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Abstract

Climate change is very crucial for ecological systems and society. But Global climate models run at coarse spatial resolution which is difficult to do regional analysis. Regional-scale projections can be obtained by a technique called statistical downscaling which uses past data to find out the high resolution and low-resolution mapping. There are many methods for statistical downscaling of climate data: 1) Conventional methods 2) Deep learning architecture. Some of the existing works like DeepSd downscaled High-resolution climate projections but in such cases, Global climate model (GCM) data suffers from concept drift, change of mapping between input and label over time. So applying these deep learning models is not a good idea for statistical downscaling. In our study, we have developed new approach of downscaling which outperforms other deep learning architectures like super-resolution convolutional neural network (SRCNN), Long short term memory network (LSTM) in terms of accuracy and reliability. These existing models focus on minimizing the root mean square error (RMSE) and do not take care of the tails or extremes. Therefore the objective function of these models should be changed other than root mean square error (RMSE). Our proposed model focuses on both means and extremes. We provide a comparison between proposed and other existing deep learning models in downscaling daily precipitation and temperature from 1.25 to 0.25 resolution over India. We have downscaled 6 Global climate model (GCM) models in our comparative study.

Introduction

Climate change causes very dangerous effects on society which leads to extreme precipitation and temperature events. Natural resources are very much sensible to these extreme events.
which may cause drought and flood etc. Earth system models simulate climate change. These physics-based models can predict the atmospheric variables on a very large scale of about 125x125 KM grid [4]. But for regional analysis of these variables, we need to downscale the GCM data into the resolution of 25x25 [3]. Downscaling is basically of two types statistical and dynamic downscaling [1]. Dynamic downscaling is physics-based models that run on a regional scale and these are computationally expensive [2]. In contrast, Statistical downscaling finds the relationship between observed small scale variables and larger scale variables using Artificial neural networks or support vector machines, linear regression. But these methods do not care about the spatial correlations and other existing deep learning models like SRCNN and LSTM do not perform well for statistical downscaling due to concept drift in GCM data. SRCNN is used in computer vision for signal image super resolution. It tries to minimize the mean difference (RMSE) between high resolution and low-resolution images. BCSD is a state of the art technique for Statistical downscaling which reproduces statistical distribution by doing quantile mapping between GCM data and observation from each individual grid point. Our proposed work, BCSRCNN, a combination of BCSD and SRCNN to perform statistical downscaling doesn't limit itself to minimize the means but it also captures the extremes. We have downscaled the low-resolution climate projections into high-resolution climate projections over India for 6 global climate models (CESM-CAM5, NOR-ESM, MIROC, MPI, BNU-ESM, GFDL). In our proposed model first we will do BCSD and apply the weights of auto encoded SRCNN for high-resolution output prediction. BCSD cares about the statistics of the data and SRCNN cares about the spatial correlations and distribution of errors. Data used to train and validate downscaling methods include observed precipitation data (high resolution) and GCM. We have used different GCMs (CESM-CAM5, NOR-ESM, MIROC, MPI, BNU-ESM, GFDL) from 1920-2005 as coarse resolution Input with resolution 1.25 and observation Data as High-Resolution Labels with Resolution 0.25 has been used for training.

**Related Work:**

From Ahmed et al. study, it has been noticed that statistical downscaling and dynamic downscaling perform equally with a negligible difference over a small region from GCM, which encourages us to opt for statistical downscaling over dynamical downscaling [6-8]. But Statistical downscaling approaches are developed based on the assumption that the statistical relationship between GCM and observation will remain the same in future predicted data [sachindra pap]. Generally, statistical downscaling approaches have been divided into three
major categories: weather classification, weather generators and regression-based approaches [9-19]. In our study as we are focusing on regression-based approaches.

Many regression-based approaches have been widely used in statistical downscaling which includes Automated regression-based statistical downscaling (which classify the wet and non-wet days first and later apply regression techniques) [20-24]. Linear regression and stepwise regression model (they will estimate predictand by using an optimized linear combination of predictors) [25-27], Support vector machines and Relevance Vector Machine (In the SVM and RVM algorithms, we use kernel functions to map non-linear problems into linear problems in high dimensional space) [28-35], Bayesian model averaging [36-42], LSTM [70,71], DeepSD [7’s pap] (which tries to captures spatial correlations by using convolution neural network and elevation as bias. But in his study, he has taken input as downscaled observation instead of a GCM output. Due to this, his model performs good, as it does not suffer from concept drift. We will talk more elaborately about concept drift in our later discussion). BCSD (it will try to do quantile mapping, which performs quite better in spite of its simplicity) [53-59].

