in the basin is undermined in terms of subsidence problems, on impacting the environment by altering interconnectivities between the lake and watercourses, and on discerning the causes for aquifer depletions to be due to mismanagement but not of Met droughts. Already, migration from the basin area can be detected.

The challenge for defining meteorological (Met) and groundwater (GW) droughts is topical research through the following two approaches: (i) those based on drought indices, which refer to frequency analysis [1, 2, 3]; and (ii) those based on the balance equation [4], which refers to the continuity equation alone. The first approach defines droughts as a deficit in water-related variables, such as precipitation or groundwater level (for wider definitions, see <https://drought.unl.edu/Education/DroughtIn-depth/TypesofDrought.aspx>), using Standard Precipitation Index (SPI) [5] or Standard Groundwater Index (SGI) [6] but these are not capable of studying the interactions between human activities and drought indices. The second approach is capable of studying such interactions (see [7]) by using the mass balance equation, but they include parameters that cannot be determined readily. These parameters (such as aquifer recharge and natural discharge) are inherently uncertain, and as such, balance equations are not capable of studying variations in drought within a basin without approximations. Thus, the second approach is avoided in this research investigation. Another technique through trend analysis in timeseries is noteworthy to study droughts, but their applications to the basin of Lake Urmia are not reviewed here as their defensibility depends on having long records of data, which is not the case here.

The modelling strategy is pivotal for the novelty of the paper in terms of discerning the causes for aquifer depletion with possible causes comprising climate change, Met droughts, lack of an effective planning system and mismanagement. The key issues in the narrative for the data-driven modelling strategy, depicted in Fig. 1, are now stressed, in which the term maximum events is pivotal. As detailed in due course, the available sparse data comprise the precipitation records at 48 synoptic stations and groundwater levels at 158 observation wells, each with its 21 years of recorded timeseries at monthly intervals. Following Step 3 for each of Met/GW droughts, an SPI/SGI timeseries are generated for each station/well and these serve to generate two more timeseries for duration and severity at each station/well (Step 5). Each of the generated timeseries has a maximum value, which is extracted to form one more basin-wide timeseries for Met droughts and GW droughts (Step 5), and as such, there are now 48 values of duration/severity for Met droughts and 158 values for GW droughts. The application of Steps 5 and 6 to these data renders return periods, which are distributed over the study area using the Kriging interpolation technique.

Met droughts are outcomes of natural processes but the role of carbon emission on Met droughts is global and not considered specifically here by the virtue of 21 years of data; whereas, GW droughts are impacted by both natural and anthropogenic factors. The impact of the Met drought on GW drought would take time, which should vary according to the capacity available in the aquifer but this is unknown for the aquifers in the study area. As the outcome of the modelling strategy is an emerging capability by putting Met droughts side-by-side of GW droughts, it becomes possible to ask the question that can interactions between Met/GW droughts be seen through data-driven modelling studies? To the best knowledge of the authors, there is no technique to answer the questions, but the modelling strategy in Fig. 1 is a heuristic approach to discern anthropogenic impacts in terms of their return periods. There is no precedence for the inter-comparison of Met/GW return periods, hence the learning from the results is 'heuristic,' as defined below. At this very early stage, the intention is to extract information by visual comparisons and/or from relative differences between Met and GW return periods ($(Met_T - GW_T)/GW_T$, where Met_T denotes the return period of Met drought and GW_T is that due to groundwater). On a similar note, Ashraf et al. (2021) use the term 'anthropogenic drought' as the ratio of anthropogenic withdrawal to the total outgoing flux using the balance equation [4]. Notably, heuristics refers to a clearly defined 'scheme of doing things' by any credible approach (further discussed by [8]).

Currently, Lake Urmia undergoes an unprecedented crisis as its water level has declined severely, most of which took place in the living memory during 2009-2016. This is the outcome of multiple factors including the absence a planning control system and mismanagement, lack of risk-based decision-making, anthropogenic and natural processes. The plethora of research outputs on the decline of lake water level is often focussed on climate change and/or drought but without a due regards to the absence of a planning system and mismanagement. The paper relies on the modelling strategy in Fig. 1 to discern the cause. The research on deriving return periods for Met droughts is yet to become topical on GW drought studies. These results are interpreted with respect to the

physical system comprising: (i) the lake, (ii) the surrounding aquifers, (iii) streamflows due to quick runoff, (v) interflows due to percolations; (iv) baseflows originating lost by aquifers or gained by them; and compensation flows but yet to be allowed to flow downstream of the dams. Generally, the interconnectivity between each of these components have not been fully established but that between the lake and aquifers used to be significant for one or two aquifer should now be considered almost zero, as discussed further in the next section.

The derived return periods are the basis for heuristic learning from the data for the study area. Their values are derived from bivariate distributions, which represent the mean time interval between drought events with the highest duration and severity observed in the recorded periods, where the term bivariate refers to duration and severity. By definition, a lower return period means a higher probability of occurrence. For floods, higher (or large) values of return periods stem by definition from lower probability of occurrences, generally understood to refer to adverse conditions; whereas, in drought studies, adverse conditions are captured by low values of return periods (higher frequencies) under the condition of fixing the event to maximum conditions, as explained above. Thus, severe droughts are frequent droughts with maximum durations and maximum severities. Although SPI/SGI are derived individually at the synoptic stations and observation wells, the modelling strategy renders their return periods, to spatially-compare them for the study area, and this serves as a heuristic basis for their inter-comparison. Comparing two stations with identical return periods does not mean identical drought events but it is the statement of the obvious that (i) Met droughts are unlikely to be impacted by GW droughts in the planning periods; (ii) GW droughts are likely to be impacted by mismanagement and by Met droughts.

