

Response to reviewers' comments

Reply to RC1 of the preprint submitted to Earth System Science Data (ESSD) entitled: "GRQA: Global River Water Quality Archive"

The authors' **answers** marked bold are given below the reviewer's comments. The updated version of the paper with **changes highlighted in yellow** can be found at the end of the document.

General comment

This manuscript present workflow and data for harmonizing and joining several major water quality data basis on international and national level to a consistent dataset. The authors carefully describe their workflow and present selected examples on the spatiotemporal coverage of their data sets and suggest further improvements. This is a good

example and a showcase what problems scientists have to face when joining datasets. The authors are very careful in making their workflow reproducible for scientists who want to work with the data, e.g. by flagging but not removing outliers. The resulting dataset is unique and very helpful for water quality researchers. I would consider the data as high quality with a few drawbacks mentioned below. While I very much appreciate the work the authors put into the data, I have some concerns regarding the manuscript itself. Overall I found the introduction rather weak. The authors build the justification for their work mainly on water quality modelling with a special focus on machine learning. For me this is to narrow. Any research rely on data, be it the mere statement of a global or regional statistics of a certain constituent, data-driven exploration of controlling factors behind observed patterns or statistical or even mechanistic models. I moreover miss a reference to the need for open data and the FAIR principles. Considering the workflow I greatly miss the handing of values below the limit of detection/ quantification. This is a major issue for all water quality studies and is left entirely open here. I hope the authors can make use of these general comments and the more detailed specific comments below.

Answer: Thank you for the useful comments! We addressed most of the issues under the specific comments (see below). We have now referred to the FAIR Data Principles when discussing the insights gained about the importance of metadata and usability of large-scale water quality data after compiling GRQA (line 67-69). We also processed the data again, so that observation values below and above detection limit were retained and flagged according to how they appeared in source data (see below). We reduced the focus on machine learning by broadening the value of water quality analysis in the introduction (line 16-22) and specifying that encouraging the uptake of open data policies by institutions collecting water quality data would still be the main way of improving the spatiotemporal coverage, rather than ML methods (line 375-376 & 381-383).

In addition, we included an extensive data catalog with maps showing the spatiotemporal coverage and graphs describing the distribution of all 42 parameters as supplementary material of the paper. The data catalog can be viewed at

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UvI5tmeXff4Fwgard5xt0h9SIh2rdra/view?usp=sharing>.

Specific comments

Abstract

Line 1-4: I find the introduction rather weak. Some more specific words would be helpful to define the problem, to say what is already there and to what extent this manuscript is going beyond the status quo.

Answer: We added a small section to the beginning of the abstract addressing this (line 1-5).

Line 2: It is not immediately clear that "current" study is referring to this manuscript. Consider rewording.

Answer: Replaced that part of the sentence into the full name of the dataset (line 6).

Introduction

Line 13: I disagree here. Why is water quality modelling an integral part of ecosystem health monitoring? Why starting directly with modelling? Models need a conceptual basis that arises from data and interpretation of mechanisms behind the observations. I think there is great value in the data analysis itself before making the step to modelling.

L34ff: I see the point for putting emphasis on machine learning approaches. However, this seems to be the major justification for large-scale or large-sample datasets and the major outlet of these data. Here I disagree - ML is one possibility but surely not the only justification for the need for water quality data with a wide spatial and temporal coverage.

Answer: These are definitely valid remarks. Indeed, the focus might seem too skewed towards modeling and ML, rather than other methods of analysis. The initiative to focus on modeling came from the advent of large-scale streamflow modeling studies (e.g. Gudmundsson and Seneviratne, 2015). We saw water quality as complementary to streamflow models, as it would allow for large-scale nutrient or sediment runoff modeling. However, as we realized during working on this dataset, further improvements to the spatiotemporal coverage of global water quality data are still needed before modeling becomes more viable. We rephrased some of the sentences and added more wider context to the beginning of the introduction (line 16-22).

Line 21: What model inputs do you mean here? Please specify. Is it rather calibration data? Or input in terms of drivers (such as precipitation drives a rainfall-runoff model)? Or do you mean parameterization for processes such as a nutrient uptake?

Answer: The wording was indeed confusing here. We meant calibration and validation data in the form of water quality observations used when developing the model and verifying its performance. We have specified this now in text (line 30-31).

Line 28-33: Here you seem to jump to hydrological models (quantity, not quality) without further mentioning that. To what extent can this be transferred to water quality models?

Answer: Here, we referred to both quantity and quality in the sense that some issues regarding scaling the models are similar regardless of the phenomena that is being modeled, e.g. the amount of location-specific calibration and variables needed to upscale the model from the catchment level to a larger scale. We made the wording more clear (line 38-39).

Line 40: Do you really mean large-scale here? Or rather a wide spatial coverage?

Answer: Indeed, we meant large-scale in the sense of modeling on a continental or global level. As "large-scale" is commonly used in the context of spatial extent in hydrological modeling studies, we did not feel the need to specify here.

Data

Line 71f: What dataset "that had been previously collected from the other sources" are you referring to? Is that showing up later in the manuscript? Maybe introduce that in the preceding section?

Answer: We meant that out of the total selection of parameters included in GRQA only eight were available in CESI. The wording was poor on our part, so that has now been fixed (line 82-83).

Table 2: Would it make sense to state the date of download here? The databases are still actively fed with new data, right?

Answer: Good suggestion! We added the date of dataset retrieval to the caption of Table 1. The table has now been updated with additional information about site count range, mean time series length per site and mean number of observations per site. Other than GLORICH, which is a static dataset, they are indeed being updated with WQP collecting data on a daily basis and the others having irregular updates every once in a while. We also had date of retrieval in the references previously.

Method

I miss a description how the detection limit was handled. This is very crucial. Often numbers such as <0.01 mg/L are given. For some constituents this is rather the rule than the exception.

Answer: Thank you for pointing this out! Our original thought process was that keeping these values would result in having a lot of records with the same default value (e.g. 0.01) in the data, which would affect potential modeling efforts (e.g. overfitting to the lower value range). However, we agree that by keeping values flagged as below detection limit in source data can provide useful information in the case of certain parameters. We added these values to GRQA along with an additional column (*detection_limit_flag*) showing whether a particular value was below (<) or above (>) detection limit in the source data and mentioned this in line 183-184 and added this column description to Table 6.

Line 120: Are outliers just detected (flagged?) or also removed? Why are time series characteristics derived before removing duplicates? Are duplicate station or duplicate samples ment?

Answer: As noted in section 3.2, the outliers were indeed flagged and not removed. In paragraph 3.3 "duplicate observations" refers to samples rather than stations. Since we did not remove any of the potentially duplicate observations and left determining which of the detected matches are "true duplicates" that should be merged up to the end user, we also did not remove these values for statistical purposes.

Table 4: For me this table does not make sense. Why not stating all conversion information but only an example? The meaning of x1 to x2 should be mentioned in the header.

Answer: The table was intended to be just an example of the conversion of four different forms of nitrogen parameters, which were the ones most commonly in need of conversion in the source datasets. All other conversions made are given per dataset in the lookup table files (`*_code_map.csv`) also used for parameter harmonization and mentioned in section 3.1 *Parameter harmonization*, so they can be found in the metadata package. We have added the full list of unit conversion procedures in the appendix (Table A1) and referred to that in line 171.

Line 155: Surely this decision was made wisely. However, it is not clear for the reader why one km is the threshold here. Can you explain that? In a headwater catchment of 2 km² size a shift of the sampling stations by 1 km would probably not be treated as one joint size, right?

Answer: We looked for similar studies dealing with merging datasets and duplicated stations for determining the search radius. It appears that there is no consensus and the assessment of spatial proximity depends on the subjective threshold set by authors. For example, the GSIM streamflow dataset (Do et al., 2018) used a radius of 5 km for selecting potential duplicate gauging stations. We chose 1 km to avoid having too many false positives (e.g. in the case of small headwater catchments, as you mentioned) to evaluate in the second stage of deduplication (RMSE calculation). We have added an explanation for our radius distance in line 247-251.

Line 206: This is maybe not the best example/ justification. If an agricultural spill has a long-lasting effect on water quality, it would not be an outlier but create more than one elevated values. Consider adjusting the example here.

Answer: Thank you for the suggestion. We rephrased the sentence and added a better example (line 227-230).

Line 210ff: What about physical impossible values? Negative concentrations, water temperature above 100°C or concentrations above the solubility of a constituent? Would it make sense to check and remove those as (if they occur) they will influence the percentiles/ quartiles?

Answer: Please see next answer.

Figure 7: Here I realize the point of the physical possible range of parameters. Oxygen can, to the best of my knowledge not be much higher than 15 mg/L - sure there can be oversaturation. But I would claim that 502.75 mg/L is impossible. Would those values not hamper your outlier statistics?

Answer: Very good point!. There are certainly values that were flagged as outliers that are extremely high and "illogical" because of some data entry or equipment malfunction errors, rather than "natural" outliers (e.g. because of spill events), which also affect the statistical calculations (Fig. 7). Negative values were removed as reported in section 3.1 *Observation data filtering* (line 182). We did try to come up with ways to determine thresholds above which a value can be considered physically impossible and for parameters like temperature and pH something like you suggested could work. For chemical concentrations, however, perhaps a more sophisticated procedure based on freshwater quality guidelines (Enderlein et al., 1996) would be needed. We considered this to be out of the scope of our robust outlier detection procedure, but we have now added this as a suggestion when discussing the limitations of GRQA in section 5.1 *Skewness of observation values* (line 349-352). As we

also discussed certain aspects of metadata quality in the available water quality datasets in our paper, the occurrence of these potentially faulty values can provide some context about the state of water quality data in general, if only to point out what could be avoided when collating such datasets in the future.

Results

Table 6: Attribute parameters such as "upstream basin area" and "Drainage region" have not been mentioned before. However, this is a very crucial information for researchers working with the data. Choosing sites according to their catchment sizes is common with the consequence that this information needs to be reliable. Was that just taken over from the original datasets?

Answer: We agree that the catchment size is important information. However, in this study we were only able to use the information that came from source data and was only extracted if available. We added a reference to this in line 201-202. We could not add the missing catchment sizes because that would have required global level catchment extraction which is already another potential study in itself.

Table 7: Number of digits is relevant here! Is that fixed for all constituents to the same value? If yes, is should be e.g., 0.010 for median phosphorous, not 0.01. This decision should be part of the text.

Answer: Thanks for noticing. The trailing zeros seemed to have been truncated when calculating the median values. It is now fixed (Table 7).

Line 267: Table reference is missing.

Answer: Thank you for pointing that out. We have now added the missing reference (line 293).

Line 291ff: Usually concentrations are considered to be lognormally distributed. A skewness does thus not purely result from outliers. You should mention that non-normal distribution rule here.

Answer: Good point, which we now have added to this section (line 319-320).

Figure 4 is less informative than figure 3 but basically shows the same. For me this is not necessary. Potentially both figures can be combined.

Answer: We moved the figure 4 to the appendix (Fig. A1). The figures were meant to be complementary with Fig. 3 showing the distribution of observation values in general as well as the proportion of observations per source dataset. On the other hand, Fig. 4 was meant to show the range of values within source datasets as there are differences between how the values are distributed depending on source.

Line 312: What is the question mark referring to?

Answer: Thank you for pointing that out. This was a broken reference that has now been fixed.

Line 330ff: This is a good idea to come up with suggestions for improving datasets. However, I strongly recommend to make this part of the problem definition in the introduction and the objectives of this study.

Answer: Thank you for the suggestion. We have addressed this in the introduction by listing this as one of the objectives in lines 67-69.

Line 352ff: The spatial lack of data is for me not directly connected to the adoption of machine learning. Yes, those techniques may come up with an estimate. However, data-driven models are only as good as their training data coverage. For a prediction under boundary conditions/ landscape properties that have not been sampled you will need a mechanistic approach. The whole discussion here is a bit misleading. I don't think the solution for spatial gaps is not gap filling but rather measurements or incentives for countries to share data.

Answer: We agree that increased measures for encouraging countries to publish their data in accordance with open data standards is still the best option when improving the spatial coverage of data. We changed this section, so that potential ML methods refer specifically to filling temporal gaps in time series, rather than spatial (line 381-383).

References added to the paper:

Enderlein, R., Enderlein, R., and Williams, W.: Chapter 2*—Water Quality Requirements, Water Pollution Control—A Guide to the Use of Water, Quality Management Principles, 1996.

