

Bibliography

- Abbott, M. B., Bathurst, J. C., Cunge, J. A., O'Connell, P. E., and Rasmussen, J. (1986). An introduction to the European Hydrological System - Systeme Hydrologique Europeen, "SHE", 1: History and philosophy of a physically-based, distributed modelling system. Journal of hydrology, 87(1):45–59.
- Abramowitz, G., Gupta, H., Pitman, A., Wang, Y., Leuning, R., Cleugh, H., and Hsu, K.-l. (2006). Neural error regression diagnosis (NERD): A tool for model bias identification and prognostic data assimilation. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7(1):160–177.
- Adler, R. F., Huffman, G. J., Chang, A., Ferraro, R., Xie, P.-P., Janowiak, J., Rudolf, B., Schneider, U., Curtis, S., Bolvin, D., et al. (2003). The version-2 global precipitation climatology project (GPCP) monthly precipitation analysis (1979-present). Journal of hydrometeorology, 4(6):1147–1167.
- Ahasan, M. and Khan, A. (2013). Simulation of a flood producing rainfall event of 29 July 2010 over north-west Pakistan using WRF-ARW model. Nat. Hazards, 69(1):351–363.
- Amante, C. and Eakins, B. (2009). ETOPO1 1 Arc-Minute Global Relief Model: Procedures, Data Sources and Analysis. NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS NGDC-24, 19.
- Andermann, C., Bonnet, S., and Gloaguen, R. (2011). Evaluation of precipitation data sets along the Himalayan front. Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 12(7).
- Anders, A. M., Roe, G. H., Hallet, B., Montgomery, D. R., Finnegan, N. J., and Putkonen, J. (2006). Spatial patterns of precipitation and topography in the Himalaya. Geological Society of America Special Papers, 398:39–53.
- Anderson, J. D. and Wendt, J. (1995). Computational fluid dynamics, volume 206. Springer.
- Angevine, W. M. and Mitchell, K. (2001). Evaluation of the NCEP mesoscale Eta model convective boundary layer for air quality applications. Monthly weather review, 129(11):2761–2775.

- Anyah, R. O., Weaver, C. P., Miguez-Macho, G., Fan, Y., and Robock, A. (2008). Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 3. Simulated groundwater influence on coupled land-atmosphere variability. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 113(D7).
- Arnault, J., Wagner, S., Rummeler, T., Fersch, B., Bliefernicht, J., Andresen, S., and Kunstmann, H. (2016). Role of Runoff–Infiltration Partitioning and Resolved Overland Flow on Land–Atmosphere Feedbacks: A Case Study with the WRF-Hydro Coupled Modeling System for West Africa. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 17(5):1489–1516.
- Arnold, D., Schicker, I., and Seibert, P. (2010). High-Resolution Atmospheric Modelling in Complex Terrain for Future Climate Simulations (HiRmod) Report 2010.
- Arnold, J. and Allen, P. (1996). Estimating hydrologic budgets for three illinois watersheds. Journal of hydrology, 176(1):57–77.
- Asencio, N., Stein, J., Chong, M., and Gheusi, F. (2003). Analysis and simulation of local and regional conditions for the rainfall over the Lago Maggiore Target Area during MAP IOP 2b. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 129(588):565–586.
- Ashouri, H., Hsu, K.-L., Sorooshian, S., Braithwaite, D. K., Knapp, K. R., Cecil, L. D., Nelson, B. R., and Prat, O. P. (2014). PERSIANN-CDR: Daily Precipitation Climate Data Record from Multi-Satellite Observations for Hydrological and Climate Studies. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.
- Avisar, R. and Pielke, R. A. (1989). A parameterization of heterogeneous land surfaces for atmospheric numerical models and its impact on regional meteorology. Monthly Weather Review, 117(10):2113–2136.
- Baldauf, M., Seifert, A., Förstner, J., Majewski, D., Raschendorfer, M., and Reinhardt, T. (2011). Operational convective-scale numerical weather prediction with the COSMO model: description and sensitivities. Monthly Weather Review, 139(12):3887–3905.
- Baldocchi, D. and Harley, P. (1995). Scaling carbon dioxide and water vapor exchange from leaf to canopy in a deciduous forest. II. Model testing and application. Plant, Cell & Environment, 18(10):1157–1173.
- Ball, J. T., Woodrow, I. E., and Berry, J. A. (1987). A model predicting stomatal conductance and its contribution to the control of photosynthesis under different environmental conditions. In Progress in photosynthesis research, pages 221–224. Springer.
- Balsamo, G., Pappenberger, F., Dutra, E., Viterbo, P., and Van den Hurk, B. (2011). A revised land hydrology in the ECMWF model: a step towards daily water flux prediction in a fully-closed water cycle. Hydrological Processes, 25(7):1046–1054.