The heuristic learning through comparing return periods of Met/GW droughts is based on the basic assumption that if the return period of the Met drought at a location is equal to that of GW drought, the location is likely to be exposed to natural agents of drought, hence groundwater shortages ought to stem from Met droughts. However, if GW droughts are more frequent (of lower return period), this must be due to such factors as excessive water abstractions from aquifers and/or natural aquifer processes. The results presented in the next section identify the following zones:

- i. **Sustainable Zones:** the results show no zone in the basin to have the return period of GW droughts to be significantly equal to its Met drought. Therefore, the aquifers in the basin are all impacted but under varying degrees, as explored below.
- ii. **Northern Aquifers:** these aquifers are seen to be under relatively severe Met and GW droughts, although their relative differences fails to expose the gravity of the problem.
- iii. **Central Aquifers** (eastern and western aquifers): these are found under relatively severe Met and GW droughts although their values of return period are somewhat closer to each other. Nonetheless, they are deemed to be reaching the biting point toward aquifer depletion.
- iv. **Southern Aquifers** (covering three major waterways of the basin): these are found under relatively moderate Met drought regimes but relatively severe GW drought regimes, which confirm the aquifers to be under relatively severe anthropogenic stresses by interrupting the natural regime of water exchanges between the aquifers and watercourse reaching irreparable damages.

The results section discusses the correlation between both return periods and states that their overall correlation is poor and as such, Met droughts are not dominant factors on GW droughts. The above four zones are similar to the risk matrix (see, [9]), which may be captured in terms of Low-Low, Low-High, High-Low and High-High, in which both return periods are banded as Low and High. However, they further suggest the possibility of breaking each return periods to three or more bands. The authors are devising a more appropriate analytics to study the correlation within each zone by extending arithmetic calculus as developed by [10].

The environmental damage on Lake Urmia and on its basin was triggered circa 1990 at the onset of the green revolution in Iran, a period which coincided with the followings unprecedented changes: (i) population in the country rose from 39 million in 1980 to 56 million in 1990 and nearly 80 million in 2016; (ii) uncontrolled developments broke the backbone of traditional agricultural practices and opened the gateways to aquifer water abstraction practices by pumping and deep-well pumping; and (iii) the use of fertilisers have subsequently been contaminating the aquifers, although this is not the subject of investigation in the paper. The outcome was the 'tragedy of the commons, which stemmed from a lack of long-term thinking, and this created an opportunity for individuals, rational or irrational, to reap the maximum benefit from their shared resource of aquifers. Soon the normal wells were not enough but the practice changed to using deep-wells.

Now, the resilience in the basin is undermined, as outlined here by interpreting the results and the professional knowledge of the author on the local area. The aquifers surrounding the lake are being depleted so much so that their capacity is under a severe test and as such year on year their depletions are biting their inherent resilience and at one point they may stop being recoverable. Over-abstractions in the basin of Lake Urmia has already triggered land subsidence (see [11, 12, 13]), which undermines the resilience of the agricultural land, transportation networks and buildings. As discussed in the next section, aquifers and watercourses have largely been polarised in the sense that watercourses feed the aquifers when water is available but are not fed by aquifers anymore and these amplify environmental damage on the basin. Migration from the basin, with the recent memory of its lush valleys, is looming over.

When the water crisis in Lake Urmia captured international attention, the urge for 'saving face' was turned into blaming climate change, where during 1995-2006 the global average temperature in the basin was approx. 0.5°C-1.0°C rise (see [14]) but not enough to support such a cause. Even then climate change refers to the likely future possibilities but not to now other than detecting some of its early signals. Currently, the average annual temperature rise in the basin of Lake Urmia is 1.5°C -1.6°C (see [14]) but this is not still large enough to substantiate the onset of destructive forces of climate change. The blame culture prolongs the tragedy of the commons. In recent years, organisational arrangements have been put in place to cater for abstraction controls but these are operating nominally and shifting the blame game to the users without mitigating the problems by overhauling water use practices and without producing publicly-communicated water resources plans, drought plans and water cycle management plans.

The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are one way of avoiding the tragedy of the commons, which are outcomes of scientific learning from past failures towards a more sustainable future. Delivering SDGs are now a common purpose in the global agenda and comprises 17 SDGs, broken down to some

169 targets (each of them are described in UN sites, see: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/> or <https://www.concernusa.org/story/sustainable-development-goals-explained/>). The goals and targets are transformed into several hundred indicators which are being used to measure progress towards achieving the goals and targets [8]. The issue of droughts is mentioned in Targets 2.4 and 15.3; Paragraph 14 of *Our Shared Principles*; Paragraph 33 of the *New Agenda*; and Paragraphs 205, 207 and 208 of *the Future We Want*. The study underpins the need for sustainable development in the basin of Lake Urmia to stop the ongoing damages before they become irreparable.

The paper shows that return periods on their own are capable of giving a heuristic insight into drought problems. These may be seen as the evidence for the proof of concept for the modelling strategy to discern the role of anthropogenic impacts on aquifer droughts. The authors are now expanding their works in a number of directions including: (i) investigating a synthetic index to better summarise the problem; (ii) assessing impacts of climate change both on precipitation and on the aquifers of the Lake Urmia basin and thereby on Met/GW droughts; and (iii) introducing indices to gain an insight into aquifer droughts towards resilient and sustainable performances.

Results

An Insight into the Catastrophe of Lake Urmia

Unsustainable groundwater abstractions threaten water availability in Iran, which is evidenced by doubling abstraction wells in 13 years (2002 to 2015) (see [15]). Ashraf et al. (2021) demonstrated that the basin-scale groundwater droughts in Iran are affected by groundwater withdrawal by humans even though Met droughts intensify GW droughts [4]. Of the plethora of studies on Lake Urmia, Khatibi et al. (2020) study the decline of water levels at Lake Urmia and conclude that it is the outcome of mismanagement [16]; Vahedoost and Aksoy (2021) study the water balance in Lake Urmia in conjunction with the surrounding aquifers and surface water inflows and conclude that groundwater and evaporation are significant variables on the decline in the water level of Lake Urmia but the effect of groundwater surpasses all other variables [17]. Attributing the decline to droughts is not rare but there is no reason to assume that there is any prolonged extreme drought in the region other than operational water shortages during peak demands. Indeed, there has been exceptionally high precipitations e.g. in 2006-07 and 2018-19, significantly raising the water levels in the lake, when floodwaters were allowed to bypass the vast number of dams.

Drought planning in developed countries are publicly communicated plans put in place for the delivery of various goals, for instance, in the UK, the aim is to safeguard the environment during drought and to oversee actions to secure public water supplies over often one year period. There are also severe and extreme droughts, as they become more prolonged that can be considered as part of drought planning. There are no known plans of this nature for managing Lake Urmia and its basin. An understanding of the occurrences of droughts in the Lake Urmia basin is a challenge since Lake Urmia has undergone a severe water level decline during 2009-2016 due to extensive embankments of its watercourses. It is not scientific to attribute the decline to droughts or climate change without focussing on the extensive number of dams constructed since the 1990s. Nonetheless, the results presented in the section leads to answering the question that did the Met droughts induce GW droughts; or do anthropogenic activities intensify the usual water shortage problem and under what mechanisms do these activities intensify the decline in Lake Urmia and its basin?