Reply to RC2 of the preprint submitted to Earth System Science Data (ESSD) entitled: "GRQA: Global River Water Quality Archive"

The authors' answers marked bold are given below the reviewer's comments. The updated version of the paper with **changes highlighted in yellow** can be found at the end of the document.

General comments

Virro et al. describe aggregating and harmonizing five national, continental and global datasets that can be used for global water quality models. Among the five selected datasets the GEMSTAT itself is a global database containing harmonized data from the contributing countries. The authors follow the ETL approach (Extract-Transform-Load) to bring the different data sets together. The methods are well described and data, metadata and scripts are available at the given websites. The authors suggest in their conclusions to transform the set of CSV files to a relational database in future what would further improve the usability of this dataset. I encourage the authors to do it. Also I like the idea to develop an online dashboard for GRQA. From a global modelers perspective the derived GRQA can be easily used. The authors selected 42 specific parameter relevant for modelling nutrients (water temperature, oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorous, carbon compounds ...). Still, GRQA cannot solve the problem of data scarcity in Africa, Asia and South America and also the suggested machine learning cannot help here.

In general, the paper is well written and supports the publishing of GRQA. One issue for me is that it was not mentioned that WATERBASE is already integrated in GEMSTAT and how the authors dealt with this. There must be a lot of duplicate data from this fact. But the given procedures should have found all the doubled data.

I support the publication of this paper. Some minor issues are listed below.

Answer: Thank you for the supportive opinion! Indeed, the GRQA cannot solve the problem of data scarcity in Africa, Asia and South America but is only one step towards this. We have now specified that encouraging the uptake of open data policies by institutions collecting water quality data would still be the main way of improving the spatiotemporal coverage, rather than ML methods (line 375-376 & 381-383). This paper will provide a base database to complement, but also the guideline how new water quality datasets should be created so that they can be most efficiently used with modern data science methods and ML. See response regarding WATERBASE vs GEMSTAT below.

In addition, we included an extensive data catalog with maps showing the spatiotemporal coverage and graphs describing the distribution of all 42 parameters as supplementary material of the paper. The data catalog can be viewed at

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UvI5tmeXff4Fwgard5xt0hI9SIh2rdra/view?usp=sharing>.

Specific comments

line 55: please list the parameter used here “most important water quality parameters” or refer to your table 7

Answer: We added a reference to Table 7 (line 65).

line 71: “... only eight parameter matched the data set” – you mean one of the 42 selected parameters? Pls clarify.

Answer: We meant that out of the total selection of parameters included in GRQA only eight were available in CESI. The wording was poor on our part, so that has now been fixed (line 82-83).

line 73 – 74: please give this numbers (how many parameter matched the set, site count range, mean time series length per site, average number of observations per site) for all data sets in a table and refer only to the parameters that were used

Answer: Thank you for the suggestion. We updated the table with this information (Table 1).

line 99: “WATERBASE has the shortest timeseries ... 2008 - 2018” - as far as I remember there are nutrient data available starting with 1992; please check again the disaggregated data; e.g. see the graphs given under this link

<https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/daviz/rivers-nutrient-trend-4#tabdashboard-01>
The graph is based on data from WATERBASE.

Answer: The time period shown for WATERBASE in our paper refers to the time series length of the 15 parameters that were extracted and included in GRQA. For these parameters the earliest observations are from 2008.

line 125: “introduction: nutrients, carbon, sediments and oxygen”-Please refer to table 7 here.

Answer: Reference now added (line 141).

line 217: I understood that WATERBASE was included into GEMSTAT; please see <https://www.waterandchange.org/en/european-water-quality-monitoring-data-in-gemstat-databaseundergoes-major-update/>

Also here the time frame is given with 49 years for WATERBASE; please check and write a short paragraph how you dealt with this issue.

Answer: A valid remark. We became aware of the inclusion of WATERBASE into GEMSTAT some time after we had started working on compiling GRQA. However, only sites with more than three years of data were included in this update. As mean time series length per site was only 1.4 years in WATERBASE, a significant number of sites were left out, which is why we decided to include WATERBASE separately in GRQA. Although it is likely that there were many observations, which appeared both in GEMSTAT and WATERBASE, the duplicate detection procedure we implemented should have identified WATERBASE observations also appearing in GEMSTAT. We added an explanation about WATERBASE inclusion in line 112-117.

The time frame given for WATERBASE in our paper refers to the time series length of the 15 parameters that were extracted and included in GRQA, as mentioned in a previous comment.

Figure 2: Why is the percentage of observations (1898 - 1970) not given here? If no data exist before 1970 it should be mentioned here. The colors in the legend don't correspond to the colors in the plot. E.g., I can only guess what dark green is. Also I wonder what I can learn from this plot. Maybe the authors change this plot and show the time series available per continent instead. That is actually where I'm interested in as global modeler.

Answer: Only seven observations (0.0000169%) existed for DOC in the 1968–1970 period, so the number seemed to get lost due to rounding. We added this detail under the plot. We also changed the design of the plot to a more clear line plot. This figure was meant to show the temporal distribution of values per source, since depending on the dataset the distribution is different. For example, GEMSTAT has more observations from the more recent time period, while WQP contains quite a lot of data also from the earlier years, which can be important to know when studying long term trends.

Unfortunately, we were not able to produce the continental distribution plots due to that information not being available in the source data. This was specifically an issue with GEMSTAT and GLORICH, since in the case of CESI, WATERBASE and WQP the continent can be assumed to be the same for all sites. As not all observations had country of origin reported in GEMSTAT and GLORICH, they could not be linked to a specific continent and more complex spatial queries would have been needed to generate continental statistics. However, we added extensive data catalogue as an appendix with graphs and maps for temporal and spatial coverage of every variable. This should help potential users to get a better overview of the data before downloading it.

line 222-228: I wonder how can the same station be reported to different databases with different position information? In case it is the same station then both stations should contain the same time series? And how are you dealing with stations that are very dense (<1km) but not the same? For example at a tributary that is going parallel and there is one station in the tributary and one in the main stream before tributary is coming in. Did you find such cases and how did you deal with it?

Answer: These cases could be due to differences in rounding of coordinates or when a station's location has shifted over time, so that it appears in another dataset under a different ID and slightly different coordinates. Indeed, those station pairs should have the

same observation values, so they would be detected by the RMSE calculation procedure and collected to the corresponding metadata file (*_dup_obs.csv).

Regarding nearby stations, which are actually independent. For these stations, the second stage of duplication detection (RMSE calculation) should have identified them as separate time series, because only cases where RMSE=0 were flagged as potential duplicates. There were also stations that were closer than 1 km within the same source dataset, but we considered those stations to have been validated by the corresponding institutions (e.g. ICWRGC in the case of GEMSTAT). We also checked some of these nearby stations present within the same source data and based on the location and metadata (e.g. station name/description) it seemed like they had been placed there for a reason, e.g. to monitor water quality both upstream and downstream from a town or facility. Therefore, we decided to apply the duplication detection procedure only to stations from different source datasets.

line 296-297: It is not clear to me why the IQR test outliers are removed from the plot? For illustrative purpose – what does it mean? The plots would not look much different wouldn't they? So the outliers are not shown or are removed from the data? And actually for TSS the outliers can be really data e.g. before the crest of a flood or at the beginning of discharge reach a region specific threshold TSS can get extraordinary values.

Answer: As mentioned in section 3.2 *Outlier flagging*, no outliers were removed from the GRQA and a column indicating their status was added instead. However, including them in the plot would have seriously affected the visibility of the rest of the data points due to the extreme skewness. The skewness of the data can be seen when examining the maximum values given in the summary statistics (*_processed_stats.csv) found in the metadata, where in some cases the maximum value of a parameter exceeded that of the median by several orders of magnitude. It is likely that the most extreme outliers are caused by data entry errors (incorrect unit, e.g. reported in $\mu\text{g/l}$ instead of mg/l etc) or equipment malfunction. Regarding TSS, it is true that in certain instances the concentration can be significantly greater than the median value, but similar to other parameters, there were some extremely high values, which would have affected the illustration. For example, in the case of TSS values in WQP (*WQP_processed_stats.csv*) the maximum (7700 mg/l) greatly exceeded the median (7.6 mg/l) as well.

Figure 4: e.g. TSS – 18.9% outliers removed from the plot – this 18.9% refers to all data? So it could be that 18% outliers are in GEMSTAT and the rest in the other datasets? Do I understand it right? please clarify in the figure text.

Answer: Yes, the percentage of outliers refers to the whole dataset. As the same percentage of outliers per parameter is given in Table 7, we did not feel the need to specify that again here and instead added a reference to Table 7 under this figure.

line 307 – 313: Please delete this paragraph. The focus of this paper is on merging data together rather than assessing the content. Therefore I would remove lines starting with "DOC concentrations are lower ..." and ending with "point sources". Even if Figure 7 is interesting from the content perspective I would remove it from this paper because it is not the main focus. In my opinion it is sufficient to mention that this kind of plots are available for all 42 parameters in the GRQA dataset.

Answer: We removed this part and moved the example plot to the appendix (Fig. A2).

line 320: What do the authors mean by "using the wrong form"? This is not clear to me. You should have checked the forms before using it in your codes and I'm sure you did. So how can it happen that a wrong form was used? Please explain.

Answer: Please see the next answer.

line 322: Why are units in GLORICH in $\mu\text{g/l}$ a problem during conversion process? The authors transformed it to mg/l . I cannot see a problem here. Please clarify the discussion.

Answer: This was poor wording on our part. As mentioned in section 3 *Unit conversion*, not all parameters in source data had information about in which form (e.g. NO_3 vs N) they were reported available, so assumptions had to be made about the chemical form when converting the units using the molecular mass. We did try to find additional information about these missing forms from proxy sources, e.g. in the case of GLORICH another dataset, where the author of GLORICH was involved with and that had metadata about the chemical forms available (Börker et al., 2020). These references have been included in the *form_ref* column in corresponding lookup tables (**_code_map.csv*) used during the harmonization stage. However, if the assumption made based on this limited ancillary information was incorrect then the conversion would have been affected as well. We have now added this explanation to the unit conversion description (line 160-162) and fixed the wording in line 340-341.

line 352: I doubt that ML methods alone can help to fill the gaps in Africa and Asia without support of any measurements in the regions. So, the argument given in line 359 contradicts the statement given in line 352. Maybe a combination of remote sensing techniques and water quality modelling (including ML) could help. Please revise.

Answer: We agree that increased measures for encouraging countries to publish their data in accordance with open data standards is still the best option when improving the spatial coverage of data. We changed this section, so that potential ML methods refer specifically to filling temporal gaps in time series, rather than spatial.

line 380: "The dataset is expected to have yearly updates after publishing" – are you sure that this is realistic? I would rather advise to remove this sentence. It is not necessary to state something like this in a paper, you can just do it if the capacity is available.

Answer: Valid remark. We removed this sentence as it is unknown if it will be viable.

line 383 – 384: I like very much the idea to put GRQA in a database and to make it accessible via an online dashboard.

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We will consider some options to improve the usability and have added some potential options to the conclusions (line 405-411).

Technical corrections

line 268: table reference is missing

Answer: Thank you for pointing that out. We have fixed it now (line 293).

line 269: given numbers of sites per parameter ("15 (POP) up to 90792 (pH)") don't correspond with the numbers given in Table 7. Please clarify.

Answer: Thank you for pointing that out. These were likely placeholder values from some earlier version that are now fixed (line 294).

line 312: reference is missing

Answer: As we removed this section, this missing reference has also been removed.

References added to the paper:

Börker, J., Hartmann, J., Amann, T., Romero-Mujalli, G., Moosdorf, N., and Jenkins, C.: Chemical river data from drained loess areas, PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915784>, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915784>, in: Börker, J et al. (2020): Chemical weathering of loess - GIS data, alkalinity measurements of a loess column experiment in the laboratory under pCO₂ atmospheric andsaturated conditions and chemical river data from drained loess areas. PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915793>, 2020.

GRQA: Global River Water Quality Archive

Holger Virro¹, Giuseppe Amatulli^{2,3}, Alexander Kmoch¹, Longzhu Shen^{4,5}, and Evelyn Uuemaa¹

¹Department of Geography, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, Vanemuise 46, Tartu, 51003, Estonia

²Yale University, School of the Environment, New Haven, CT, 06511, USA

³Yale University, Center for Research Computing, New Haven, CT, 06511, USA

⁴HyperAmp, Barnwell Road, Cambridge CB5 8RQ, UK

⁵Spatial-Ecology, Meaderville House, Wheal Buller, Redruth, TR16 6ST, UK

Correspondence: Holger Virro (holger.virro@ut.ee)

Abstract. Large-scale hydrological studies are often limited by the lack of available observation data with a good spatiotemporal coverage. This has affected the reproducibility of previous studies and the potential improvement of existing hydrological models. In addition to the observation data itself, insufficient or poor quality metadata has also discouraged researchers to integrate the already available datasets. Therefore, improving both, the availability, and quality of open water quality data would increase the potential to implement predictive modeling on a global scale.