- Barros, A. P., Chiao, S., Lang, T. J., Burbank, D., and Putkonen, J. (2006). From weather to climate - seasonal and interannual variability of storms and implications for erosion processes in the Himalaya. Geological Society of America Special Papers, 398:17–38.
- Barros, A. P. and Kuligowski, R. J. (1998). Orographic effects during a severe wintertime rainstorm in the Appalachian Mountains. Monthly Weather Review, 126(10):2648–2672.
- Barros, A. P. and Lettenmaier, D. P. (1994). Dynamic modeling of orographically induced precipitation. Reviews of geophysics, 32(3):265–284.
- Bates, B., Kundzewicz, Z. W., Wu, S., and Palutikof, J. (2008). climate change and Water: technical Paper VI. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- Battaglia, A., Tanelli, S., Kobayashi, S., Zrnica, D., Hogan, R. J., and Simmer, C. (2010). Multiple-scattering in radar systems: A review. Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer, 111(6):917–947.
- Beard, K. V. and Chuang, C. (1987). A new model for the equilibrium shape of raindrops. Journal of the Atmospheric sciences, 44(11):1509–1524.
- Benjamin, S. G., Grell, G. A., Brown, J. M., Smirnova, T. G., and Bleck, R. (2004). Mesoscale weather prediction with the RUC hybrid isentropic-terrain-following coordinate model. Monthly Weather Review, 132(2):473–494.
- Berberly, E. H. (2001). Mesoscale moisture analysis of the North American monsoon. Journal of Climate, 14(2):121–137.
- Berberly, E. H., Luo, Y., Mitchell, K. E., and Betts, A. K. (2003). Eta model estimated land surface processes and the hydrologic cycle of the Mississippi basin. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 108(D22).
- Berberly, E. H., Mitchell, K. E., Benjamin, S., Smirnova, T., Ritchie, H., Hogue, R., and Radeva, E. (1999). Assessment of land-surface energy budgets from regional and global models. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 104(D16):19329–19348.
- Berberly, E. H., Rasmusson, E. M., and Mitchell, K. E. (1996). Studies of North American continental-scale hydrology using Eta model forecast products. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 101(D3):7305–7319.
- Betts, A. K. (1986). A new convective adjustment scheme. Part I: Observational and theoretical basis. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 112(473):677–691.
- Betts, A. K., Chen, F., Mitchell, K. E., and Janjic, Z. I. (1997). Assessment of the land surface and boundary layer models in two operational versions of the NCEP Eta model using FIFE data. Monthly Weather Review, 125(11):2896–2916.