Khatibi et al. (2020) discuss encroachments onto the hydrological cycle of the Lake Urmia basin since the 1990s both in terms of surface water hydrology and groundwater exploitations. There is no published study of the baseline conditions on drought occurrences in the study area with only some sporadic record of precipitation and GW levels. However, Khatibi et al. (2020) [16] and Khatibi and Nadiri (2020) [18] hint at the pristine natural conditions prior to the 1990s, when traditional agricultural activities were woven over the natural resources in a sustainable fashion. Since the 1990s, mismanagements of resources have not been controlled and this remains the norm to date. The results produced by the paper and outlined below examine critically the wisdom of attributing the crisis of Lake Urmia to meteorological droughts or climate change. The implication of the results conform with those by the authors' works on subsidence in the basin [11, 12, 13], according to which subsidence is a reflections of depleting aquifers. Some of these aquifers have also been studied by the authors in terms of the aquifers in the basin [18] or GW droughts [19].

The Data and Processed Datasets

Precipitation and groundwater level timeseries with 21 years length (2000-2020) are incorporated in this study for analysing meteorological and groundwater droughts, respectively. Although Tong et al. (2015) discusses the uncertainty within copula's results increases when the data availability is reduced from 100 year-data to 20 year-data [20], arguably still there are significant information signals within 21 years of data availability. For some stations in the study, the data availability is 30 or more, but 21 years of data are available for all of the stations and therefore all the results are produced for the common time base of 21 years. These are quite sparse but are all that is available. Data examinations in the pre-processing stage indicated that there were no outliers; also, the gaps in the data for all synoptic stations were less than 5% of the total data, estimated by fitting regression equations between a station with data gaps and other stations, rendering a correlation coefficient greater than 0.9. This justified the gap-filling algorithm; hence the pre-processed timeseries are deemed fit-for-purpose in calculating SPI and SGI.

Both SPI and SGI are calculated using the gamma distribution as often recommendations in the literature [6, 21, 22, 23]. For SPI, the use of the gamma distribution seems widespread but for SGI there are recommendations to select a more appropriate distribution for a particular dataset. In the present study, the objective was not to identify the most accurate distribution but a fit-for-purpose distribution is deemed good enough and this may be assessed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The modelling strategy shown in Figure 1 produces the results summarised in Table 1.

The results in Table 1 show the details of the fitted copulas to monthly precipitation data for 48 synoptic stations; the details of which comprise: (i) select the best copula among its seven types of Clayton, Ali-Mikhail-Haq, Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstern, Frank, Galambos, Gumbel-Hougaard, and Plackett (see [24]); (ii) identify the parameters related to their inherent marginal distributions (λ , α , β) using the data related to duration and severity, in which the exponential

distribution is used for duration and the gamma distribution for severity, as discussed in Methods; (iii) optimise copula dependency parameter (θ) based on the method of Inference Function for Margins (IFM); (iv) calculate the logarithmic likelihood values corresponding to the optimised θ ; and (v) calculate Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) and Root Mean Square Errors (RMSE) values by comparing fitted and empirical copulas. NSE changes in the ranges of 0.51-0.95 and RMSE in the ranges of 0.06-0.19, which provide evidence that the fitted copulas are fit-for-purpose with sufficient information signals.

Similar to Table 1, the fitted copulas for the data of the 158 observation wells are presented in Table 2 using groundwater levels. For brevity, all the results are reported in the form of mean and standard deviations for each aquifer. The table also represents the best copula types and the number of corresponding observation wells but the other details are defined as for Table 1. The preliminary investigations with respect to fitting different distributions to duration and severity show that the exponential distribution is more appropriate to duration and the gamma distribution for severity of GW droughts. The table indicates that the means of NSE per aquifer vary in the range of 0.59-0.85 and that of RMSE in the range of 0.09-0.17, which also indicates that the fitted copulas are fit-for-purpose.

Table 1. Meteorological drought: a summary of statistical parameters for the fitted marginal distributions and copulas in 48 synoptic stations