The Global River Water Quality Archive (GRQA) aims to contribute into improving water quality data coverage by aggregating and harmonizing five national, continental and global datasets: CESI, GEMSTAT, GLORICH, WATERBASE and WQP. The GRQA compilation involved converting observation data from the five sources into a common format and harmonizing the corresponding metadata, flagging outliers, calculating time series characteristics and detecting duplicate observations from sources with a spatial overlap. The final dataset extends the spatial and temporal coverage of previously available water quality data and contains 42 parameters and over 17 million measurements around the globe covering the 1898–2020 time period. Metadata in the form of statistical tables, maps and figures are provided along with observation time series.

The GRQA dataset, supplementary metadata and figures are available for download on the DataCite and OpenAire enabled Zenodo repository <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5097436> (Virro et al., 2021).

15 1 Introduction

Human-driven loads of nutrients to aquatic ecosystems have become the main driver of eutrophication in waterways and coastal zones (Desmit et al., 2018; Sinha et al., 2019). Agricultural production is already one of the major forces behind environmental degradation (Foley et al., 2011), and population growth is increasing that pressure (Mueller et al., 2012). The use of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) fertilizers to increase agricultural productivity is predicted to increase threefold by 2050 unless more efficient fertilizer use can be implemented (Tilman et al., 2001). At the same time, it has been estimated that "globally, over 3 billion people are at risk of disease because the water quality of their water source is unknown, due to a lack of data" (UN-Water, 2021). In order to achieve the UN SDG 6, we need better understanding of our water resources and water quality. Monitoring and modeling the hydrochemical properties of rivers is essential for understanding and mitigating water quality

deterioration due to agricultural and industrial non-point source pollution (Krysanova et al., 1998; Leon et al., 2001; Wu and Chen, 2013). Modeling of different water quality indicators such as nutrients (Caraco and Cole, 1999; He et al., 2011), carbon compounds (Evans et al., 2005; Hope et al., 1994), sediments (Choubin et al., 2018; Ouyang et al., 2018) and oxygen (Radwan et al., 2003; Singh et al., 2009) gives valuable understanding of hydrochemical cycles and enables to estimate the effect of human influence on them.

Traditional approaches to water quality modeling consist of applying bottom-up, physically based models on the catchment level (Wellen et al., 2015). **Calibration and validation data in the form of water quality observations used when developing the model and verifying its performance** is usually gathered through *in situ* observations and, more recently, automated sensor networks. Although airborne remote sensing based data acquisition methods have been successfully used to supplement field data for lakes (Chen and Quan, 2011; Toming et al., 2016), applying those methods is only viable in the case of rivers with a large enough surface area (Olmanson et al., 2013). Therefore, improving the river water quality data spatial and temporal coverage with remote sensing is limited. Significant progress has been made in improving the technical capabilities and lowering the installation and maintenance costs of the field sensors, but the spatial and temporal coverage of observation sites remains to be an issue (Pellerin et al., 2016).

In order to improve the spatial coverage of **water quality and** hydrological data, different solutions have been used in predictive hydrological mapping. Until recently, a common approach for predicting **water quality and** hydrological phenomena in ungauged catchments has been the application of already existing process-based models to catchments with similar characteristics (Hrachowitz et al., 2013; Strömqvist et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2011). These physical models usually require extensive calibration along with location-specific knowledge, which limits the wider applicability and spatial upscaling that can be done (Abbaspour et al., 2015; McMillan et al., 2012).

Recently, advances in implementing machine learning (ML) methods in hydrology have given rise to a new, data-driven approach to hydrological modeling (Mount et al., 2016). Comparison of physically based and ML approaches has shown that ML methods can achieve a similar accuracy to the physically based ones and outperform them when describing nonlinear relationships (Chau, 2006; Ouali et al., 2017; Papacharalampous et al., 2019). The recent advent of so-called physics-guided ML, which entails combining process-based models with ML methods is likely to become more applicable in the near future as well (Kratzert et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2018; Marzadri et al., 2021).

Nevertheless, a major problem related to large-scale predictive hydrological modeling has been the lack of available observation data with a good spatiotemporal coverage (Bierkens, 2015). This has affected the reproducibility of previous studies and the potential improvement of existing models (Blöschl et al., 2019; Meals et al., 2010; Stagge et al., 2019). In addition to the observation data itself, insufficient or poor quality metadata has also discouraged researchers to integrate the already available datasets. Here, ambiguities in supplementary metadata such as parameter names, units and methods of measurement has limited the use of open data for large-scale water quality modeling purposes (Archfield et al., 2015; Hutton et al., 2016; Sprague et al., 2017). Therefore, improving both the availability and quality of open water quality data would increase the potential to implement predictive modeling on a global scale. Global ML models have been already successfully used for discharge modeling (Beck et al., 2015; Gudmundsson and Seneviratne, 2015) and recent years have seen the publication of

global discharge datasets (Do et al., 2018; Harrigan et al., 2020). The publication of global and continental datasets (Hartmann et al., 2014; Read et al., 2017) could make ML methods applicable for large-scale water quality modeling as well (Shen et al., 2020). However, issues related to a lack of training and validation data due to general data scarcity affects model accuracy and, therefore, limits the further adoption of ML for global water quality predictions (Chen et al., 2020).

We aim to address the aforementioned issues by presenting the novel Global River Water Quality Archive (GRQA) by integrating and harmonizing five different global and regional datasets. The resulting dataset has combined observation data for 42 different forms of some of the most important water quality parameters (Table 7). Supplementary metadata and statistics are provided with the observation time series to improve the usability of the dataset. We report on developing a harmonized schema and reproducible workflow that can be adapted to integrate and harmonize further data sources. In addition, we provide recommendations for improving multi-source water quality data compilation, especially focusing on the metadata quality and adhering to the FAIR Data Principles (Wilkinson et al., 2016). We conclude our study with a call for action to extend this dataset and hope that the provided reproducible method of data integration and metadata provenance shall lead as an example.

2 Data

A total of five data sources were used to compile the GRQA with two being global, one regional, and two national level (Table 1). All datasets with the exception of GEMSTAT are publicly available to download online as CSV or Excel file packages. GEMSTAT data can be requested via email. The number of available observation sites was highly dependent on the source with the Water Quality Portal (WQP) maintained by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) having the most sites. Files used during the creation of GRQA are listed in Table 2.

2.1 CESI

The first dataset included in GRQA originated from the Canadian Environmental Sustainability Indicators program (CESI) operated by Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC), which is a Canadian governmental department responsible for coordinating environmental policies and programs. CESI consists of water quality measurements collected by federal, provincial and territorial monitoring programs from Canadian rivers from the 2002–2018 time period (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2020). CESI data is mainly focused on heavy metals, so out of the 42 of parameters included in GRQA only eight were available in CESI (Table 1). It is the smallest of the five source datasets with site count ranging from two to 77 per parameter. Mean time series length per site is approximately 13 years and the average number of observations per site is 145.

2.2 GEMSTAT

The Global Freshwater Quality Database GEMStat (Färber et al., 2018) is hosted by the International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change (ICWRGC) and provides inland water quality data within the framework of the GEMS/Water Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). GEMStat contains over 7 million samples from approx-

Table 1. Source datasets used for compiling GRQA with their total number of observations, parameters and timeframe length in GRQA. All datasets were retrieved on November 16, 2020.

Dataset	Name	Observations	Timeframe	Parameters	Site count range	Mean time series length per site (years)	Mean observation count per site
CESI	Water quality in Canadian rivers	30,457	2002–2018	8/42	2–77	12.9	145
GEMSTAT	Global Freshwater Quality Database	2,094,598	1950–2020	32/42	7–4,274	9.2	77
GLORICH	GLObal RIver Chemistry database	3,231,797	1942–2011	26/42	4–9,728	4.1	41
WATERBASE	Waterbase Water Quality	306,332	2008–2018	15/42	4–1,976	1.4	19
WQP	USGS Water Quality Portal	8,689,335	1898–2020	37/42	1–59,000	3.4	25

imately 5,700 sites in 75 countries. The data was obtained through a custom request to their data portal (International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change, 2020).

Approximately 500 water quality parameters were available in the GEMSTAT database, out of which 32 were used when compiling GRQA (Table 1). Observations cover the period 1950–2020 and mean observation count per parameter is approximately 41. Mean time series length per site is nine years. Site count per parameter ranges from less than ten (dissolved and total carbon) to 4,274 (total phosphorus).

95 2.3 GLORICH

The GLObal RIver CHemistry (GLORICH) database (Hartmann et al., 2014) is a collection of hydrochemical data from more than 1.27 million observations and more than 18,000 sampling locations across the globe. The samples originate from various environmental monitoring programs and scientific literature.

Out of 47 water quality parameters available in the raw data, 26 were chosen to be included in the GRQA (Table 1). The samples cover the time period of 1942–2011, but the length of the time series is dependent on the parameter. Mean time series length per site is less than a decade for all parameters. The number of available sites per parameter ranges from just four (particulate organic nitrogen) to 9,728 (dissolved inorganic phosphorous). The dataset can be downloaded at Pangaea (Hartmann et al., 2019).

Table 2. Source dataset files used for compiling GRQA. WQP sites and observations were downloaded separately for each parameter and file names were assigned during the process.

File name	Size (MB)	Rows	Description	Sheet name	Source
wqi-federal-raw-data-2020-iqe-donnees-brutes-fed.csv	171.5	314,867	Observation data		CESI
data_request.xls	2.4	5,419	Site data	Station_Metadata	GEMSTAT
data_request.xls	2.4	30	Parameter data	Parameter_Metadata	GEMSTAT
data_request.xls	2.4	311	Method data	Methods_Metadata	GEMSTAT
pH.csv	21.9	372,211	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Carbon.csv	19.2	337,928	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Nitrogen.csv	65.1	1,052,823	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Phosphorus.csv	24.3	386,113	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Oxygen_Demand.csv	20.1	331,617	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Solids.csv	11.8	201,628	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Water_Temperature.csv	23.9	370,335	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Oxygen.csv	30.6	488,749	Observation data		GEMSTAT
Sampling_Locations_v1.shp	0.4	15,553	Site point data		GLORICH
sampling_locations.csv	1.6	18,897	Site name data		GLORICH
catchment_properties.csv	10.2	15,514	Catchment data		GLORICH
hydrochemistry.csv	273.3	1,274,102	Observation data		GLORICH
Waterbase_v2019_1_S_WISE6_SpatialObject_DerivedData.csv	15.1	62,288	Site data		WATERBASE
ObservedProperty.csv	0.2	888	Observation data		WATERBASE
Waterbase_v2019_1_T_WISE6_DisaggregatedData.csv	10019.2	39,121,790	Observation data		WATERBASE
WQP_*_sites.csv	2543	9,467,369	Site data		WQP
WQP_*_obs.csv	2749.8	10,088,212	Observation data		WQP

2.4 WATERBASE

105 Waterbase is the generic name given to the European Environment Agency's (EEA) databases on the status and quality of Europe's rivers, lakes, groundwater bodies and transitional, coastal and marine waters (European Environment Agency, 2020). The database is compiled from data sent by the national European water agencies involved in the Water Framework Directive (WFD).

110 Over 600 water quality parameters are included in the full dataset out of which 15 matched those of GRQA (Table 1). Out of all source datasets, WATERBASE had the shortest time series with observations covering only the period 2008–2018. The maximum site count per parameter is 1,976, while there were on average only around 19 observations per site.

115 In May 2020, the ICWRGC announced that parts of WATERBASE had been also added to the GEMSTAT database (International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change, 2020). However, only sites with more than three years of data were included in this update. As mean time series length per site was only 1.4 years in WATERBASE, a significant number of sites were left out, which is why we decided to include WATERBASE separately in GRQA. Although it is likely that there were many observations, which appeared both in GEMSTAT and WATERBASE, the duplication detection procedure discussed in section 3.3 should have identified them.