- Beven, K. and Freer, J. (2001). Equifinality, data assimilation, and uncertainty estimation in mechanistic modelling of complex environmental systems using the GLUE methodology. Journal of hydrology, 249(1):11–29.
- Beven, K., Kirkby, M., Schofield, N., and Tagg, A. (1984). Testing a physically-based flood forecasting model (TOPMODEL) for three UK catchments. Journal of Hydrology, 69(1-4):119–143.
- Beven, K. and Kirkby, M. J. (1979). A physically based, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology/un modèle à base physique de zone d’appel variable de l’hydrologie du bassin versant. Hydrological Sciences Journal, 24(1):43–69.
- Beven, K. and Wood, E. F. (1983). Catchment geomorphology and the dynamics of runoff contributing areas. Journal of Hydrology, 65(1):139–158.
- Bonan, G. B. (1996). Land surface model (LSM version 1.0) for ecological, hydrological, and atmospheric studies: Technical description and users guide. technical note. Technical report, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO (United States). Climate and Global Dynamics Div.
- Bony, S., Webb, M., Stevens, B., Bretherton, C., Klein, S., and Tselioudis, G. (2009). The cloud feedback model intercomparison project: summary of activities and recommendations for advancing assessments of cloud-climate feedbacks. Available online at: http://cfmip.metoffice.com/CFMIP2_experiments_March20th2009.pdf.
- Boone, A., Habets, F., Noilhan, J., Clark, D., Dirmeyer, P., Fox, S., Gusev, Y., Haddeland, I., Koster, R., Lohmann, D., et al. (2004). The rhone-aggregation land surface scheme intercomparison project: An overview. Journal of Climate, 17(1):187–208.
- Bowling, L. C., Lettenmaier, D. P., Nijssen, B., Graham, L. P., Clark, D. B., El Maayar, M., Essery, R., Goers, S., Gusev, Y. M., Habets, F., et al. (2003). Simulation of high-latitude hydrological processes in the Torne–Kalix basin: PILPS Phase 2 (e): 1: Experiment description and summary intercomparisons. Global and Planetary Change, 38(1):1–30.
- Brocca, L., Melone, F., and Moramarco, T. (2011). Distributed rainfall-runoff modelling for flood frequency estimation and flood forecasting. Hydrological Processes, 25(18):2801–2813.
- Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Wagner, W., and Albergel, C. (2013). Scaling and filtering approaches for the use of satellite soil moisture observations. Remote Sensing of Energy Fluxes and Soil Moisture Content, page 411.
- Brown, B. G., Bullock, R., Gotway, J. H., Ahijevych, D., Davis, C., Gilleland, E., and Holland, L. (2007). Application of the MODE object-based verification tool for the evaluation of model precipitation fields. In AMS 22nd conference on weather analysis and forecasting and 18th conference on numerical weather prediction, volume 25, page 29.

- Brubaker, K. L. and Entekhabi, D. (1996). Analysis of feedback mechanisms in land-atmosphere interaction. Water Resources Research, 32(5):1343–1357.
- Bruintjes, R. T., Clark, T. L., and Hall, W. D. (1994). Interactions between topographic airflow and cloud/precipitation development during the passage of a winter storm in Arizona. Journal of the atmospheric sciences, 51(1):48–67.
- Bryan, G. H. and Morrison, H. (2012). Sensitivity of a simulated squall line to horizontal resolution and parameterization of microphysics. Mon. Wea. Rev., 140(1):202–225.
- Büttner, G. (2014). CORINE Land cover and land cover change products. In Land Use and Land Cover Mapping in Europe, pages 55–74. Springer.
- Butts, M., Drews, M., Larsen, M. A., Lerer, S., Rasmussen, S. H., Grooss, J., Overgaard, J., Refsgaard, J. C., Christensen, O. B., and Christensen, J. H. (2014). Embedding complex hydrology in the regional climate system—Dynamic coupling across different modelling domains. Advances in Water Resources, 74:166–184.
- Buzzi, A., Tartaglione, N., and Malguzzi, P. (1998). Numerical simulations of the 1994 Piedmont flood: Role of orography and moist processes. Monthly Weather Review, 126(9):2369–2383.
- Bytheway, J. L. and Kummerow, C. D. (2013). Inferring the uncertainty of satellite precipitation estimates in data-sparse regions over land. J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 118(17):9524–9533.
- Camici, S., Romano, E., Preziosi, E., A., T., Brocca, L., and Moramarco, T. (2010). Analisi di trend e ciclicità di serie storiche pluviometriche per la modellazione stocastica di scenari di precipitazione in condizioni di cambiamenti climatici (submitted). In Atti delle giornate di studio "Impatto delle modificazioni climatiche su rischi e risorse naturali. Strategie e criteri d'intervento per l'adattamento e la mitigazione", Bari, 10 Marzo 2011.
- Caracena, F., Maddox, R. A., Hoxit, L. R., and Chappell, C. F. (1979). Mesoanalysis of the Big Thompson storm. Monthly Weather Review, 107(1):1–17.
- Carpenter, T. M. and Georgakakos, K. P. (2004). Continuous streamflow simulation with the HRCDHM distributed hydrologic model. Journal of Hydrology, 298(1):61–79.
- Carrera, J. and Neuman, S. P. (1986). Estimation of aquifer parameters under transient and steady state conditions: 2. uniqueness, stability, and solution algorithms. Water Resources Research, 22(2):211–227.
- Castelli, F. (1995). Atmosphere modelling and hydrology prediction uncertainty. In Proc. US-Italy Research Workshop on Hydrometeorology: Impacts and Management of Extreme Floods, Perugia, Italy, Water Resources Research and Documentation Center of Colorado State University, USA, pages 13–17.