From the past literature it has been found that irrespective of the machine learning and deep learning models which has been used, they perform well in simulating average (Means) and underestimates the tails and the standard deviation [60-62]. These downscaling models overfits the trend of lower percentiles and underfits the trend of higher percentiles [68]. But all-natural calamities related to climate are considered as extremes; which occur at higher percentiles. Even though in past studies, machine learning has been applied to statistical downscaling, those studies lack good evaluation of models that were developed. Because the majority of the studies used only RMSE as their metric; but mean will reside in lower percentiles and these models’ overfit lower percentiles, RMSE is not a good enough metric to evaluate the models [63-67].

**Methodology**

**Data Pre-processing**

Data for a single day at the coarse resolution (GCM ) of 1.25° is an “image” of size 25x27. Precipitation and elevation are used as input channels while precipitation is the sole output. Images are obtained at each resolution through downsampling using bicubic interpolation. For instance down-sampling 1.25° to 0.25° increases image size from 25x27 to 129x135 similar to
the resolution of observed data. This interpolated image is given as input to all models. Data pre-processing is same across all the methods

**Methods**

- Super-Resolution Convolutional Neural Networks (SRCNN)
- Long-short term memory network (LSTM)
- Convolutional Long short term memory network (ConvLSTM)
- Auto Encoded Bias corrected Super-Resolution Convolutional Neural Networks (AE BCSRCNN)
- Bias Corrected Super-Resolution Convolutional Neural Networks (BCSRCNN)

**Super-Resolution Convolutional Neural Networks (SRCNN)**

CNN’s are good at dealing with spatially related data. SR convolutional neural networks (SRCNNs) is a special type of Deep Neural Network. SRCNN is used to learn the functional mapping between LR images and HR images [5]. SRCNN involves three main operations:

- Patch Extraction
- Nonlinear mapping
- Reconstruction

In our work, we have used three-layered SRCNN which takes two-channel images as input. One channel is the Low-resolution precipitation data for India and other is High-resolution Elevation. Layer one is formulated as follows

\[ F(x) = \max (W \ast X + B_0) \]
As shown in **fig 1** layer one involves convolution operation between kernel and input image followed by nonlinear mapping where W is filters and B is biased. W consists of 64 filters of size 9 x 9. Each filter of size n x n slides over the image and works as of the patch extraction layer. We have used relu activation function for nonlinear mapping. We have used padding with a replication method which preserves the size of an image similar to the input image after the convolution operation. Layer 2 is formulated as same as layer one but it takes input from layer one. Layer one output feature maps are fed as input to layer two which respectively performs convolution with 32 filters of size 1x1 and Relu operation. The output of layer two is fed as input to layer three. It performs convolution operation with 1 filter of size 5x5. End to end mapping involves learning of the parameters W and B of each layer. A Mean square loss function is used as an objective function which is defined as

\[
l = argmin (\theta) \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||F(Xi; \theta) - Yi||^2
\]

**Long Short term memory network**
LSTM is a very special type of recurrent neural network[70]. It is good at dealing with temporally related data. LSTM introduces a special so-called memory cell, which acts as an accumulator to learn long term dependency in a time-series. The cell is self-connected and copied its own real-valued state. Memory cell contains three gates input gate, output gate and forget gate. These gates indicate how much of the information should be passed to the next state and how much should be forgotten. Therefore LSTM preserves the long term dependency without vanishing gradient. The formulation of the LSTM cell is as follows:

\[
x_t = \sigma(W_{xi}x_t + W_{hi}h_{t-1} + W_{ci}c_{t-1} + b_i)
\]

\[
f_t = \sigma(W_{xf}x_t + W_{hf}h_{t-1} + W_{cf}c_{t-1} + b_f)
\]

\[
c_t = f_t c_{t-1} + i_t \text{tanh}(W_{hc}h_{t-1} + W_{hc}h_{t-1} + b_c)
\]

\[
o_t = \sigma(W_{xo}x_t + W_{ho}h_{t-1} + W_{co}c_t + b_o)
\]

\[
h_t = o_t \text{tanh}(c_t)
\]

Here f is forget gate, I is input gate and o is output gate, c is cell memory, h is the previous state.