2.5 WQP

120 USGS, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Water Quality Monitoring Council developed the Water Quality Portal (WQP), which is so far the largest standardised water quality database (Read et al., 2017; United States Geological Survey, 2020). Although the portal also includes data from a few other countries (e.g. Mexico, Pacific islands) associated with the National Water Information System (NWIS) network, only a very limited amount of non-US samples were available. For this reason, only US national data was selected to be added to GRQA.

125 Due to the size of the source dataset, the full set of parameters could not be downloaded at once. Therefore, a scripted download procedure was used to retrieve water quality samples and their corresponding sampling sites separately per parameter. In the case of temperature, the data had to be further divided by state. Unlike other source datasets used in the study, the WQP often had multiple versions of the same parameter available under separate codes, in case the parameter had been measured in different units, using different methods, etc. The final count of parameters used for GRQA was 37 (Table 1).

130 The longest time series of source datasets is present in the WQP with some dating back to 1898. However, the average time series length per station is just over three years. Like GEMSTAT, WQP is still being updated, so most parameters have their latest observations from 2020. Site count ranges from a single station (dissolved inorganic nitrogen) to 59,000 per parameter (total suspended solids).

3 Methodology

The GRQA compilation workflow was divided into three parts: (1) The pre-processing stage involved converting observation 135 data from the five sources into a common format and harmonizing the corresponding metadata; (2) Pre-processed data were merged by parameter, after which outliers and time series characteristics were detected; (3) Duplicate detection was conducted in the last processing step. The Pandas (McKinney et al., 2010), GeoPandas (Jordahl et al., 2020) and NumPy (Harris et al., 2020) Python libraries were used throughout all data processing stages.

3.1 Source data preprocessing

140 *Parameter selection.* The parameters included in GRQA cover the four groups of water quality indicators outlined in the introduction: nutrients, carbon, sediments and oxygen (Table 7). GLORICH was used as a reference for parameter selection due to being one of the two global source datasets and having the least amount of discrepancies within source data, i.e. each GLORICH parameter had a single matching code, unit, etc.

145 *Parameter harmonization.* Preliminary analysis showed that there were ambiguities in the parameter names, codes, units and chemical forms in the different source datasets, which has been identified as a recurring issue when dealing with multi-source water quality data (McMillan et al., 2012; Sprague et al., 2017). For this reason, lookup tables were created for each of the source datasets (*_code_map.csv) to use as guides in the following processing stages (Table 3). The purpose of the schemas was to match parameter codes and other metadata with the versions used later in the GRQA. For most parameters, this could be done based on the literal names, remarks and descriptions in the metadata. Relevant literature and online resources were 150 consulted for more ambiguous scenarios. One such example was total suspended solids (TSS), which can also be reported as suspended particulate matter (SPM) (Neukermans et al., 2012). Where a reliable decision could not be made (e.g. biological oxygen demand as BOD vs BOD5) the parameters were kept separate.

155 *Unit conversion.* Units of measurement were harmonized along with other metadata. All parameters except temperature (°C), pH and dissolved oxygen (%) were converted into mg/l, which was the most prevalent unit in source data. Where units were converted, observation values had to be changed as well. This was done by calculating conversion constants, which were based on both the magnitude of the source unit (e.g. $\mu\text{g/l}$ vs mg/l) and the reported chemical form of the parameter. The latter affected nitrite (NO_2), nitrate (NO_3) and ammonium (NH_4) the most, as these parameters had a variety of forms in the source data that were all converted into corresponding nitrogen versions ($\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$, $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ & $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$). In some cases, the chemical form could be identified from the source unit (e.g. mg{N}/L or mg{NO₃}/L), while others were detected by examining parameter names and 160 method descriptions (e.g. "Nitrate, reported as nitrogen"). **Where possible, additional information about these missing forms was collected from proxy sources, such as other similar datasets (e.g. Börker et al. (2020) in the case of GLORICH). These references have been included in the *form_ref* column in corresponding lookup tables (*_code_map.csv).** For other nitrogen (TKN, TN, etc.), all carbon (DOC, TC, etc.) and phosphorus (TP, TIP, etc.) parameters, the chemical were assumed to be either N, C or P even if not reported, because there is only one common element in the molecule (Sprague et al., 2017). GLORICH 165 was the only source dataset, which **also** needed conversion constants for carbon and phosphorus parameters as they had been

Table 3. Summary table of lookup table attributes.

Attribute name	Description	Data type
source_param_code	Parameter code in source dataset	string
source_param_code_meta	Additional code specification used for CESI	string
param_code	Parameter code in GRQA	string
source_param_name	Parameter name in source dataset	string
param_name	Parameter name in GRQA	string
source_param_form	Parameter chemical form in source dataset	string
param_form	Parameter chemical form in GRQA	string
form_ref	Parameter form reference	string
source_unit	Parameter unit in source dataset	string
divisor	Divisor applied to the observation value	float
multiplier	Multiplier applied to the observation value	float
conversion_constant	Unit conversion constant calculated based on divisor and multiplier and applied to the observation value	float
unit	Parameter unit in GRQA	string
source	Source dataset name	string

Table 4. Examples of unit conversion from the chemical form in source data to the GRQA version. x_1 and x_2 are observation values before and after conversion, respectively.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	x_1	M_{x_2}	n	M_{x_1}	x_2
TAN	CESI	N	NH3	mg/l	mg/l	0.106	14.007	1	17.031	0.087
NO2N	GEMSTAT	N	NO2	mg/l	mg/l NO2	0.024	14.007	1	46.005	0.007
NO3N	GLORICH	N	NO3	mg/l	μ mol/l	210.268	14.007	1000	62.004	0.048
NH4N	WATERBASE	N	NH4	mg/l	mg/l	0.063	14.007	1	18.039	0.049

reported as μ mol/l. All WQP units matched those intended to be used for GRQA, so no conversion was needed. The formula for conversion constants was

$$x_2 = \frac{x_1 \times M_{x_2}}{n \times M_{x_1}} \quad (1)$$

where x_1 and x_2 are observation values before and after conversion, M is the corresponding molar mass and n the magnitude difference between source and converted unit. Some examples of unit conversion are given in Table 4. The full list of all unit conversion procedures is given in the appendix (Table A1).

Site ID duplication. There were some instances of duplicated site IDs in GLORICH (2 site pairs) and WATERBASE (101 pairs) source data, which meant that joining observations with sites would have created duplicate time series as well. Site ID duplicates could indicate that were have been small shifts in the site location or that the site had been closed and reinstated

175 at some point. If the distance between the duplicate pairs was less than a kilometer, only the first instance was retained in the output table. When distance was greater than a kilometer both instances were removed as metadata that could be used to make a decision (e.g. when the site first opened) was not available. Finally, all duplicate pairs were exported as separate files (e.g. *GLORICH_dup_sites*).

Coordinate conversion. CESI and WQP originally had the site coordinates in the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83).
180 The Pyproj (Snow et al., 2020) Python library was used for converting the North American site coordinates into World Geodetic System 1984 (WGS84) which was the coordinate system chosen for the GRQA.

Observation data filtering. Preliminary cleaning included the removal of observations of negative, missing or low quality values. In this case, low quality refers to measurements that were flagged as either coming from unreliable sources or having any kind of literal quality assessment flag in the source data (e.g. "poor quality"). Additionally, observations marked as below (<) 185 or above (>) detection limit in source data where flagged as such in GRQA as well (column *detection_limit_flag*). Observations originating from unreliable sources or otherwise suspect (e.g. unvalidated) were omitted. Three source datasets (GEMSTAT, GLORICH & WATERBASE) had this type of a quality evaluation included in the metadata. Observations from sites marked as "Not for publication" due to national legislation in WATERBASE were also not included in GRQA.

Filtration information. Where possible, supplementary information about whether a sample was filtered or unfiltered was 190 retained as filtration can affect the sample values (Sprague et al., 2017). This information was usually available in a separate metadata column. Both "filtered" and "dissolved" were used depending on the source. GRQA includes the dissolved versions of certain parameters (total nitrogen, total phosphorus and Kjeldahl nitrogen), which originally did not exist as separate parameters in WATERBASE and WQP. In those cases, the filtered/dissolved observations of TN, TP and TKN in the two datasets were treated as the corresponding dissolved forms (TDN, TDP, DKN) in GRQA.

195 Time and date processing. Observations could have invalid timestamps due to formatting or entry errors, so a validity check was included in the pre-processing scripts. Dates were tested against the presumed source format and observations with incorrectly formatted or implausible dates were removed. The source datasets used different date formats, which were all converted into a common one (%Y-%m-%d). Where possible, observation time was extracted as well. A default value (00:00:00) was used to fill missing information. Time zone information was only possible to extract from the WQP. Other sources lacked time zone 200 information, so it was not possible to determine whether the recorded timestamp was in local or Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) and the time given is up to the user to interpret.

Other metadata. If available, metadata about the upstream basin area, its unit and the name of the greater drainage region of the site was included in GRQA. Additional information about methods used or other available observation remarks in the source data were also retained. The metadata depended on the source and was available only sporadically and could not be 205 concatenated in a reasonable way between the datasets, so the information is given in the GRQA for each source separately in the format of *source_meta_sourcecolumnname* (e.g. *GEMSTAT_meta_Analysis Method Code*). Here, the source column names were kept as they appear in raw data, e.g. spaces were not replaced with underscores.

3.2 Outlier treatment, time series availability and continuity

Time series availability and continuity. The analysis of the statistics generated during pre-processing showed that most of the time series extracted from the source datasets are very discontinuous. For example, the mean time series length per site for total phosphorus (TP) in GEMSTAT was 6.6 years and 4.9 years in GLORICH, while the mean observation count per site was only 57.7 and 52.4, respectively. This means that many sites have observations at a monthly time step at best. Similar findings have been previously reported about WQP time series (Read et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2020).

In order to illustrate the suspected temporal fragmentation in observation data, monthly availability and monthly continuity statistics appropriated from the strategy used by Crochemore et al. (2019) were calculated for each site in each of the merged parameter time series. Both characteristics can give insight to the granularity of the time series and can affect the applicability of different modeling methods. Monthly availability of observation data was defined as the ratio between number of months with at least one observation and the total number of months a particular site had any observations. A ratio of 1.0 would mean that there was at least one observation in every month of the time series. Monthly continuity was calculated as the ratio between the longest period of consecutive months with any measurements and the length of time series in months. Here, a ratio of 1.0 would mean that there were no months without observations and the time series is continuous on a monthly level. The resulting characteristics were added as columns in the output files.

Outlier flagging. Water quality modeling often involves dealing with numerous outliers and uncertainties in observation data, particularly when integrating time series from multiple sources (McMillan et al., 2012; Sprague et al., 2017). Due to the differences in environmental conditions and water regimes, the potential range of observation values can vary a lot between catchments. Although extreme outliers caused by faulty equipment or data entry errors can sometimes be detectable by examining distribution plots, it is often difficult to decide whether an outlier is an error or not. For example, sudden spikes in observation time series can be caused by events such as accidental fertilizer spills to the waterway or a cow getting entrapped in a in-stream wetland (Hughes et al., 2016), which can have short-term effects on water quality and, therefore, should not be removed from data. However, flagging outliers can still help researchers troubleshoot potential issues at the modeling stage.

For this reason, no observations were omitted from the time series and two flags associated with outliers were added to the output tables instead. First flag (*obs_iqr_outlier*) shows whether an observation was deemed to be an outlier by the interquartile range (*IQR*) test. *IQR* is defined as the difference between the third (*Q3*) and first (*Q1*) quartile. All values greater than $Q3 + 1.5 \times IQR$ or less than $Q1 - 1.5 \times IQR$ are considered outliers. The second flag (*obs_percentile*) was an indicator (0.0–1.0) showing which percentile a particular observation belongs to. Histograms along with box and whisker plots were used to visually show the range and distribution of the parameter observations. The plots were produced for every parameter and are included in the GRQA data repository.

3.3 Duplicate observation detection

The global datasets (GEMSTAT and GLORICH) used in this study had at least partial spatial overlap with the other three sources, which means that merging could have created duplicate sites in the GRQA. Contrary to site ID duplicates within the

same dataset discussed in section 3.1, site duplicates from different sources would likely also have different IDs. Therefore, rather than comparing ID information, the duplicates had to be identified by spatial proximity and time series similarity. Similar to procedures described in section 3.2, duplicate detection was done separately for each parameter.