- Chen, F. (2005). Variability in global land surface energy budgets during 1987–1988 simulated by an off-line land surface model. Climate dynamics, 24(7-8):667–684.
- Chen, F. and Dudhia, J. (2001). Coupling an advanced land surface-hydrology model with the Penn State-NCAR MM5 modeling system. Part I: Model implementation and sensitivity. Monthly Weather Review, 129(4):569–585.
- Chen, F., Janjić, Z., and Mitchell, K. (1997a). Impact of atmospheric surface-layer parameterizations in the new land-surface scheme of the NCEP mesoscale Eta model. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 85(3):391–421.
- Chen, F., Manning, K. W., LeMone, M. A., Trier, S. B., Alfieri, J. G., Roberts, R., Tewari, M., Niyogi, D., Horst, T. W., Oncley, S. P., et al. (2007). Description and evaluation of the characteristics of the NCAR high-resolution land data assimilation system. Journal of applied Meteorology and Climatology, 46(6):694–713.
- Chen, F. and Mitchell, K. (1999). Using the GEWEX/ISLSCP forcing data to simulate global soil moisture fields and hydrological cycle for 1987-1988. Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. II, 77(1B):167–182.
- Chen, F., Mitchell, K., Schaake, J., Xue, Y., Pan, H.-L., Koren, V., Duan, Q. Y., Ek, M., and Betts, A. (1996). Modeling of land surface evaporation by four schemes and comparison with FIFE observations. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 101(D3):7251–7268.
- Chen, T. H., Henderson-Sellers, A., Milly, P., Pitman, A., Beljaars, A., Polcher, J., Abramopoulos, F., Boone, A., Chang, S., Chen, F., et al. (1997b). Cabauw experimental results from the project for intercomparison of land-surface parameterization schemes. Journal of Climate, 10(6):1194–1215.
- Chen, X. and Hu, Q. (2004). Groundwater influences on soil moisture and surface evaporation. Journal of Hydrology, 297(1):285–300.
- Chou, M.-D. and Suarez, M. J. (1999). A solar radiation parameterization for atmospheric studies. NASA Tech. Memo, 104606:40.
- Chou, M.-D., Suarez, M. J., Liang, X.-Z., Yan, M. M.-H., and Cote, C. (2001). A thermal infrared radiation parameterization for atmospheric studies.
- Christensen, J. H., Christensen, O. B., Lopez, P., van Meijgaard, E., and Botzet, M. (1996). The HIRHAM4 regional atmospheric climate model. DMI Scientific report, 964.
- Clark, A. J., Gallus Jr, W. A., Xue, M., and Kong, F. (2009). A comparison of precipitation forecast skill between small convection-allowing and large convection-parameterizing ensembles. Weather and forecasting, 24(4):1121–1140.