Station	Copula	l	a	b	q_{opt}	Log-likelihood	NSE	RMSE	Station	Copula	l	a	b	q_{opt}	Log-likelihood	N
1	Frank	3.5	1.05	2.59	7.90	-139.1	0.72	0.14	25	Clayton	3.5	1.43	1.48	1.06	-107.8	0
2	Frank	3.0	0.77	4.43	8.22	-124.2	0.72	0.14	26	Clayton	3.5	1.29	1.43	0.98	-99.1	0
3	Galambos	3.5	0.88	2.73	2.72	-101.5	0.73	0.14	27	Galambos	4.0	1.39	1.65	1.91	-100.8	0
4	Frank	3.0	0.99	1.74	8.59	-112.3	0.66	0.15	28	Clayton	3.5	2.38	0.96	0.46	-105.6	0
5	Frank	3.5	0.71	4.07	7.45	-133.9	0.67	0.15	29	Clayton	3.0	2.72	0.68	0.42	-92.6	0
6	Frank	3.0	1.41	1.55	8.24	-118.1	0.65	0.16	30	Clayton	3.5	0.93	2.62	0.98	-111.6	0
7	Frank	3.0	0.95	3.64	11.67	-105.7	0.55	0.18	31	Clayton	3.5	1.29	1.60	0.99	-109.2	0
8	Frank	3.0	0.77	2.78	7.62	-114.6	0.51	0.18	32	Clayton	3.5	1.01	2.15	0.69	-108.9	0
9	Galambos	3.0	1.78	1.03	2.29	-81.7	0.90	0.09	33	Galambos	2.5	0.88	2.68	2.02	-112.7	0
10	Galambos	3.0	0.96	1.95	2.39	-92.9	0.88	0.10	34	Frank	2.5	0.96	2.63	7.21	-133.4	0
11	Clayton	2.5	1.17	1.25	0.65	-98.4	0.87	0.11	35	Frank	3.0	1.34	1.40	8.30	-114.3	0
12	Frank	2.5	1.02	1.97	7.28	-120.5	0.60	0.18	36	Frank	2.5	1.03	2.11	5.72	-131.0	0
13	Frank	2.5	1.38	1.65	6.38	-99.9	0.65	0.16	37	Galambos	3.5	0.84	2.79	1.47	-111.9	0
14	Frank	3.0	0.98	2.47	7.30	-132.3	0.51	0.19	38	Frank	2.5	1.40	1.73	5.99	-136.9	0
15	Galambos	3.5	0.98	2.38	2.58	-92.1	0.86	0.10	39	Plackett	3.0	1.07	1.87	20.00	-89.0	0
16	Galambos	3.0	1.20	1.76	2.11	-113.2	0.87	0.10	40	Plackett	3.0	1.61	1.16	20.00	-86.1	0
17	Frank	3.0	0.94	2.68	13.17	-109.7	0.92	0.08	41	Galambos	3.5	0.95	1.90	2.68	-82.6	0
18	Galambos	2.5	1.76	1.01	2.20	-88.7	0.93	0.07	42	Clayton	3.5	0.96	2.63	1.15	-113.7	0
19	Galambos	2.5	0.79	2.31	3.02	-87.3	0.94	0.07	43	Galambos	3.5	0.67	5.15	2.96	-102.5	0
20	Frank	3.0	1.05	2.10	9.81	-117.7	0.90	0.08	44	Galambos	3.5	0.93	3.46	2.95	-103.5	0
21	Frank	3.0	1.14	1.76	12.94	-84.2	0.84	0.10	45	Clayton	3.5	1.21	2.10	1.11	-112.3	0
22	Frank	2.5	1.09	2.02	9.61	-120.8	0.84	0.10	46	Clayton	3.5	1.11	1.88	1.06	-114.1	0
23	Galambos	4.0	1.00	2.43	2.33	-118.6	0.72	0.15	47	Clayton	3.0	1.62	1.18	0.76	-98.3	0
24	Frank	3.0	1.00	2.16	8.59	-112.6	0.70	0.15	48	Clayton	3.0	0.70	3.93	1.44	-117.2	0

The copulas in Tables 1 and 2 are employed to carry out frequency analysis and obtain the return period of drought events corresponding to the maximum duration and severity in the available historical data. The spatial distributions of copula-based bivariate return periods are given in Fig. 2 in two sets: (i) return period values for Met droughts within the basin of the lake; (ii) and that for GW droughts within each of the 13 aquifers around the lake. The identical red-to-blue colour palette for both types of droughts corresponds to low-to-high return periods.

Table 2. Groundwater drought: statistical parameters for the fitted marginal distributions and copulas in 158 observation wells

Aquifers and number of observation wells	Number of observation wells related to each type of Copula						<i>l</i>		<i>a</i>		<i>b</i>		<i>q_{opt}</i>		Log-lik
	Clayton	AM Hag	FGM	Frank	Galambos	Gumbel H.	Mean	St dv.	Mean	Stdv.	Mean	Stdv.	Mean	Stdv.	
Tasuj (8)	3	0	0	1	4	0	15.4	9.3	0.7	0.3	27.9	33.0	6.0	3.9	-38.7
Shabestar (8)	2	0	0	5	1	0	9.7	5.2	1.2	1.2	18.7	18.6	9.6	5.6	-41.3
Tabriz (16)	1	0	0	8	7	0	6.5	3.1	1.2	1.0	10.6	8.4	7.1	5.1	-64.1
Azershahr (7)	0	0	0	5	2	0	8.6	4.2	0.9	0.4	12.3	10.6	9.7	6.7	-70.3
Shiramin (3)	0	0	0	2	1	0	13.3	7.2	0.8	0.4	24.1	25.6	11.1	7.8	-63.9
Ajabshir (6)	0	0	0	3	3	0	12.0	6.1	0.8	0.4	23.4	30.4	8.2	6.5	-59.2
Maragheh-Bonab (13)	2	0	0	4	7	0	8.7	5.5	0.9	0.6	12.3	7.7	6.9	5.8	-53.4
Miandoab- (Qoshachay) (23)	1	1	0	12	8	1	8.2	5.7	1.3	1.0	10.9	14.5	6.9	5.6	-56.3
Mahabad (10)	2	0	0	8	0	0	10.5	2.4	0.5	0.1	25.0	5.8	14.6	4.7	-51.0
Naghadeh (Sulduz) (20)	1	0	0	6	13	0	5.1	1.3	1.2	0.6	7.2	3.6	4.3	5.0	-74.3
Urmia (28)	1	0	0	8	19	0	6.4	3.7	1.2	0.7	7.7	4.8	5.6	5.8	-64.7
Kahriz (4)	0	0	1	1	2	0	7.1	4.3	1.9	1.8	10.2	14.2	6.2	9.2	-47.5
Salmas (12)	4	0	0	3	4	1	6.6	2.9	1.7	1.4	4.9	4.6	4.4	3.9	-33.4

Salient Features of the Results

To understand the results better, the physical system is subdivided into: (i) the lake, (ii) the surrounding aquifers, (iii) streamflows due to quick runoff, (v) interflows due to percolations; (iv) baseflows originating lost by aquifers or gained by them; and (vi) possible connectivity between the lake and its surrounding aquifers. A further issue of the primary importance is the compensation flows that must be allowed from the dams to maintain the ecological functions at their downstream. The overwhelming perception is that this is commonly not observed as the embankment dams retain all the water unless there is a risk of over-spillage. These are discussed in due course.