First stage of duplicate detection was clustering sites based on their geographic location. The DBSCAN (density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise) algorithm (Xu et al., 1998) from the Scikit-learn Python library (Pedregosa et al., 2011) was used to create clusters of sites within a one kilometer radius of each other, which is the approximate accuracy of around two decimal points in latitude/longitude degrees. There does not seem to be a consensus for assigning this search radius for duplicate detection and the assessment of spatial proximity depends on the subjective threshold set by authors. For example, the GSIM streamflow dataset (Do et al., 2018) used a radius of 5 km for selecting potential duplicate gauging stations. The 245 1 km radius was chosen to avoid having too many false positives (e.g. in the case of small headwater catchments) to evaluate in the second stage of deduplication (RMSE calculation). A major advantage of DBSCAN compared to similar density-based clustering methods is that the algorithm can be run without determining a priori the number of output clusters (Birant and Kut, 2007). In addition, DBSCAN has shown to be more applicable than others when dealing with large-scale datasets (Khan et al., 2014; Parimala et al., 2011).

255 Although there are time series similarity detection methods that can be applied to irregular time series and handle some degree of discontinuity, the focus of those methods is on misalignment of the time of observations rather than differences in the pattern of time series gaps (Berndt and Clifford, 1994). Therefore, it is likely that GRQA time series are too fragmented for these advanced methods to yield reliable results. A conservative approach based on root-mean-square error (RMSE) was chosen here instead. Output site clusters were converted into unique site pairs, so that all sites within a cluster could be compared to 260 one another (e.g. a cluster of four would yield six unique ID pairs). Site ID pairs were then used to extract corresponding time series from observation data. Only observations made on matching dates were used for calculating the RMSE and only pairs where RMSE was equal to zero were considered as potential duplicates. Finally, the duplicates were exported into separate CSV files (e.g. *TP_dup_obs.csv*) along with relevant metadata to help the user decide whether the sites can be considered duplicate (Table 5). A high number of matching dates with the same observation value (column *date_match_count*) would 265 indicate a higher likelihood of duplication.

4 Results

GRQA data model and descriptive overview. The GRQA dataset consists of observation time series for 42 different water quality parameters provided in tabular form as CSV files. Each of the observation files is accompanied by corresponding metadata files (tables and images) describing the spatial and temporal characteristics of the time series.

270 GRQA is made up of the following files:

- Water quality observation time series files (named *paramcode_GRQA.csv*)
- Harmonization schemas used in the preprocessing stage (*source_code_map.csv*) for each source dataset

Table 5. Summary table of duplicate observation file attributes.

Attribute name	Description	Data type
obs_id_1	Observation ID of first site	string
lat_wgs84_1	Latitude of first site	float
lon_wgs84_1	Longitude of first site	float
site_id_1	First site ID	string
site_name_1	First site name	string
obs_value_1	First site observation value	float
source_1	First site source	string
site_ts_availability_1	First site availability	float
site_ts_continuity_1	First site continuity	float
obs_date	Observation date	string
obs_id_2	Observation ID of second site	string
lat_wgs84_2	Latitude of second site	float
lon_wgs84_2	Longitude of second site	float
site_id_2	Second site ID	string
site_name_2	Second site name	string
obs_value_2	Second site observation value	float
source_2	Second site source	string
site_ts_availability_2	Second site availability	float
site_ts_continuity_2	Second site continuity	float
date_match_count	Number of matching dates with the same observation value	int
param_code	Parameter code	string

275 – Summary statistics of observation values by parameter for each source dataset before (*paramcode_source_raw_stats.csv*) and after (*paramcode_source_processed_stats.csv*) processing

280 – Histograms (*paramcode_GRQA_hist.png*) and box plots (*paramcode_GRQA_box.png*) showing the distribution of observation values by source dataset

– Maps showing the spatial distribution of the observations by source (*paramcode_GRQA_spatial_dist.png*)

– Maps showing the median observation values of sites (*paramcode_GRQA_median.png*)

– Maps showing the monthly availability (*paramcode_GRQA_availability.png*) and continuity (*paramcode_GRQA_continuity.png*) of the observations

– Where relevant, duplicate site ID files (*source_dup_sites.csv*)

– Where relevant, duplicate observation files (*source_dup_obs.csv*)

Table 6. Summary table of output water quality observation file attributes.

Attribute name	Description	Data type
obs_id	Unique observation ID generated by hashing	string
lat_wgs84	Observation site latitude in WGS84	float
lon_wgs84	Observation site longitude in WGS84	float
obs_date	Observation date in the %Y-%m-%d format	string
obs_time	Observation time in the %H:%M:%S format	string
obs_time_zone	Observation time zone code	string
site_id	Observation site ID	string
site_name	Observation site name	string
site_country	Observation site country	string
upstream_basin_area	Site upstream basin area	string
upstream_basin_area_unit	Site upstream basin area unit	string
drainage_region_name	Drainage region where site is located in	string
param_code	Parameter code in GRQA	string
source_param_code	Parameter code in source dataset	string
param_name	Parameter name in GRQA	string
source_param_name	Parameter name in source dataset	string
obs_value	Observation value in GRQA	float
source_obs_value	Observation value in source dataset	float
detection_limit_flag	Whether a value was flagged as below (<) or above (>) detection limit in source data	string
param_form	Parameter chemical form in GRQA	string
source_param_form	Parameter chemical form in source dataset	string
unit	Parameter unit in GRQA	string
source_unit	Parameter unit in source dataset	string
filtration	Sample filtration information	string
source	Source dataset name	string
obs_percentile	Percentile of the observation value	float
obs_iqr_outlier	Flag to mark whether observation value is an outlier according to the interquartile range test	string
site_ts_availability	Monthly availability of the time series per site	float
site_ts_continuity	Monthly continuity of the time series per site	float
meta	Other observation metadata with a reference to the corresponding source column (e.g., GEMSTAT_meta_Method Description)	string
...	...	

Table 7. GRQA water quality parameter statistics.

Parameter code	Parameter name	Sites	Observations	Median value	Unit	Start year	End year	Outlier %	
285	BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand	2,945	163,531	2.627	mg/l	1974	2019	13.4
	BOD5	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD5)	13,283	278,629	5.875	mg/l	1905	2020	8.3
	BOD7	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD7)	386	5,282	2.200	mg/l	2013	2018	5.9
	COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand	2,769	126,372	22.362	mg/l	1974	2019	10.8
	CODCr	Chemical Oxygen Demand (Cr)	671	7,350	24.900	mg/l	2013	2018	3.4
	CODMn	Chemical Oxygen Demand (Mn)	287	2,310	4.600	mg/l	2013	2018	2.3
	DC	Total Dissolved Carbon	7	9	4.800	mg/l	2000	2001	0
	DIC	Dissolved Inorganic Carbon	969	30,633	12.266	mg/l	1968	2020	3.5
	DIN	Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen	119	7,822	4.200	mg/l	1998	2019	2.6
	DIP	Dissolved Inorganic Phosphorus	9,931	612,922	0.040	mg/l	1942	2017	13.3
	DKN	Dissolved Kjeldahl Nitrogen	2,820	80,732	0.347	mg/l	1973	2020	6.5
	DO	Dissolved Oxygen	48,072	1,487,724	8.835	mg/l	1898	2020	2.2
	DOC	Dissolved Organic Carbon	14,799	413,328	2.804	mg/l	1968	2020	6.8
	DON	Dissolved Organic Nitrogen	10,811	163,630	0.371	mg/l	1951	2020	8.1
	DOP	Dissolved Organic Phosphorus	142	899	0.010	mg/l	1971	2003	8.7
	DOSAT	Dissolved Oxygen Saturation	34,949	953,274	92.164	%	1898	2020	8.7
	NH4N	Ammonium Nitrogen	11,372	651,850	0.027	mg/l	1942	2018	15.1
	NO2N	Nitrite Nitrogen	30,902	720,944	0.010	mg/l	1900	2020	12.7
	NO3N	Nitrate Nitrogen	45,422	1,229,584	0.468	mg/l	1900	2020	11.1
	PC	Particulate Carbon	2,898	51,049	0.908	mg/l	1995	2020	11
	pH	pH	27,577	1,372,794	6.886	pH	1900	2020	14.1
	PIC	Particulate Inorganic Carbon	1,095	9,196	0.060	mg/l	1974	2020	14
	PN	Particulate Nitrogen	2,996	56,125	0.129	mg/l	1981	2020	9.5
	POC	Particulate Organic Carbon	22,910	615,941	1.617	mg/l	1900	2020	9.7
	PON	Particulate Organic Nitrogen	28	1,111	0.120	mg/l	1989	2019	14
	POP	Particulate Organic Phosphorus	12	13	0.020	mg/l	1999	2000	7.7
	TAN	Total Ammonia Nitrogen	27,980	717,776	0.065	mg/l	1900	2020	13.3
	TC	Total Carbon	1,181	12,338	27.000	mg/l	1968	2007	3.3

Table 7. Continued.

Parameter code	Parameter name	Sites	Observations	Median value	Unit	Start year	End year	Outlier %
TDN	Total Dissolved Nitrogen	968	62,980	0.310	mg/l	1972	2020	11.2
TDP	Total Dissolved Phosphorus	3,325	169,297	0.031	mg/l	1965	2020	11.3
TEMP	Water Temperature	26,860	1,113,471	18.968	Deg C	1912	2020	9.3
TIC	Total Inorganic Carbon	1,984	23,024	11.833	mg/l	1968	2019	3.8
TIN	Total Inorganic Nitrogen	78	12,951	3.649	mg/l	1992	2020	0.8
TIP	Total Inorganic Phosphorus	1,328	42,495	0.026	mg/l	1971	2018	13.8
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	9,418	425,595	0.680	mg/l	1962	2020	8.1
TN	Total Nitrogen	18,507	575,887	1.329	mg/l	1958	2020	11.9
TOC	Total Organic Carbon	18,032	420,029	4.526	mg/l	1958	2020	7.2
TON	Total Organic Nitrogen	22,799	592,654	0.622	mg/l	1900	2020	8.6
TOP	Total Organic Phosphorus	294	1,811	0.030	mg/l	1971	2020	11.9
TP	Total Phosphorus	44,990	1,914,538	0.105	mg/l	1900	2020	11.8
TPP	Total Particulate Phosphorus	77	5,836	0.021	mg/l	1978	2019	10.5
TSS	Total Suspended Solids	68,592	1,958,429	9.785	mg/l	1898	2020	20.5

The structure of GRQA observation files is given in Table 6. In addition to the attributes outlined in section 3, the extracted metadata also includes information about the upstream basin and drainage region of the observation site. It has to be noted that the availability of this information was dependent on both the source (i.e. not present in CESI and WATERBASE) and the observation site itself and is therefore available only sporadically in GRQA as well (Table 6). Parameter codes, names, forms and observation values in GRQA are given as they appeared in source data alongside their harmonized and processed GRQA versions, so that end users could assess the validity of conversion and make corrections if needed.

Statistical overview of the parameters included in GRQA is shown in Table 7. The number of sites per parameter ranges from only 7 (DC) up to 68,592 (TSS). Parameters having more sites generally also have more observations. Parameters with a small number of sites and observations were usually present in only one or two source datasets. For example, dissolved organic phosphorus (DOP) only existed in WQP. Different versions of biochemical and chemical oxygen demand that could not be harmonized based on source metadata were kept separate, although the median value for BOD and BOD5 ended up being equal.

Spatial distribution of water quality observation sites depended on the parameter and is illustrated in Fig. 1 using dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), TP and TSS. These parameters were the largest in terms of number of sites and observations in their corresponding groups (oxygen, carbon, nutrients and sediments). They are also used in the following figures. Some observations that could be made when examining site maps were the following:

- Europe and North America are the best represented in the case of all parameters




Figure 1. Distribution of observation sites for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS).

- Coverage is also good in Australia, New Zealand, parts of East Asia and Brazil in the case of some of the key parameters

305

- Rest of the world (Africa, most of Asia) only has sporadic coverage

The temporal distribution of the four parameters is given in Fig. 2. Similar to the spatial distribution, temporal coverage of observations depended on both source data and parameter with WQP having the longest and WATERBASE the shortest time series. Most of the data from GEMSTAT are from the past decade, while GLORICH has a more even observation distribution

310

throughout the time series.

Statistical characteristics of GRQA observation time series. As mentioned in the previous section, each of the observation files was accompanied by a set of images and tables giving insight into the characteristics of the observation time series. The structure of tabular summary statistics is shown in Table 8. These files contain some basic statistics (standard deviation, etc) about observation values per parameter and source. In addition, information about the temporal characteristics of time series




Figure 2. Temporal distribution of observations for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS) for the period 1970–2020. Percentage of observations before the period shown on the plot is given for each parameter. Only seven observations ($1.69 \times 10^{-5}\%$) existed for DOC in the 1968–1970 period.