- Clark, M. P. and Slater, A. G. (2006). Probabilistic quantitative precipitation estimation in complex terrain. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7(1):3–22.
- Collatz, G. J., Ball, J. T., Grivet, C., and Berry, J. A. (1991). Physiological and environmental regulation of stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration: a model that includes a laminar boundary layer. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 54(2):107–136.
- Collatz, G. J., Ribas-Carbo, M., and Berry, J. (1992). Coupled photosynthesis-stomatal conductance model for leaves of C4 plants. Functional Plant Biology, 19(5):519–538.
- Costantini, S., Berni, N., Pandolfo, C., Stelluti, M., Zauri, R., Ponziani, F., Governatori Leonardi, F., Francioni, M., Formica, A., Marcellini, D., and Casini, L. (2012). Evento Alluvionale 11-14 Novembre - Rapporto d'evento.
- Courant, R., K. O. F. and Lewy, H. (1928). Über die Differenzgleichungen der Mathematischen Physik. Math. Ann, 100:1–32.
- Courant, R. et al. (1943). Variational methods for the solution of problems of equilibrium and vibrations. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 49(1):1–23.
- Cuenca, R. H., Ek, M., and Mahrt, L. (1996). Impact of soil water property parameterization on atmospheric boundary layer simulation. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 101(D3):7269–7277.
- DAAC), O. R. N. L. D. A. A. C. O. (2016). Fluxnet web page. [Online; accessed 9-December-2016].
- Daamen, C. C. (1997). Two source model of surface fluxes for millet fields in Niger. Agricultural and forest meteorology, 83(3):205–230.
- Daamen, C. C. and Simmonds, L. P. (1996). Measurement of evaporation from bare soil and its estimation using surface resistance. Water Resources Research, 32(5):1393–1402.
- Davis, C., Brown, B., and Bullock, R. (2006a). Object-based verification of precipitation forecasts. Part I: Methodology and application to mesoscale rain areas. Mon. Wea. Rev., 134(7):1772–1784.
- Davis, C., Brown, B., and Bullock, R. (2006b). Object-based verification of precipitation forecasts. Part II: Application to convective rain systems. Mon. Wea. Rev., 134(7):1785–1795.
- Davis, R. E. (1978). Predictability of sea level pressure anomalies over the North Pacific Ocean. Journal of Physical Oceanography, 8(2):233–246.

- Dee, D., Uppala, S., Simmons, A., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., et al. (2011a). The ERA-Interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 137(656):553–597.
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., HÅslm, E. V., Isaksen, L., KÃllberg, P., KÃhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., ThÃlpaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F. (2011b). The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 137(656):553–597.
- Delire, C., de Noblet-Ducoudr , N., Sima, A., and Gouirand, I. (2011). Vegetation dynamics enhancing long-term climate variability confirmed by two models. Journal of Climate, 24(9):2238–2257.
- Dickinson, R. E. (1983). Land surface processes and climate - Surface albedos and energy balance. Advances in geophysics, 25:305–353.
- Dickinson, R. E., Shaikh, M., Bryant, R., and Graumlich, L. (1998). Interactive canopies for a climate model. Journal of Climate, 11(11):2823–2836.
- Dingman, S. L. (2015). Physical hydrology. Waveland press.
- Dirmeyer, P. A., Dolman, A., and Sato, N. (1999). The pilot phase of the global soil wetness project. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 80(5):851.
- Dirmeyer, P. A., Gao, X., Zhao, M., Guo, Z., Oki, T., and Hanasaki, N. (2006). GSWP-2: Multimodel analysis and implications for our perception of the land surface. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 87(10):1381–1397.
- Doherty, J. and Johnston, J. M. (2003). Methodologies for calibration and predictive analysis of a watershed model.
- Dudhia, J. (1989). Numerical study of convection observed during the winter monsoon experiment using a mesoscale two-dimensional model. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 46(20):3077–3107.
- Dudhia, J. (1996). A multi-layer soil temperature model for MM5. In Preprints, The Sixth PSU/NCAR mesoscale model users’ workshop, pages 22–24.
- Dudhia, J., Hong, S.-Y., and Lim, K.-S. (2008). A new method for representing mixed-phase particle fall speeds in bulk microphysics parameterizations. Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan, 86A:33–44.