The return period values produced by implementing the modelling strategy for Met/GW return periods are spatially distributed by the ordinary Kriging technique and are displayed in Fig. 2, which underpins the following broad findings:

- The return periods for the Met drought at the Southwest of the Basin are relatively high (and therefore less adverse regimes) in the region. This corresponds to the source of three dominant rivers with the potential to supply of more than 50% of the input surface flows to the lake in the old hydrological regime before its encroachment. Thus, at least, water levels at Lake Urmia should potentially be robust to adverse effects, should the flow regimes of these river not be encroached. However, the values of the Met return periods gradually decrease towards the southeast and northern parts of the basin (and therefore relatively more adverse drought regimes).
- The GW return periods do not show significant differences from one aquifer to another, and this is apparent from the return period contours within the aquifers, where both droughts return periods use an identical colour pallet. Nevertheless, the comparison demonstrates a salient feature on return periods that for GW droughts their values are detectably lower (more adverse) than those for Met droughts, and this signifies an intensified anthropogenic impact on drought occurrences.
- The differences between the Met and GW droughts are wide among the aquifers and these are further shown in Fig. 3 as they have significant implications to be discussed next. Naturally, the rivers and aquifers in a basin exchange water through a gain/ loss process or mode, in which a river is recharged by its aquifers and hence the river is in its gain mode (but the aquifer is in the loss mode); whereas the aquifer is recharged by its river and hence the aquifer is in its gain mode (but the river is in the loss mode). The authors' observations show that the rivers crossing the aquifers surrounding Lake Urmia used to display both modes in the course of past years. However, since the onset of anthropogenic activities and their intensification, the gain mode of the rivers has turned into a loss mode, and consequently the baseflows would hardly match their past states. The authors have also examined salt intrusion records and geological logs of the aquifers surrounding the lake but would state without producing the data here that they found no evidence for the direct interconnectivity between the lake and most of its surrounding aquifers for the interfaces are normally clay. This should conform further with the shape of the aquifers, all of which are alluvial fans and therefore are physically situated above the depression of Lake Urmia. The implication of this local knowledge is that the decline of Lake Urmia is not related to the aquifers but stems from the 40 embanking dams. Likewise, the depletion of the aquifers stem from over-abstraction by pumping.

The focus in Fig. 3 is on the aquifers, which uses an identical colour palette and ranges for the return period distributions of Met/GW droughts, where the range of the palette is from 3 years to 31 years. It displays the mean values within the aquifers in the digital form on the top of solid lines. A comparison of Fig. 3a (Met droughts) with Fig. 3b (GW droughts) provides a visual evidence that GW droughts tend to be more frequent (lower values of return periods and more adverse) than those of Met droughts (higher return periods). These two visual observations are also supported statistically by a poor correlation coefficient between the mean return periods for Met/GW droughts, as follows. The value of the coefficient is 0.26 but this is not significant enough to underpin any significant dependence of return periods GW droughts on those of Met droughts. The range of the return period of Met droughts is from 11 years to 31 years but that of GW droughts is from 3 years to 16 years and their relative differences range from 0.1 to 0.64 (the full range is from 0 to 1).

Detecting Anthropogenic Impacts

GW droughts in the aquifers, displayed in Fig. 3, serve the extraction of the salient features on anthropogenic impacts by breaking down the aquifers into the following zones:

- i. Return periods of Met droughts coincide with those of GW droughts: This is not observed in this study area but are thought to exist for sustainable aquifers, in which they are recharged annually by adequate amounts without triggering drought events.
- ii. **Northern Aquifers** (Tasuj, Shabestar, and Salmas): The contours of both Met and GW droughts in this zone are within relatively severe (low values of return periods, see Fig. 3a,b) but their relative differences seem to be in the moderate range. The heuristic learning is that relative differences can be quite misleading as both return periods are relatively severe (low values of return period) but their differences diffuse their severity. The prevalence of droughts in these aquifers is further supported by the authors' investigations on subsidence, who report that due to GW over-abstraction the subsequent subsidence is significant and may be considerable (e.g., [11, 12, 13]).
- iii. **Aquifers at the Central Zones** (eastern aquifers: Tabriz, Azershahr, Shiramin and Ajabshir; and western aquifers: Urmia and Kahriz): The contours of both Met and GW droughts in this zone are relatively severe in terms of return periods (low values of return period), but those of GW droughts are only slightly severer than Met droughts. In these aquifers, anthropogenic activities are known to be intensive and therefore it is anticipated that as soon as they reach a biting point, the likely critical state of GW droughts could inflict a greater impact for not being prepared. Relative values of mid-range droughts in Fig. 3(c) are justifiable, as high subsidence occurrences are yet to be observed in this zone.
- iv. **Aquifers of Southern Zones** (Qoshachay-Miandoab, Mahabad, Sulduz-Naghade): The contours of Met droughts in this zone are within relatively low contours in terms of return periods (high values of return periods and less adverse), but those of GW droughts are in severe contours (low values of return periods and more adverse). These aquifers are already known to be stressed from severe anthropogenic impacts and Fig. 3c captures this salient feature.

The above results provide a heuristic basis to learn from the data on both visual grounds, and the analysis of differences and statistical coefficients that GW droughts are being impacted by anthropogenic encroachments more directly than meteorological processes. Arguably, this is a significant evidence for discerning anthropogenic impacts, as the local knowledge is of all aquifers are fast being depleted. However, the heuristic learning is that the resolution of dividing each return period to a number of bands need to be investigated. An adequate resolution should then be the base for devising an analytics for quantifying anthropogenic impacts. This may additionally require further dimensions and parameters into the inter-comparison, e.g. the capacity of an aquifer departing from its long-term recharged state).

The study employs an identical procedure to define return period for Met and GW droughts using monthly data but 3-month or 6-month SPI can normally be used too. However, the study seeks to cope with data sparsity with respect to the 21-year available data and therefore higher intervals would restrict the validity of frequency analysis. The above visual extraction of information using 21 years of data is fit-for-purpose but for the defensibility of the results need to be improved as more data becomes available.

Methods

Statistical Distributions

The gamma distribution is used in the study by implementing its standard procedure with the two parameters, which comprises a shape parameter, α , and a scale parameter β , where both are positive real numbers (for more details, see [25]). Its parameter estimation procedure is inbuilt in the MATLAB platform.

The exponential distribution is also used in the study by implementing its standard procedure with the one parameter, which comprises the rate parameter (λ), where it is a positive and real number (for more details, see [25]). Its parameter estimation procedure is inbuilt in the MATLAB platform.