Figure 3. Distribution of observation values for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS). Outliers determined by the IQR test (Table 7) are not shown on the plot.

Table 8. Summary table of observation time series statistics file attributes.

Attribute name	Description	Data type
source_param_code	Parameter code in source dataset	string
param_code	Parameter code in GRQA	string
param_name	Parameter name in source dataset	string
source_param_form	Parameter form in source dataset	string
param_form	Parameter form in GRQA	string
source_unit	Parameter unit in source dataset	string
unit	Parameter unit in GRQA	string
count	Total number of observations	int
min	Minimum observation value	float
max	Maximum observation value	float
mean	Mean observation value	float
median	Median observation value	float
std	Standard deviation of observation values	float
min_year	Time series start	int
max_year	Time series end	int
ts_length	Total time series length per parameter	float
site_count	Total number of sites per parameter	int
mean_obs_count_per_site	Mean observation count per site	float
mean_ts_length_per_site	Mean time series length in years per site	float

315 (mean length per site, etc) is given as well as this can be important when assessing the suitability of the data for modeling purposes.

The applicability of water quality modeling is greatly affected by the distribution of observation values as a majority of modeling methods require a near normal distribution. The skewness caused by extreme outliers is a common problem in hydrological modeling. **The observations often follow a lognormal distribution, which means that the data often needs to be**

320 **transformed and normalized in order to be usable (Helsel, 1987; Hirsch et al., 1982; Parmar and Bhardwaj, 2014).** Similar behavior was also examined in GRQA, where values of most parameters showed a strong positive skew. This can be seen in histograms (Fig. 3) and box plots (Fig. A1). For illustrative purposes, values determined as outliers by the IQR test have been omitted from the figures. In the case of parameters such as TP and TSS, the skewness remains even after outlier omission. This is confirmed by the box plots, where the total range of the values greatly exceeds the median.

325 Availability (Fig. 4) and continuity (Fig. 5) plots were used to examine the temporal fragmentation of the time series. In general, observations from national sources (CESI and WQP) exhibited slightly higher availability and continuity than others, likely caused by more consistent data acquisition frameworks. No clear spatial pattern emerged from the analysis meaning that differences in both indicators exist at the site level even within the same country. Due to how the metrics were calculated,




Figure 4. Monthly availability for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS).

shorter time series outperformed longer ones. An example of this is TP in Brazil, where the examined high continuity correlated
330 with very short mean time series length (less than a year). Parameters with very fragmented time series (e.g. TSS) had only a limited number of sites where observations had been collected consistently throughout the whole time frame.

The GRQA also includes plots of median observation values, which were calculated over the whole time series for each site. Seasonal fluctuations cannot be identified on this aggregation level, so the maps are meant to be only indicative. An example of median plots can be seen in the appendix (Fig. A2).




Figure 5. Monthly continuity for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS).

335 **5 Discussion**

5.1 Limitations and considerations regarding the use of GRQA

Taking into account aforementioned issues encountered during the compilation of GRQA, certain limitations and potential remaining errors have to be considered when using the dataset for water quality modeling.

340 *Potential errors in unit conversion.* As described in section 3, several assumptions had to be made when creating harmonization schemas about the chemical form of certain nitrogen parameters (NO_2 , NO_3 and NH_4). **However, if the assumption made based on this limited ancillary information was incorrect then using the conversion would have been affected as well.** For this reason, the source observation values along with source units were retained and the users can retrace the conversion steps using the harmonization schemas.

345 *Skewness of observation values.* The outlier treatment strategy used for GRQA involved only flagging the values based on the IQR test, which means that the skewness illustrated in section 4 still remains. Although the described strong positive skew existed also in source data, potential unit conversion errors could have exaggerated it. As shown by histograms, omitting flagged outliers is not enough to eliminate the skewness in some cases (TP and TSS), so additional processing could be needed to transform the data into a normal shape. Power transformation methods like the Box-Cox transformation (Box and Cox, 1964) could be used to further minimize skewness. **It is likely that some of the most extreme outliers are caused by data entry errors or equipment malfunction rather than events such as agricultural spills. For setting thresholds to determine whether a value is illogical or not, more sophisticated outlier detection methods based on some general freshwater quality guidelines (Enderlein et al., 1996) could perhaps be used to further filter the observation values.**

5.2 Suggestions for improving multi-source water quality data compilation

355 *Metadata quality.* When merging datasets from different sources, most of the complications stemmed from inadequate metadata of water quality observations, such as ambiguous parameter names and codes, and missing details on the chemical forms of parameters. This information would be integral for harmonizing units and observation values. The terms used for indicating the filtration status of samples are often dependent on the interpretation of the authors (total vs unfiltered, dissolved vs filtered), which can affect results when merging (McMillan et al., 2012; Sprague et al., 2017). Annotation of suspect or incomplete data is another aspect of good quality metadata (Gudivada et al., 2017). Internal quality control measures such as the ones in 360 GEMSTAT and WATERBASE would help the end user in the data cleaning stage and eliminate some of the outliers.

The following aspects should be considered to make multi-source data harmonization more efficient in the future:

- Parameter forms should be reported with the units
- The filtration status of the samples should be reported and the terms filtered/unfiltered should be preferred as opposed to the more ambiguous dissolved/total
- Machine-readable quality flags as found in GEMSTAT (columns *Value Flags* and *Data Quality*) or WATERBASE (columns *resultObservationStatus*, *metadata_statusCode* and *metadata_observationStatus*) should be added
- Whether observations are daily or monthly at the source level should be clearly defined
- Area units (m^2 , km^2 , etc) should be included, when the upstream catchment area of the site is reported
- Other information about potential errors in the data (potential duplicates, typographical errors, etc)
- When certain assumptions or decisions are made when harmonizing data from different sources, they should be reported when the data is published

370 *Spatial and temporal discontinuity.* Although spatial coverage of water quality observations in GRQA exceeds that of the existing global datasets (GEMSTAT and GLORICH), large areas of Africa and Asia are empty. A major reason might be a

lack of knowledge and funding to update and extend site networks, particularly in hard to reach areas. In addition, not all
375 governments adhere to an open data policy. **Therefore, improving the spatial coverage of water quality data still relies mostly on implementing additional measures to encourage countries to share it in accordance with open data principles.**

The availability and continuity analysis showed that the GRQA time series are fragmented and significant gaps remain in the data, which will negatively affect large-scale modeling performance. These gaps could be caused by both issues with sensor maintenance or technical limitations under certain conditions (weather, etc) and inconsistencies in the data acquisition
380 practices on the local level. Recently, ML based solutions for time series augmentation have been used to fill in gaps in historical monitoring data (Gao et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2019). **However, this kind of gap filling still requires enough good quality training data in the existing time series fragments to be effective and can potentially only be of help when improving the temporal, rather than spatial coverage.**

Another option for improving continuity is using data from one time series to fill in gaps in another. For example, turbidity
385 has been successfully translated into TP and TSS content (Castrillo and García, 2020; Jones et al., 2011). As turbidity data can be acquired at a higher frequency than TP and TSS, the use of such surrogate parameters can be helpful in data scarce regions for certain parameters.

General remarks. An important part in improving the spatiotemporal coverage of water quality is raising awareness about the existing datasets (e.g. GEMSTAT), so that new institutions could join the contributor network and submit their own site
390 data. Continued growth of international collaboration will be vital in improving open global water quality data (Blöschl et al., 2019; Tang et al., 2019). Most of the data collected locally is intended only for regional or national use. Thus, the data is not compatible with those from other countries due to lack of common metadata management practices with problems discussed above being a major bottleneck (Hutton et al., 2016; Sprague et al., 2017; Stagge et al., 2019). Providing those institutions with an example workflow when designing water quality data pipelines, such as the schema recently proposed by Plana et al.
395 (2019), would help them develop their own data management strategy. The workflow used to compile GRQA along with the issues raised in this study will hopefully also help to draw attention to this topic.

6 Conclusions

The GRQA dataset was created with the intention to improve the spatiotemporal coverage of previously available open water quality data and provide an example workflow for multi-source data compilation that can be accustomed for other data sources
400 as well. The current version of GRQA is mainly focused on different forms of the main nutrients (N and P) and carbon compounds, although GEMSTAT, WATERBASE and WQP also had many other types of parameters that are used as water quality indicators (heavy metals, pesticides, etc). Other researchers are able to make additions and customize the dataset to their needs for parameter-specific studies using the scripts published with GRQA.

Updates and additions by the hydrological community are encouraged to further develop GRQA. As it stands, GRQA is a
405 set of well structured CSV files rather than a queryable database. **We intend to add a Jupyter Notebook example of loading and processing the CSV files to the GRQA GitHub repository. We included an extensive data catalogue with graphs and maps**

for temporal and spatial coverage of every variable as supplementary material. This should help potential users to get a better overview of the data before downloading it. Converting the files into a database would also greatly improve data management and make extending GRQA easier in the future. In the case of a relational database, the schema recommended by Plana et al. 410 (2019) could be followed. We also consider the addition of an online dashboard for data visualization and download, similar to that of GEMSTAT or WQP. A versioning system along with a metadata validation strategy similar to Welty et al. (2020) could be implemented to ensure metadata quality.

Future work could also include the development of a dataset for catchment characteristics in order to better study how water quality in rivers and streams is affected by land use changes in their catchments. The CAMELS dataset (Addor et al., 2017) 415 and its regional implementations (Chagas et al., 2020; Coxon et al., 2020) can be used as an example. In addition, interactions between water quality and streamflow can be further studies by linking water quality observations to streamflow data from the Global Streamflow Indices and Metadata Archive (GSIM) (Do et al., 2018).

Code and data availability. The GRQA dataset, supplementary metadata and figures are available for download on the DataCite and OpenAire enabled Zenodo repository <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5097436> (Virro et al., 2021). 420 The data processing scripts used for the compilation of GRQA are available on Zenodo <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5082147> (Virro and Kmoch, 2021).

Appendix A: Figures and tables in appendices




Figure A1. Box plot of observation values for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS). Outliers determined by the IQR test (Table 7) are not shown on the plot.




Figure A2. Spatial distribution of yearly median observation values for dissolved oxygen (DO), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total phosphorus (TP) and total suspended solids (TSS). Outliers determined by the IQR test are not shown on the plot.

Table A1. Conversion procedures of source data units and chemical forms into their corresponding GRQA versions for all parameters.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	Divisor	Multiplier	Conversion constant
TAN	CESI	N	NH3	mg/l	MG/L	17.031	14.007	0.822441
NO3N	CESI	N	N	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
NO2N	CESI	N	N	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
TN	CESI	N	N	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
TDN	CESI	N	N	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
DO	CESI	O2	O2	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
pH	CESI			pH	PH UNITS	1	1	1
TP	CESI	P	P	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
TDP	CESI	P	P	mg/l	MG/L	1	1	1
TEMP	CESI			Deg C	DEG C	1	1	1
DC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DIC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DOC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
POC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	$\mu\text{g/g}$	1	1	1
POC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
425	TC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	TIC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	TOC	GEMSTAT	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	DKN	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	DON	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	NH4N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	NH4N	GEMSTAT	N	NH4	mg/l	mg/l NH4	18.039	14.007
	NH4N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{g/l}$	1000	1
	NO2N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	NO2N	GEMSTAT	N	NO2	mg/l	mg/l NO2	46.005	14.007
	NO2N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{g/l}$	1000	1
	NO3N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	NO3N	GEMSTAT	N	NO3	mg/l	mg/l NO3	62.004	14.007
	NO3N	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{g/l}$	1000	1
	PN	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	PON	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1
	PON	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{g/g}$	1	1

Table A1. Continued.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	Divisor	Multiplier	Conversion constant
TDN	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TKN	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TN	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TON	GEMSTAT	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DO	GEMSTAT	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DOSAT	GEMSTAT			%	%	1	1	1
BOD	GEMSTAT	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
COD	GEMSTAT	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
pH	GEMSTAT			pH	—	1	1	1
DIP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TDP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TDP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	µg/l	1000	1	0.001
TIP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	µg/l	1000	1	0.001
TPP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	µg/g	1	1	1
TPP	GEMSTAT	P	P	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TSS	GEMSTAT			mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TEMP	GEMSTAT			Deg C	°C	1	1	1
TEMP	GLORICH			Deg C	°C	1	1	1
pH	GLORICH			pH		1	1	1
DO	GLORICH	O2	O2	mg/l	mg O2 L-1	1	1	1
DOSAT	GLORICH			%	%	1	1	1
TSS	GLORICH			mg/l	mg L-1	1	1	1
TC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
TIC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
DIC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
PIC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
TOC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
DOC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
POC	GLORICH	C	C	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	12.011	0.012011
TN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	14.007	0.014007
TDN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	14.007	0.014007
PN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	µmol L-1	1000	14.007	0.014007