- Ek, M., Mitchell, K., Lin, Y., Rogers, E., Grunmann, P., Koren, V., Gayno, G., and Tarpley, J. (2003). Implementation of noah land surface model advances in the National Centers for Environmental Prediction operational mesoscale Eta model. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 108(D22).
- Entin, J. (1999). Evaluation of global soil wetness project soil moisture simulations. J. Meteor. Soc. Japan, 77:183–191.
- Fan, Y., Miguez-Macho, G., Weaver, C. P., Walko, R., and Robock, A. (2007). Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 1. Water table observations and equilibrium water table simulations. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112(D10).
- Fels, S. B. and Schwarzkopf, M. (1981). An efficient, accurate algorithm for calculating CO₂ 15-/ m band cooling rates. J. Geophys. Res., 86:1205–1232.
- Ferraris, L., Rudari, R., and Siccardi, F. (2002). The uncertainty in the prediction of flash floods in the northern Mediterranean environment. Journal of hydrometeorology, 3(6):714–727.
- Fersch, B., Gochis, D. J., Kunstmann, H., Mendicino, G., and Senatore, A. (2014). Book of Abstracts of the 1st European Fully Coupled Atmospheric-Hydrological Modeling and WRF-Hydro Users Workshop, Univ. of Calabria, Rende (CS), Italy. In Available at <http://cesmma.unical.it/wrf-ydro2014/BookOfAbstracts.pdf>.
- Field, C. B. (2012). Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: special report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Cambridge University Press.
- Fiori, E., Comellas, A., Molini, L., Rebora, N., Siccardi, F., Gochis, D., Tanelli, S., and Parodi, A. (2014). Analysis and hindcast simulations of an extreme rainfall event in the Mediterranean area: the Genoa 2011 case. Atmospheric Research, 138:13–29.
- Fowler, H. and Archer, D. (2006). Conflicting signals of climatic change in the Upper Indus Basin. Journal of Climate, 19(17):4276–4293.
- Friedl, M. A., McIver, D. K., Hodges, J. C., Zhang, X., Muchoney, D., Strahler, A. H., Woodcock, C. E., Gopal, S., Schneider, A., Cooper, A., et al. (2002). Global land cover mapping from MODIS: algorithms and early results. Remote Sensing of Environment, 83(1):287–302.
- Galarneau Jr, T. J., Hamill, T. M., Dole, R. M., and Perlwitz, J. (2012). A multiscale analysis of the extreme weather events over Western Russia and Northern Pakistan during July 2010. Mon. Wea. Rev., 140(5):1639–1664.
- Gallus Jr, W. A. and Bresch, J. F. (2006). Comparison of impacts of WRF dynamic core, physics package, and initial conditions on warm season rainfall forecasts. Monthly Weather Review, 134(9):2632–2641.

- Gao, Y., Fu, J., Drake, J., Liu, Y., and Lamarque, J. (2012). Projected changes of extreme weather events in the eastern United States based on a high resolution climate modeling system. Environmental Research Letters, 7(4):044025.
- Gerard, L. (2007). An integrated package for subgrid convection, clouds and precipitation compatible with meso-gamma scales. Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 133(624):711–730.
- Givati, A., Gochis, D., Rummeler, T., and Kunstmann, H. (2016). Comparing One-Way and Two-Way Coupled Hydrometeorological Forecasting Systems for Flood Forecasting in the Mediterranean Region. Hydrology, 3(2):19.
- Gochis, D. and Chen, F. (2003). Hydrological enhancements to the community Noah land surface model. NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-454+ STR.
- Gochis, D., Yu, W., and Yates, D. (2013). The WRF-Hydro model technical description and user’s guide, version 1.0. NCAR Technical Document, 120.
- Goodall, J. L., Saint, K. D., Ercan, M. B., Briley, L. J., Murphy, S., You, H., DeLuca, C., and Rood, R. B. (2013). Coupling climate and hydrological models: Interoperability through Web Services. Environmental modelling & software, 46:250–259.
- Grell, G. A. (1993). Prognostic evaluation of assumptions used by cumulus parameterizations. Monthly Weather Review, 121(3):764–787.
- Grell, G. A. and Dévényi, D. (2002). A generalized approach to parameterizing convection combining ensemble and data assimilation techniques. Geophysical Research Letters, 29(14).
- Grell, G. A., Dudhia, J., Stauffer, D. R., et al. (1994). A description of the fifth-generation Penn State/NCAR mesoscale model (MM5).
- Gu, L., Fuentes, J. D., Shugart, H. H., Staebler, R. M., and Black, T. A. (1999). Responses of net ecosystem exchanges of carbon dioxide to changes in cloudiness: Results from two North American deciduous forests. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 104(D24):31421–31434.
- Guo, Z., Dirmeyer, P. A., Koster, R. D., Sud, Y., Bonan, G., Oleson, K. W., Chan, E., Verseghy, D., Cox, P., Gordon, C., et al. (2006). GLACE: the global land-atmosphere coupling experiment. Part II: analysis. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7(4):611–625.
- Gutman, G. and Ignatov, A. (1998). The derivation of the green vegetation fraction from NOAA/AVHRR data for use in numerical weather prediction models. International Journal of remote sensing, 19(8):1533–1543.
- Han, J. and Pan, H.-L. (2011). Revision of convection and vertical diffusion schemes in the NCEP global forecast system. Weather and Forecasting, 26(4):520–533.