Meteorological Drought Events

Further to the categorisation of drought studies in the introduction, the focus is now on Standardised Precipitation Index (SPI), developed by McKee et al. (1993) [5], which is detailed next. It quantifies drought events based on precipitation timeseries for specific time scales, e.g., 1, 3, 6, or 12 months. To calculate SPI, a probability distribution is fitted to long-term precipitation data, and this renders the calculation of cumulative probabilities. More than often, the distribution fitted is the gamma distribution (see [5, 26]). As per Eq. 1(a), the SPI values are defined in terms of the transformed inverse standard normal distribution (further details are available in [27]):

$$SPI = \Phi^{-1}((P))$$

1a

where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ represents the inverse standard normal distribution; and $(\cdot)$ is the gamma distribution fitted to precipitation timeseries (P). Notably, SPI varies in accordance with the x-axis range of standard normal distribution (approximately between -3 to 3), and the negative values identify dry month. As per McKee

et al. (1993) [5], the duration of a drought event is defined as a period in which SPI is continuously negative but its severity is defined as the cumulative magnitude of SPI for the duration (see Fig. 1).

Groundwater Drought Events

Similarly, the focus is on index-based drought studies and the paper uses Standardised Groundwater level Index (SGI), developed by Bloomfield and Marchant (2013) [6], which is processed by using changes in groundwater levels. The calculation procedure is similar to SPI (see Eq. 1b), but previous studies highlight that the monthly timeseries distribution for groundwater levels may not follow the gamma distribution and hence more distributions need to be evaluated [6]. Therefore, wide ranges of distributions are fitted and a more appropriate distribution is selected using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

$$SGI = \Phi^{-1}(\beta(GWL))$$

1b

where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ represents the inverse standard normal distribution; and $\beta(\cdot)$ is an appropriate distribution fitted to groundwater level timeseries (GWL). Similar to SPI, the negative values for SGI identify the dry months. The duration and severity are also defined similar to SPI (Fig. 1).

Copula

Copulas, are multivariate cumulative distributions normally applied for estimating the joint probability of multiple random variables, first developed in statistics by Sklar (1959) [28] and then applied in hydrological studies such as rainfall-runoff [29] and drought [30]. In drought studies, these functions calculate the probability of joint occurrences of drought characteristics such as duration and severity using marginal distribution functions. Marginal distribution functions indicate the probability of independent occurrence of drought characteristics [24, 31]. Shiao (2006) used Copulas to analyse the frequency of Met droughts, based on duration and severity characteristics using SPI [30]. The technique became topical with extensive reports (e.g., [22, 32]).

Recent applications of copulas include: (i) groundwater drought frequency analysis based on SGI [3]; (ii) conducting tri-variate (duration, severity, and peak) [33] and fourth-variate (duration, severity, peak, and inter-arrival time) [34] frequency analysis for Met droughts; (iii) uncertainty analysis in estimating copulas' parameters using the Monte Carlo Markov chain [35, 36]; (iv) combining different drought indices such as SPI with other drought indices such as the agricultural drought index [37], the evaporative drought index [38]; and (v) drought frequency analysis based on the results of climate models [39, 40, 41, 42].

A Copula function is a technique that indicates the relationship between a multivariate distribution function and one-dimensional marginal distributions. Copula models are based on the Sklar theory [28], which use joint distributions for the random variable of X defined for n -dimensional continuous random variables ($X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$) with marginal distributions of $F(X_i) = P_X(X \leq x_i)$, as follows:

$$H_{X_1, \dots, X_n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = P[X_1 \leq x_1, X_2 \leq x_2, \dots, X_n \leq x_n] \quad (2)$$

The bivariate copula (C) is defined as follows:

$$F_{XY}(x, y) = C(F_X(x), F_Y(y))$$

3

where x and y are dependent random variables; F_{XY} is bivariate distribution function; and F_X and F_Y are marginal distributions.

The bivariate copula for drought duration and severity is defined as follows:

$$C(u, v) = F_{DS}(d, s) = C(F_D(d), F_S(s))$$

4

where d and s are drought duration and severity, respectively; and F_D and F_S are marginal distributions for drought duration and severity, respectively (further information is available in [43]). In Met drought studies, previous research works indicate that the exponential distributions are appropriate for duration and the gamma distributions for severity [22, 23, 30]. In GW drought studies, there are no recommendations for the types of duration and severity probability distributions. Therefore, different distributions should be checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Table 3 illustrates the incorporated copulas in the study, which involves the estimation of copula parameters and for this, there are various techniques, including parametric, semi-parametric and non-parametric approaches. Among them, the Inference Function for Margins (IFM) method is the most common technique for estimating the copula parameter [44] and requires two distinct steps outlined as follows. Step 1: marginal distributions are obtained from observed values; Step 2: the joint likelihood functions are maximised to estimate the copula parameter, θ . The logarithmic likelihood function is defined as follows:

$$L() = \sum_{k=1}^n \log [c(F_D(d), F_S(s))] = \sum_{k=1}^n \log [c(u, v)]$$

5

where n is number of data; and c is the density function of copula and is calculated as follows [45]:

$$C(u, v) = \frac{\partial^2 C(u, v)}{\partial u \partial v}$$

6

Table 3. The list of incorporated copulas and related formulas

Copula Family	Copula CDF $C(u, v)$	θ Interval
Clayton	$C(u, v) = (u^{-\theta} + v^{-\theta} - 1)^{-1/\theta}$	$\theta \geq 1$
Ali-Mikhail-Haq	$C(u, v) = \frac{uv}{1 - \theta(1-u)(1-v)}$	$-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$
Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstern	$C(u, v) = [1 + \theta(1-u)(1-v)]$	$-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$
Frank	$C(u, v) = -\frac{1}{\theta} \ln \left[1 + \frac{(e^{-\theta u} - 1)(e^{-\theta v} - 1)}{(e^{-\theta} - 1)} \right]$	$\theta \neq 0$
Galampos	$C(u, v) = \exp \left\{ -[(-\ln u)^{-\theta} + (-\ln v)^{-\theta}]^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \right\}$	$\theta \geq 0$
Gumbel-Hougaard	$C(u, v) = \exp \left\{ -[(-\ln u)^{\theta} + (-\ln v)^{\theta}]^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \right\}$	$\theta \geq 1$
Plackett	$C(u, v) = \frac{1}{2\theta - 1} \left\{ 1 + (\theta + 1)(u + v) - [(1 + (\theta - 1)(u + v))^2 - 4\theta(\theta - 1)uv]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}$	$\theta \geq 0$

Joint Return Period

Two cases are considered for the return period: (i) simultaneous exceedance of both duration and severity from a given threshold, denoted by T_{DS} ; and (ii) exceedance of either duration or severity from a given threshold, denoted by T'_{DS} , as defined below [30]:

$$T_{DS} = \frac{E(L)}{P(D \geq d, S \geq s)} = \frac{E(L)}{1 - F_D(d) - F_S(s) + C(F_D(d), F_S(s))} \quad (D \geq d \text{ AND } S \geq s)$$

7

$$T'_{DS} = \frac{E(L)}{1 - C(F_D(d), F_S(s))} \quad (D \geq d \text{ OR } S \geq s)$$

8

where L is the interval between the onset of a drought to the next drought; and $E(L)$ is the average of all L values.