Table A1. Continued.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	Divisor	Multiplier	Conversion constant
TIN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
DIN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
TON	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
DON	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
PON	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
TKN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
DKN	GLORICH	N	N	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	14.007	0.014007
NO3N	GLORICH	N	NO3	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	0.225905	0.000226
NO2N	GLORICH	N	NO2	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	0.304467	0.000304
NH4N	GLORICH	N	NH4	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	0.776484	0.000776
TP	GLORICH	P	P	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	30.973	0.030973
TDP	GLORICH	P	P	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	30.973	0.030973
TPP	GLORICH	P	P	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	30.973	0.030973
TIP	GLORICH	P	P	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	30.973	0.030973
DIP	GLORICH	P	P	mg/l	$\mu\text{mol L-1}$	1000	30.973	0.030973
NO3N	WATERBASE	N	NO3	mg/l	mgNO3/L	62.004	14.007	0.225905
NO2N	WATERBASE	N	NO2	mg/l	mgNO2/L	46.005	14.007	0.304467
NH4N	WATERBASE	N	NH4	mg/l	mgNH4/L	18.039	14.007	0.776484
NH4N	WATERBASE	N	NH3	mg/l	mgNH3/L	17.031	14.007	0.822441
NH3N	WATERBASE	N	NH3	mg/l	mgNH3/L	17.031	14.007	0.822441
NH3N	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	ug/L	1000	1	0.001
TP	WATERBASE	P	P	mg/l	mgP/L	1	1	1
TSS	WATERBASE			mg/l	mg/L	1	1	1
TEMP	WATERBASE			Deg C	Cel	1	1	1
DOSAT	WATERBASE			%	%	1	1	1
DO	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/L	1	1	1
DO	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mgO2/L	1	1	1
BOD5	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mgO2/L	1	1	1
BOD7	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mgO2/L	1	1	1
CODCr	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mgO2/L	1	1	1
CODMn	WATERBASE	O2	O2	mg/l	mgO2/L	1	1	1
DOC	WATERBASE	C	C	mg/l	mgC/L	1	1	1
DOC	WATERBASE	C	C	mg/l	mg/L	1	1	1
TOC	WATERBASE	C	C	mg/l	mgC/L	1	1	1

Table A1. Continued.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	Divisor	Multiplier	Conversion constant
TOC	WATERBASE	C	C	mg/l	mg/L	1	1	1
pH	WATERBASE			pH		1	1	1
TKN	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mgN/L	1	1	1
TKN	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mg/L	1	1	1
TON	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mgN/L	1	1	1
PON	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mgN/L	1	1	1
TIN	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mgN/L	1	1	1
TN	WATERBASE	N	N	mg/l	mgN/L	1	1	1
PC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DO	WQP	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DOSAT	WQP			%	% saturatn	1	1	1
PIC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DIC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TIC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TAN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
TAN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
DIN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
TIN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
NO3N	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
NO3N	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
NO2N	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
NO2N	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l as N	1	1	1
PON	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DON	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TON	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
POP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
DOP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
TOP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
PN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TPP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
TDP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
TP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1

Table A1. Continued.

Parameter code	Source	Form	Source form	Unit	Source unit	Divisor	Multiplier	Conversion constant
TP	WQP	P	P	mg/l	mg/l as P	1	1	1
TN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TDN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TN	WQP	N	N	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
POC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
DOC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TOC	WQP	C	C	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
BOD5	WQP	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
BOD5	WQP	O2	O2	mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
pH	WQP			pH	std units	1	1	1
TSS	WQP			mg/l	mg/l	1	1	1
TEMP	WQP			Deg C	deg C	1	1	1

430 *Author contributions.* Holger Virro conceived the manuscript, conducted the data processing and scripting. All authors contributed to the development of the workflow and writing the manuscript.

Competing interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

435 *Acknowledgements.* This research was funded by Mobilitas+ programme grant no. MOBERC34, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions individual fellowship under the Horizon 2020 Programme grant agreement number 795625, grant PRG352 from the Estonian Research Council, NUTIKAS programme and the Dora Plus PhD student mobility scholarship number 36.9-6.1/1124 of the Archimedes foundation and European Regional Development Fund (EcolChange Centre of Excellence). Holger Virro is also thankful for technical support from the Yale Center for Research Computing support and the High Performance Computing Center of University of Tartu.

References

Abbaspour, K. C., Rouholahnejad, E., Vaghefi, S., Srinivasan, R., Yang, H., and Kløve, B.: A continental-scale hydrology and water quality model for Europe: Calibration and uncertainty of a high-resolution large-scale SWAT model, *Journal of Hydrology*, 524, 733–752, 440 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.03.027>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169415001985>, 2015.

Addor, N., Newman, A. J., Mizukami, N., and Clark, M. P.: The CAMELS data set: catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (HESS)*, 21, 5293–5313, 2017.

Archfield, S. A., Clark, M., Arheimer, B., Hay, L. E., McMillan, H., Kiang, J. E., Seibert, J., Hakala, K., Bock, A., Wagener, T., et al.: 445 Accelerating advances in continental domain hydrologic modeling, *Water Resources Research*, 51, 10 078–10 091, 2015.

Beck, H. E., De Roo, A., and van Dijk, A. I.: Global maps of streamflow characteristics based on observations from several thousand catchments, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 16, 1478–1501, 2015.

Berndt, D. J. and Clifford, J.: Using dynamic time warping to find patterns in time series., in: KDD workshop, vol. 10, pp. 359–370, Seattle, 450 WA, USA:, 1994.

Bierkens, M. F.: Global hydrology 2015: State, trends, and directions, *Water Resources Research*, 51, 4923–4947, 2015.

Birant, D. and Kut, A.: ST-DBSCAN: An algorithm for clustering spatial–temporal data, *Data & knowledge engineering*, 60, 208–221, 2007.

Blöschl, G., Bierkens, M. F., Chambel, A., Cudennec, C., Destouni, G., Fiori, A., Kirchner, J. W., McDonnell, J. J., Savenije, H. H., Sivapalan, 455 M., et al.: Twenty-three unsolved problems in hydrology (UPH)—a community perspective, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 64, 1141–1158, 2019.

Börker, J., Hartmann, J., Amann, T., Romero-Mujalli, G., Moosdorf, N., and Jenkins, C.: Chemical river data from drained loess areas, PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915784>, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915784>, in: Börker, J et al. (2020): Chemical weathering of loess - GIS data, alkalinity measurements of a loess column experiment in the laboratory under pCO2 atmospheric and saturated conditions and chemical river data from drained loess areas. PANGAEA, <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.915793>, 2020.

Box, G. E. and Cox, D. R.: An analysis of transformations, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 26, 211–243, 460 1964.

Caraco, N. F. and Cole, J. J.: Human impact on nitrate export: an analysis using major world rivers, *Ambio*, 28, 167–170, 1999.

Castrillo, M. and García, Á. L.: Estimation of high frequency nutrient concentrations from water quality surrogates using machine learning methods, *Water Research*, 172, 115 490, 2020.

Chagas, V. B., Chaffe, P. L., Addor, N., Fan, F. M., Fleischmann, A. S., Paiva, R. C., and Siqueira, V. A.: CAMELS-BR: hydrological 465 meteorological time series and landscape attributes for 897 catchments in Brazil, *Earth System Science Data*, 12, 2075–2096, 2020.

Chau, K.-w.: A review on integration of artificial intelligence into water quality modelling, *Marine pollution bulletin*, 52, 726–733, 2006.

Chen, J. and Quan, W.: Using Landsat/TM imagery to estimate nitrogen and phosphorus concentration in Taihu Lake, China, *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 5, 273–280, 2011.

Chen, K., Chen, H., Zhou, C., Huang, Y., Qi, X., Shen, R., Liu, F., Zuo, M., Zou, X., Wang, J., et al.: Comparative analysis of surface water 470 quality prediction performance and identification of key water parameters using different machine learning models based on big data, *Water Research*, 171, 115 454, 2020.

Choubin, B., Darabi, H., Rahmati, O., Sajedi-Hosseini, F., and Kløve, B.: River suspended sediment modelling using the CART model: a comparative study of machine learning techniques, *Science of the Total Environment*, 615, 272–281, 2018.

Coxon, G., Addor, N., Bloomfield, J. P., Freer, J., Fry, M., Hannaford, J., Howden, N. J., Lane, R., Lewis, M., Robinson, E. L., et al.:
475 CAMELS-GB: hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 671 catchments in Great Britain, *Earth System Science Data*, 12, 2459–2483, 2020.

Crochemore, L., Isberg, K., Pimentel, R., Pineda, L., Hasan, A., and Arheimer, B.: Lessons learnt from checking the quality of openly accessible river flow data worldwide, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 0, 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2019.1659509>, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2019.1659509>, 2019.

480 Desmit, X., Thieu, V., Billen, G., Campuzano, F., Dulière, V., Garnier, J., Lassaletta, L., Ménesguen, A., Neves, R., Pinto, L., et al.: Reducing marine eutrophication may require a paradigmatic change, *Science of the Total Environment*, 635, 1444–1466, 2018.

Do, H. X., Gudmundsson, L., Leonard, M., and Westra, S.: The Global Streamflow Indices and Metadata Archive (GSIM)-Part 1: The production of a daily streamflow archive and metadata, *Earth System Science Data*, 10, 765–785, 2018.

Enderlein, R., Enderlein, R., and Williams, W.: Chapter 2*—Water Quality Requirements, *Water Pollution Control—A Guide to the Use of 485 Water, Quality Management Principles*, 1996.

Environment and Climate Change Canada: Water quality in Canadian rivers, <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/55cc50dc-feb3-46d1-b40f-09254f3c00c5>, accessed on November 16, 2020.

European Environment Agency: Waterbase - Water Quality ICM, <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/waterbase-water-quality-icm>, accessed on November 16, 2020.

490 Evans, C., Monteith, D., and Cooper, D.: Long-term increases in surface water dissolved organic carbon: observations, possible causes and environmental impacts, *Environmental pollution*, 137, 55–71, 2005.

Färber, C., Lisniak, D., Saile, P., Kleber, S.-H., Ehl, M., Dietrich, S., Fader, M., and Demuth, S.: Water quality at the global scale: GEMStat database and information system, EGUGA, p. 15984, 2018.

Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., Mueller, N. D., O’Connell, C., Ray, D. K., West, 495 P. C., et al.: Solutions for a cultivated planet, *Nature*, 478, 337–342, 2011.

Gao, Y., Merz, C., Lischeid, G., and Schneider, M.: A review on missing hydrological data processing, *Environmental earth sciences*, 77, 47, 2018.

Gudmundsson, L. and Seneviratne, S. I.: Towards observation-based gridded runoff estimates for Europe, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 2859–2879, 2015.

Harrigan, S., Zsoter, E., Alfieri, L., Prudhomme, C., Salamon, P., Wetterhall, F., Barnard, C., Cloke, H., and Pappenberger, F.: GloFAS-ERA5 operational global river discharge reanalysis 1979–present, *Hydrol. Soil Sci. Hydrol.*, 2020.

Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., Gommers, R., Virtanen, P., Cournapeau, D., Wieser, E., Taylor, J., Berg, S., Smith, N. J., 505 et al.: Array programming with NumPy, *Nature*, 585, 357–362, 2020.

Hartmann, J., Lauerwald, R., and Moosdorf, N.: A Brief Overview of the GLObal RIver Chemistry Database, GLORICH, *Procedia Earth and Planetary Science*, 10, 23–27, <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PROEPS.2014.08.005>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1878522014000678>, 2014.

Hartmann, J., Lauerwald, R., and Moosdorf, N.: GLORICH-Global river chemistry database, PANGAEA <https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.902360>, 2019.

He, B., Kanae, S., Oki, T., Hirabayashi, Y., Yamashiki, Y., and Takara, K.: Assessment of global nitrogen pollution in rivers using an integrated biogeochemical modeling framework, *Water research*, 45, 2573–2586, 2011.