- Haynes, J., Luo, Z., Stephens, G., Marchand, R., and Bodas-Salcedo, A. (2007). A multi-purpose radar simulation package: QuickBeam. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 88(11):1723–1727.
- Heikkilä, U., Sandvik, A., and Sorteberg, A. (2011). Dynamical downscaling of ERA-40 in complex terrain using the WRF regional climate model. Climate Dynamics, 37(7-8):1551–1564.
- Henderson-Sellers, A., Pitman, A., Love, P., Irannejad, P., and Chen, T. (1995). The project for intercomparison of land surface parameterization schemes (PILPS): Phases 2 and 3. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 76(4):489–503.
- Herrera, S., Fernández, J., and Gutiérrez, J. (2015). Update of the Spain02 gridded observational dataset for EURO-CORDEX evaluation: assessing the effect of the interpolation methodology. Int. J. Climatol.
- Hinkelman, L. M., Ackerman, T. P., and Marchand, R. T. (1999). An evaluation of NCEP Eta model predictions of surface energy budget and cloud properties by comparison with measured ARM data. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 104(D16):19535–19549.
- Hobbs, P. V. and Persson, P. O. G. (1982). The mesoscale and microscale structure and organization of clouds and precipitation in midlatitude cyclones. part v: The substructure of narrow cold-frontal rainbands. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 39(2):280–295.
- Hogue, T. S., Sorooshian, S., Gupta, H., Holz, A., and Braatz, D. (2000). A multistep automatic calibration scheme for river forecasting models. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 1(6):524–542.
- Holton, J. R. and Hakim, G. J. (2012). An introduction to dynamic meteorology, volume 88. Academic press.
- Hong, C.-C., Hsu, H.-H., Lin, N.-H., and Chiu, H. (2011). Roles of European blocking and tropical-extratropical interaction in the 2010 Pakistan flooding. Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(13).
- Hong, S.-Y., Dudhia, J., and Chen, S.-H. (2004). A revised approach to ice microphysical processes for the bulk parameterization of clouds and precipitation. Monthly Weather Review, 132(1):103–120.
- Hong, S.-Y. and Lim, J.-O. J. (2006). The WRF single-moment 6-class microphysics scheme (WSM6). J. Korean Meteor. Soc, 42(2):129–151.
- Hong, S.-Y., Noh, Y., and Dudhia, J. (2006). A new vertical diffusion package with an explicit treatment of entrainment processes. Mon. Wea. Rev., 134(9):2318–2341.

- Hong, S.-Y. and Pan, H.-L. (1996). Nonlocal boundary layer vertical diffusion in a medium-range forecast model. Monthly weather review, 124(10):2322–2339.
- Houze Jr, R., Rasmussen, K., Medina, S., Brodzik, S., and Romatschke, U. (2011). Anomalous atmospheric events leading to the summer 2010 floods in Pakistan. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 92(3):291–298.
- Houze Jr, R. A., Hobbs, P. V., Biswas, K. R., and Davis, W. M. (1976). Mesoscale structure of rainfall in occluded cyclones. In Sixth Conference on Weather Forecasting and Analysis of the American Meteorological Society, May 10-13, 1976, Albany, New York: Preprints, page 310. American Meteorological Society.
- Huffman, G. J. (1997). Estimates of root-mean-square random error for finite samples of estimated precipitation. J. Appl. Meteor., 36(9):1191–1201.
- ICAO (1993). Manual of the ICAO Standard Atmosphere (extended to 80 kilometres (262 500 feet). volume Doc 7488-CD. Cambridge university press.
- Ivanov, V. Y., Vivoni, E. R., Bras, R. L., and Entekhabi, D. (2004). Preserving high-resolution surface and rainfall data in operational-scale basin hydrology: a fully-distributed physically-based approach. Journal of Hydrology, 298(1):80–111.
- Janjic, Z. I. (1984). Nonlinear advection schemes and energy cascade on semi-staggered grids. Monthly Weather Review, 112(6):1234–1245.
- Janjic, Z. I. (1994). The step-mountain eta coordinate model: Further developments of the convection, viscous sublayer, and turbulence closure schemes. Monthly Weather Review, 122(5):927–945.
- Jarvis, A., Rubiano, J., and Cuero, A. (2004). Comparison of SRTM derived DEM vs. topographic map derived DEM in the region of Dapa. International Center for Tropical Agriculture CIAT.
- Jasper, K., Gurtz, J., and Lang, H. (2002). Advanced flood forecasting in Alpine watersheds by coupling meteorological observations and forecasts with a distributed hydrological model. Journal of hydrology, 267(1):40–52.
- Jones, J. E. and Woodward, C. S. (2001). Newton–Krylov-multigrid solvers for large-scale, highly heterogeneous, variably saturated flow problems. Advances in Water Resources, 24(7):763–774.
- Julien, P. Y., Saghafian, B., and Ogden, F. L. (1995). Raster-based hydrologic modeling of spatially-varied surface runoff1. JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association, 31(3):523–536.
- Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Ciais, P., Seneviratne, S. I., Sheffield, J., Goulden, M. L., Bonan, G., Cescatti, A., Chen, J., De Jeu, R., et al. (2010). Recent decline in the global land evapotranspiration trend due to limited moisture supply. Nature, 467(7318):951–954.