Empirical copula

The empirical copulas are order-based joint cumulative probabilities [24] and a two-dimensional copula with n number of observations (C_e) is defined as follows:

$$C_e \left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n} \right) = \frac{\# \{ (d, s) \mid d \leq d_{(i)} \text{ and } s \leq s_{(j)} \}}{n}$$

9

where $d_{(i)}$ and $s_{(j)}$ represent the order statistics of observed duration and severity, $0 \leq i, j \leq n$; and $\#$ denotes the cardinality of the identified sets.

Specification of Further Techniques

The production of results includes the following techniques: (i) Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) are used to select the best copula in addition to calculating the maximum logarithm likelihood. A 'perfectly' fitted copula has RMSE closer to zero and NSE, closer to 1. (ii) the calculated return periods in synoptic stations and observation wells are spatially distributed using the ordinary Kriging technique.

The Modelling Strategy

The modelling strategy in the paper is the key to be able to discern the role of anthropogenic impacts on aquifers. Whilst the theoretical groundworks are already laid down for estimating return periods of Met droughts, the paper tests the application of the procedure for GW droughts. The Introduction section outlined the salient features of the narrative for the modelling strategy. The modelling strategy is implemented in 9 steps and as illustrated in Fig. 1 and its description at each step is given below.

The strategy is as follows: **Step 1** – identify the spatial boundaries of the basin and aquifers and prepare data within the boundaries; data include precipitation data of synoptic stations within the Lake Urmia basin and also groundwater levels obtained from observation wells within the aquifers around the lake; **Step 2** – pre-process data to select or eliminate stations according to data length, conduct an outlier test and fill the gap data by using the data from the nearest stations with high correlation coefficient values; **Step 3** – calculate SPI values at 48 synoptic stations using Eq. (1a) and SGI values at 158 observation wells using Eq. (1b); **Step 4** – calculate duration and severity timeseries for Met/GW droughts at the investigated synoptic stations and observation wells; **Step 5** – identify the maximum durations and severities for Met/GW droughts at the investigated synoptic stations and observation wells; **Step 6** – examine the fitness of different copulas listed in Table 3 and select the best fitted one for the investigated synoptic stations and observation wells by optimizing the copulas' parameter; **Step 7** – conduct frequency analysis to calculate return periods of Met/GW droughts for the estimated maximum severity and duration at the investigated synoptic stations and observation wells; **Step 8** – calculate the relative difference between Met/GW droughts to identify the role of anthropogenic activities in intensifying drought; and **Step 9** – spatially-interpolate the calculated return periods for Met/GW droughts.

The modelling strategy is a heuristic study in the sense that there was no basis to anticipate the outcome of the study beforehand but their comparison guided by a number of simple rules/ observations born out of professional experience and provided a sufficient basis to gain an evidence-based insight into a complex situation.

Declarations

Acknowledgement

It is acknowledged that the timeseries data for observation wells were obtained from East Azerbaijan Water Company and those for precipitation data were obtained from the Iran Meteorological Organisation. The level of integrity checks for these data by these organisations are not known for us but the data were checked for outliers and gaps.

Data Availability

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available on request.

References

1. Mishra, A. K., & Singh, V. P. A review of drought concepts. *Journal of Hydrology* **391**, 202-216 (2010).
2. Hangshing, L., & Dabral, P. P. Multivariate frequency analysis of meteorological drought using copula. *Water Resources Management* **32**, 1741-1758 (2018).
3. Pathak, A. A., & Dodamani, B. M. Connection between Meteorological and Groundwater Drought with Copula-Based Bivariate Frequency Analysis. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* **26**, 05021015 (2021).
4. Ashraf, S., Nazemi, A., & AghaKouchak, A. Anthropogenic drought dominates groundwater depletion in Iran. *Scientific Reports* **11**, 1-10 (2021).
5. McKee, T. B., Doesken, N. J., & Kleist, J. The relationship of drought frequency and duration to time scales. *In Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Applied Climatology* **17**, 179-183 (1993).
6. Bloomfield, J. P., & Marchant, B. P. Analysis of groundwater drought building on the standardised precipitation index approach. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **17**, 4769-4787 (2013).
7. AghaKouchak, A. *et al.* Anthropogenic Drought: Definition, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Review of Geophysics* **59**, 1-22 (2021).
8. Khatibi R. (in press, Feb. 2022) "Chapter 1: A Basic Framework to Overarch Sustainability, Risk and Reliability – A Critical Review," *Risk, Reliability and Sustainability* Ed. By Roshni, T., Samui, P., Bui, D., Khatibi, R. and Kim, D., Elsevier Pub.
9. DFID (2011) Risk management guidance (publishing.service.gov.uk), accessed on 1/ December 2021
10. Khatibi R. Heuristic contextualisation of arithmetic calculus by a new network based on the difference table. *J Applied Mathematics*, **8**, 1387-1426 (2017).
11. Nadiri, A. A., Taheri, Z., Khatibi, R., Barzegari, G., & Dideban, K. Introducing a new framework for mapping subsidence vulnerability indices (SVIs): ALPRIFT. *Science of the Total Environment* **628**, 1043-1057 (2018).
12. Sadeghfam, S., Nourbakhsh Khiyabani, F., Khatibi, R., & Daneshfaraz, R. A study of land subsidence problems by ALPRIFT for vulnerability indexing and risk indexing and treating subjectivity by strategy at two levels. *Journal of Hydroinformatics* **22**, 1640-1662 (2020).
13. Gharekhani, M., Nadiri, A. A., Khatibi, R., & Sadeghfam, S. An investigation into time-variant subsidence potentials using inclusive multiple modelling strategies. *Journal of Environmental Management* **294**, 112949 (2021).
14. Carbon Brief (2018) Mapped: How every part of the world has warmed - <https://www.carbonbrief.org> (accessed 1 Nov 2021)
15. Noori, R., Maghrebi, M., Mirchi, A., Tang, Q., Bhattarai, R., Sadegh, M., ... & Madani, K. Anthropogenic depletion of Iran's aquifers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, 1-7 (2021).
16. Khatibi, R., Ghorbani, M. A., Naghshara, S., Aydin, H., Karimi, V. A framework for 'Inclusive Multiple Modelling' with critical views on modelling practices– Applications to modelling water levels of Caspian Sea and Lakes Urmia and Van. *Journal of Hydrology* **587**, 124923 (2020).
17. Vaheddoost, B., & Aksoy, H. Regressive-stochastic models for predicting water level in Lake Urmia. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 1-15 (2021).
18. Khatibi, R., Nadiri, A. A. Inclusive Multiple Models (IMM) for predicting groundwater levels and treating heterogeneity. *Geoscience Frontiers* **12**, 713-724 (2020).