Helsel, D. R.: Advantages of nonparametric procedures for analysis of water quality data, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 32, 179–190, 1987.

Hirsch, R. M., Slack, J. R., and Smith, R. A.: Techniques of trend analysis for monthly water quality data, *Water resources research*, 18, 107–121, 1982.

Hope, D., Billett, M., and Cresser, M.: A review of the export of carbon in river water: fluxes and processes, *Environmental pollution*, 84, 301–324, 1994.

515 Hrachowitz, M., Savenije, H., Blöschl, G., McDonnell, J., Sivapalan, M., Pomeroy, J., Arheimer, B., Blume, T., Clark, M., Ehret, U., et al.: A decade of Predictions in Ungauged Basins (PUB)—a review, *Hydrological sciences journal*, 58, 1198–1255, 2013.

Hughes, A. O., Tanner, C. C., McKergow, L. A., and Sukias, J. P.: Unrestricted dairy cattle grazing of a pastoral headwater wetland and its effect on water quality, *Agricultural Water Management*, 165, 72–81, 2016.

Hutton, C., Wagener, T., Freer, J., Han, D., Duffy, C., and Arheimer, B.: Most computational hydrology is not reproducible, so is it really science?, *Water Resources Research*, 52, 7548–7555, 2016.

520 International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change: Global Water Quality Database GEMStat, <https://gemstat.org/data/data-portal/>, accessed on November 16, 2020.

Jones, A. S., Stevens, D. K., Horsburgh, J. S., and Mesner, N. O.: Surrogate Measures for Providing High Frequency Estimates of Total Suspended Solids and Total Phosphorus Concentrations 1, *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 47, 239–253, 2011.

525 Jordahl, K., den Bossche, J. V., Fleischmann, M., Wasserman, J., McBride, J., Gerard, J., Tratner, J., Perry, M., Badaracco, A. G., Farmer, C., Hjelle, G. A., Snow, A. D., Cochran, M., Gillies, S., Culbertson, L., Bartos, M., Eubank, N., maxalbert, Bilogur, A., Rey, S., Ren, C., Arribas-Bel, D., Wasser, L., Wolf, L. J., Journois, M., Wilson, J., Greenhall, A., Holdgraf, C., Filipe, and Leblanc, F.: geopandas/geopandas: v0.8.1, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3946761>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3946761>, 2020.

Khan, K., Rehman, S. U., Aziz, K., Fong, S., and Sarasvady, S.: DBSCAN: Past, present and future, in: The fifth international conference on the applications of digital information and web technologies (ICADIWT 2014), pp. 232–238, IEEE, 2014.

Kratzert, F., Klotz, D., Herrnegger, M., Sampson, A. K., Hochreiter, S., and Nearing, G. S.: Toward improved predictions in ungauged basins: Exploiting the power of machine learning, *Water Resources Research*, 55, 11 344–11 354, 2019.

530 Krysanova, V., Müller-Wohlfel, D.-I., and Becker, A.: Development and test of a spatially distributed hydrological/water quality model for mesoscale watersheds, *Ecological modelling*, 106, 261–289, 1998.

Leon, L., Soulis, E., Kouwen, N., and Farquhar, G.: Nonpoint source pollution: a distributed water quality modeling approach, *Water Research*, 35, 997–1007, 2001.

535 Marzadri, A., Amatulli, G., Tonina, D., Bellin, A., Shen, L. Q., Allen, G. H., and Raymond, P. A.: Global riverine nitrous oxide emissions: the role of small streams and large rivers, *Science of The Total Environment*, p. 145148, 2021.

McKinney, W. et al.: Data structures for statistical computing in python, in: *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, vol. 445, pp. 51–56, Austin, TX, 2010.

540 McMillan, H., Krueger, T., and Freer, J.: Benchmarking observational uncertainties for hydrology: rainfall, river discharge and water quality, *Hydrological Processes*, 26, 4078–4111, 2012.

Meals, D. W., Dressing, S. A., and Davenport, T. E.: Lag time in water quality response to best management practices: A review, *Journal of environmental quality*, 39, 85–96, 2010.

Mount, N. J., Maier, H. R., Toth, E., Elshorbagy, A., Solomatine, D., Chang, F.-J., and Abrahart, R.: Data-driven modelling approaches for socio-hydrology: opportunities and challenges within the Panta Rhei Science Plan, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 61, 1192–1208, 2016.

Mueller, N. D., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., Ray, D. K., Ramankutty, N., and Foley, J. A.: Closing yield gaps through nutrient and water management, *Nature*, 490, 254–257, 2012.

Neukermans, G., Ruddick, K., Loisel, H., and Roose, P.: Optimization and quality control of suspended particulate matter concentration measurement using turbidity measurements, *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 10, 1011–1023, <https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2012.10.1011>, <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.4319/lom.2012.10.1011>, 2012.

Olmanson, L. G., Brezonik, P. L., and Bauer, M. E.: Airborne hyperspectral remote sensing to assess spatial distribution of water quality characteristics in large rivers: The Mississippi River and its tributaries in Minnesota, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 130, 254–265, 2013.

Ouali, D., Chebana, F., and Ouarda, T. B.: Fully nonlinear statistical and machine-learning approaches for hydrological frequency estimation at ungauged sites, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 9, 1292–1306, 2017.

Ouyang, W., Yang, W., Tysklind, M., Xu, Y., Lin, C., Gao, X., and Hao, Z.: Using river sediments to analyze the driving force difference for non-point source pollution dynamics between two scales of watersheds, *Water research*, 139, 311–320, 2018.

Papacharalampous, G., Tyralis, H., and Koutsoyiannis, D.: Comparison of stochastic and machine learning methods for multi-step ahead forecasting of hydrological processes, *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 33, 481–514, 2019.

Parimala, M., Lopez, D., and Senthilkumar, N.: A survey on density based clustering algorithms for mining large spatial databases, *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 31, 59–66, 2011.

Parmar, K. S. and Bhardwaj, R.: Water quality management using statistical analysis and time-series prediction model, *Applied Water Science*, 4, 425–434, 2014.

Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., et al.: Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python, *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 12, 2825–2830, 2011.

Pellerin, B. A., Stauffer, B. A., Young, D. A., Sullivan, D. J., Bricker, S. B., Walbridge, M. R., Clyde Jr, G. A., and Shaw, D. M.: Emerging tools for continuous nutrient monitoring networks: Sensors advancing science and water resources protection, *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 52, 993–1008, 2016.

Plana, Q., Alferes, J., Fuks, K., Kraft, T., Maruéjouls, T., Torfs, E., and Vanrolleghem, P. A.: Towards a water quality database for raw and validated data with emphasis on structured metadata, *Water Quality Research Journal*, 54, 1–9, 2019.

Radwan, M., Willems, P., El-Sadek, A., and Berlamont, J.: Modelling of dissolved oxygen and biochemical oxygen demand in river water using a detailed and a simplified model, *International Journal of River Basin Management*, 1, 97–103, 2003.

Read, E. K., Carr, L., De Cicco, L., Dugan, H. A., Hanson, P. C., Hart, J. A., Kreft, J., Read, J. S., and Winslow, L. A.: Water quality data for national-scale aquatic research: The Water Quality Portal, *Water Resources Research*, 53, 1735–1745, 2017.

Ren, H., Cromwell, E., Kravitz, B., and Chen, X.: Using deep learning to fill spatio-temporal data gaps in hydrological monitoring networks, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, pp. 1–20, 2019.

Shen, C., Laloy, E., Elshorbagy, A., Albert, A., Bales, J., Chang, F.-J., Ganguly, S., Hsu, K.-L., Kifer, D., Fang, Z., et al.: HESS Opinions: Incubating deep-learning-powered hydrologic science advances as a community, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (Online)*, 22, 2018.

Shen, L. Q., Amatulli, G., Sethi, T., Raymond, P., and Domisch, S.: Estimating nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations in streams and rivers, within a machine learning framework, *Scientific data*, 7, 1–11, 2020.

Singh, K. P., Basant, A., Malik, A., and Jain, G.: Artificial neural network modeling of the river water quality—a case study, *Ecological Modelling*, 220, 888–895, 2009.

Sinha, E., Michalak, A., Calvin, K. V., and Lawrence, P. J.: Societal decisions about climate mitigation will have dramatic impacts on 590 eutrophication in the 21 st century, *Nature communications*, 10, 1–11, 2019.

Snow, A. D., Whitaker, J., Cochran, M., den Bossche, J. V., Mayo, C., de Kloe, J., Karney, C., Ouzounoudis, G., Dearing, J., Lostis, G., Heitor, Filipe, May, R., Itkin, M., Couwenberg, B., Berardinelli, G., Badger, T. G., Eubank, N., Dunphy, M., Brett, M., Raspaud, M., da Costa, M. A., Evers, K., Ranalli, J., de Maeyer, J., Popov, E., Gohlke, C., Willoughby, C., Barker, C., and Wiedemann, B. M.: *pyproj4/pyproj: 2.6.1 Release*, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3783866>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3783866>, 2020.

Sprague, L. A., Oelsner, G. P., and Argue, D. M.: Challenges with secondary use of multi-source water-quality data in the United States, *Water research*, 110, 252–261, 2017.

Stagge, J. H., Rosenberg, D. E., Abdallah, A. M., Akbar, H., Attallah, N. A., and James, R.: Assessing data availability and research reproducibility in hydrology and water resources, *Scientific data*, 6, 190 030, 2019.

Strömqvist, J., Arheimer, B., Dahné, J., Donnelly, C., and Lindström, G.: Water and nutrient predictions in ungauged basins: set-up and 600 evaluation of a model at the national scale, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 57, 229–247, 2012.

Tang, T., Strokal, M., van Vliet, M. T., Seuntjens, P., Burek, P., Kroese, C., Langan, S., and Wada, Y.: Bridging global, basin and local-scale water quality modeling towards enhancing water quality management worldwide, *Current opinion in environmental sustainability*, 36, 39–48, 2019.

Tilman, D., Fargione, J., Wolff, B., D'antonio, C., Dobson, A., Howarth, R., Schindler, D., Schlesinger, W. H., Simberloff, D., and Swackhamer, D.: Forecasting agriculturally driven global environmental change, *science*, 292, 281–284, 2001.

605 Toming, K., Kutser, T., Laas, A., Sepp, M., Paavel, B., and Nõges, T.: First experiences in mapping lake water quality parameters with Sentinel-2 MSI imagery, *Remote Sensing*, 8, 640, 2016.

UN-Water: Summary Progress Update 2021: SDG 6 — water and sanitation for all, <https://www.unwater.org/publications/summary-progress-update-2021-sdg-6-water-and-sanitation-for-all/>, 2021.

610 United States Geological Survey: Water Quality Portal, <https://www.waterqualitydata.us/portal/>, accessed on November 16, 2020.

Virro, H. and Kmoch, A.: GRQA code supplement, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5082147>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5082147>, 2021.

Virro, H., Amatulli, G., Kmoch, A., Shen, L., and Uuemaa, E.: Global River Water Quality Archive (GRQA), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5097436>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5097436>, 2021.

Wellen, C., Kamran-Disfani, A.-R., and Arhonditsis, G. B.: Evaluation of the current state of distributed watershed nutrient water quality 615 modeling, *Environmental science & technology*, 49, 3278–3290, 2015.

Welty, E., Zemp, M., Navarro, F., Huss, M., Fürst, J. J., Gärtner-Roer, I., Landmann, J., Machguth, H., Naegeli, K., Andreassen, L. M., et al.: Worldwide version-controlled database of glacier thickness observations, *Earth System Science Data*, 12, 3039–3055, 2020.

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., et al.: The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship, *Scientific data*, 3, 1–9, 2016.

620 Wood, E. F., Roundy, J. K., Troy, T. J., Van Beek, L., Bierkens, M. F., Blyth, E., de Roo, A., Döll, P., Ek, M., Famiglietti, J., et al.: Hyperresolution global land surface modeling: Meeting a grand challenge for monitoring Earth's terrestrial water, *Water Resources Research*, 47, 2011.

Wu, Y. and Chen, J.: Investigating the effects of point source and nonpoint source pollution on the water quality of the East River (Dongjiang) in South China, *Ecological Indicators*, 32, 294–304, 2013.

625 Xu, X., Ester, M., Kriegel, H.-P., and Sander, J.: A distribution-based clustering algorithm for mining in large spatial databases, in: Proceedings 14th International Conference on Data Engineering, pp. 324–331, IEEE, 1998.