As shown in fig 2 we have flattened the image and given as input to the LSTM. Initially cell memory (C) and hidden state (h) is initialized with 0. LR images from the past 30 days are
used to predict the 30th-day high-resolution image. 30th day output of the LSTM is fed to dense layer which gives the output of dimension equal to label vector dimension

**Convolution LSTM (ConvLSTM)**

Long short term memory network is a special type of Recurrent network that preserves the temporal correlations and deals with long term dependencies. But in our case, we were giving a flattened image as input to LSTM which loses the special correlations. CNN preserves the special correlations. Therefore, the combination of LSTM and CNN deals with both special and temporal dependencies. ConvLSTM replaces the multiplication with convolution operation.

\[
x_t = \sigma(W_{xi} * x_t + W_{hi} * h_{t-1} + W_{ci} * c_{t-1} + b_i)
\]

\[
f_t = \sigma(W_{xf} * x_t + W_{hf} * h_{t-1} + W_{cf} * c_{t-1} + b_f)
\]

\[
c_t = f_t c_{t-1} + i_t \tanh(W_{hc} * h_{t-1} + W_{hc} * h_{t-1} + b_c)
\]

\[
o_t = \sigma(W_{xo} * x_t + W_{ho} * h_{t-1} + W_{co} * c_t + b_o)
\]

\[
h_t = o_t \tanh(c_t)
\]

Here f is forget gate, I is input gate and o is output gate, c is cell memory, h is the previous state, * is convolution operation.
It will take input as a video (continuous frames of images). ConvLSTM2D will take input as 15 days of precipitation data and learns spatial and temporal relation and predict 15th day high-resolution image. We have used a generator to yield input. As shown in Fig. 3 we have used 4 ConvLSTM2D layers and 1 conv2d layer, where layer 1 has 40 filters of size 5x5 followed by ReLU activation and the rest of the layers have 40 filters of size 3x3 followed by ReLU activation. The output from the last ConvLSTM2D is given as input to the conv2d which has 1 filter of size 3x3.

**Concept drift**

In our study, we have used GCM daily precipitation as input to the SRCNN. But raw GCM and observed data have no daily to daily correlation. Mapping between Raw GCM and observed data is changing with respect to time, this is called concept drift.

**Auto encoded SRCNN**

Data for a single day at the highest resolution, 0.25°, covering CONUS is an “image” of size 128X134. Images are obtained at each resolution through upsampling using a bicubic interpolation. For instance, up-sampling to 1.25° decreases the image size from 128x134 to
25x27. This interpolated image in an LR image (1.25) and given as input to the SRCNN model. Here, it is a mapping from Label to label (Y -> Y) which removes Concept drift

**BCSRCNN:**

Due to concept drift deep learning models are not able to find the mapping; as the relation between GCM and observed is changing with respect to time. So, we have first bias-corrected the GCM data. Bias correction will take care of a statistical relationship but it doesn’t account for spatial relations. As CNN’s will account for spatial relations, we have trained an autoencoder that takes input as extrapolated observed data (1.25°) and maps to high resolution observed data (0.25°) as discussed in Auto encoded SRCNN. Now, the weights which are obtained from Auto encoded SRCNN will account for spatial relation, so we have applied these weights to the bias-corrected data. For bias correction, we have used BCSD technique.

**Comparison**

We have used many methods for statistical downscaling like DeepSD, LSTM AEBCSRCNN, BCSRCNN, DeepSD is a stacked convolutional neural network that uses three successive CNNs to downscale from to. It does not perform well in terms of extremes but it gives good RMSE. Climate data is temporal-spatial data so we have used LSTM because LSTMs is good to handle the long term temporal dependencies but these also do not perform well in terms of extremes. AEBCSRCNN is a skated model of BCSD and AESRCNN. It performs well in terms of means and extremes. We have used the transfer learning and applied the trained weights of interpolated and raw observation on BCSD output.

BCSRN is skated model of SRCNN and BCSD which uses the BCSD output as input to it and applies the trained weights on SRCNN to predict the high resolution GCM data. It performs well in terms of both means and extremes. The following table describes the validation RMSE for each model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RMSE (mm/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRCNN</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convLSTM</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBCSRCNN</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSRCNN</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Comparison RMSE between BCSRCNN and all other models

**Mean differences:** We have calculated the mean difference between the observation and output of each model for 15 years of data. Mean difference between observations and each model output has been calculated over time dimension. As shown in fig 4 all Deep learning models have good performance in terms of means. These models try to minimize the mean error

Fig 4 Mean Differences
**Percentiles:** We have calculated the 25, 50, 75, 90, 99 percentiles for observations and each model output and taken the difference between each percentile of observation and model’s output. As shown in fig 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. All the models perform well enough for lower percentiles but SRCNN and LSTM don’t perform well for higher percentile due to the presence of extreme values. Therefore these do not capture extremes. but BCSRCNN and AUBCSRCNN perform well even for higher percentiles.

![Fig 5  99th Percentile difference](image)

![Fig 6  95th Percentile difference](image)
Fig 7  90 Percentile differences

Fig 8  75 Percentile differences

Fig 9  50 Percentile differences
Random day plot: We have randomly selected a day from each model’s output and plotted along with Input (GCM) and label (observation). As shown in fig 11 we can not do day to day mapping because each model gives a different outputs which is perceptually not similar to the label.