19. Sadeghfam, S., Ehsanitarab, A., Khatibi, R., & Daneshfaraz, R. Investigating 'risk of groundwater drought occurrences by using reliability analysis. *Ecological indicators* **94**, 170-184 (2018).
20. Tong, X. *et al.* Impact of data length on the uncertainty of hydrological copula modeling. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* **20**, 05014019 (2015).
21. Shiau, J. T., & Modarres, R. Copula-based drought severity-duration-frequency analysis in Iran. *Meteorological Applications: A Journal of Forecasting, Practical Applications, Training Techniques and Modelling* **16**, 481-489 (2009).
22. Mirabbasi, R., Fakheri-Fard, A., & Dinpashoh, Y. Bivariate drought frequency analysis using the copula method. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* **108**, 191-206 (2012).
23. Zin, W. Z. W., Jemain, A. A., & Ibrahim, K. Analysis of drought condition and risk in Peninsular Malaysia using Standardised Precipitation Index. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* **111**, 559-568 (2013).
24. Nelsen, R. B. Archimedean Copulas. An Introduction to Copulas Ch.4 (Springer, 2006).
25. Kottegoda, N. T., & Rosso, R. Applied statistics for civil and environmental engineers (Milano Univ. Blackwell, 2008).
26. Janga Reddy, M., & Ganguli, P. Application of copulas for derivation of drought severity–duration–frequency curves. *Hydrological Processes* **26**, 1672-1685 (2012).
27. Guttman, N. B. Accepting the standardized precipitation index: a calculation algorithm 1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, **35**, 311-322 (1999).
28. Sklar, M. Fonctions de repartition and dimensions et leurs marges. *Publ. inst. statist. univ. Paris* **8**, 229-231 (1959).
29. De Michele, C., & Salvadori, G. A generalized Pareto intensity-duration model of storm rainfall exploiting 2-copulas. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **108**, 1-15 (2003).
30. Shiau, J. T. Fitting drought duration and severity with two-dimensional copulas. *Water Resources Management* **20**, 795-815 (2006).
31. Grimaldi, S., & Serinaldi, F. Design hyetograph analysis with 3-copula function. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **51**, 223-238 (2006).
32. Sajeev, A., Deb Barma, S., Mahesha, A., & Shiau, J. T. Bivariate drought characterization of two contrasting climatic regions in India using copula. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* **147**, 05020005 (2021).
33. Hao, C., Zhang, J., & Yao, F. Multivariate drought frequency estimation using copula method in Southwest China. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* **127**, 977-991 (2017).
34. Ayantobo, O. O., Li, Y., & Song, S. Multivariate drought frequency analysis using four-variate symmetric and asymmetric Archimedean copula functions. *Water Resources Management* **33**, 103-127 (2019).
35. Sadegh, M., Ragno, E., & AghaKouchak, A. Multivariate Copula Analysis Toolbox (MvCAT): describing dependence and underlying uncertainty using a Bayesian framework. *Water Resources Research* **53**, 5166-5183 (2017).
36. Yang, X., Li, Y. P., Liu, Y. R., & Gao, P. P. A MCMC-based maximum entropy copula method for bivariate drought risk analysis of the Amu Darya River Basin. *Journal of Hydrology* **590**, 125502 (2020).
37. Hao, Z., & AghaKouchak, A. Multivariate standardized drought index: a parametric multi-index model. *Advances in Water Resources* **57**, 12-18 (2013).
38. Won, J., Choi, J., Lee, O., & Kim, S. Copula-based Joint Drought Index using SPI and EDDI and its application to climate change. *Science of the Total Environment* **744**, 140701 (2020).
39. Yao, N. *et al.* Projections of drought characteristics in China based on a standardized precipitation and evapotranspiration index and multiple GCMs. *Science of the Total Environment* **704**, 135245 (2020).
40. Duan, R., Huang, G., Li, Y., Zhou, X., Ren, J., & Tian, C. Stepwise clustering future meteorological drought projection and multi-level factorial analysis under climate change: A case study of the Pearl River Basin, China. *Environmental Research* **196**, 110368 (2021).
41. Li, Y. *et al.* Meteorological and hydrological droughts in Mekong River Basin and surrounding areas under climate change. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* **36**, 100873 (2021).
42. Seidenfaden, I. K., Jensen, K. H., & Sonnenborg, T. O. Climate change impacts and uncertainty on spatiotemporal variations of drought indices for an irrigated catchment. *Journal of Hydrology* **601**, 126814 (2021).
43. Schweizer, B., & Sklar, A. Probabilistic metric spaces. Courier Corporation. (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1983).
44. Joe, H. Multivariate models, dependence concepts. (London: Chapman & Hall, 1997).
45. Zhang, L., & Singh, V. P. Bivariate rainfall and runoff analysis using entropy and copula theories. *Entropy*, **14**, 1784-1812 (2012).

Figures

Figure 1

Modelling strategy and definition of drought duration (d) and severity (s)

Figure 2

(a) Location map of the study area; (b) spatial distribution of Met drought return period within the Lake Urmia basin and GW drought return period within the aquifers around the lake. Note the contours for each aquifer varies but not much and more often are lower (more severe) than those of Met droughts.

Figure 3

Variations in drought return periods between aquifers: (a) meteorological drought; (b) groundwater drought; (c) relative differences