- Kain, J. S. and Fritsch, J. M. (1990). A one-dimensional entraining/detraining plume model and its application in convective parameterization. J. Atmos. Sci., 47(23):2784–2802.
- Kain, J. S., Weiss, S. J., Bright, D. R., Baldwin, M. E., Levit, J. J., Carbin, G. W., Schwartz, C. S., Weisman, M. L., Droegemeier, K. K., Weber, D. B., et al. (2008). Some practical considerations regarding horizontal resolution in the first generation of operational convection-allowing NWP. Wea. Forecasting, 23(5):931–952.
- Kain, J. S., Weiss, S. J., Levit, J. J., Baldwin, M. E., and Bright, D. R. (2006). Examination of convection-allowing configurations of the WRF model for the prediction of severe convective weather: The SPC/NSSL Spring Program 2004. Wea. Forecasting, 21(2):167–181.
- Kelsch, M., Caporali, E., and Lanza, L. G. (2001). Hydrometeorology of flash floods. In Coping with flash floods, pages 19–35. Springer.
- Kerkhoven, E., Gan, T. Y., Shiiba, M., Reuter, G., and Tanaka, K. (2006). A comparison of cumulus parameterization schemes in a numerical weather prediction model for a monsoon rainfall event. Hydrological processes, 20(9):1961–1978.
- Kessler, E. (1969). On the distribution and continuity of water substance in atmospheric circulation.
- Kim, C. and Entekhabi, D. (1998). Feedbacks in the land-surface and mixed-layer energy budgets. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 88(1):1–21.
- Koren, V., Reed, S., Smith, M., Zhang, Z., and Seo, D.-J. (2004). Hydrology laboratory research modeling system (HL-RMS) of the US national weather service. Journal of Hydrology, 291(3):297–318.
- Koren, V., Schaake, J., Mitchell, K., Duan, Q.-Y., Chen, F., and Baker, J. (1999). A parameterization of snowpack and frozen ground intended for NCEP weather and climate models. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 104(D16):19569–19585.
- Koster, R. D., Chang, Y., and Schubert, S. D. (2014). A mechanism for land–atmosphere feedback involving planetary wave structures. Journal of Climate, 27(24):9290–9301.
- Koster, R. D., Mahanama, S., Yamada, T., Balsamo, G., Berg, A., Boisserie, M., Dirmeyer, P., Doblus-Reyes, F., Drewitt, G., Gordon, C., et al. (2010). Contribution of land surface initialization to subseasonal forecast skill: First results from a multi-model experiment. Geophysical Research Letters, 37(2).
- Krige, D. (1966). Two-dimensional weighted moving average trend surfaces for ore-evaluation. Journal of the South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 66:13–38.

- Krupnick, A., Morgenstern, R., Batz, M., Nelson, P., Burtraw, D., Shih, J.-S., and McWilliams, M. (2006). Not a sure thing: Making regulatory choices under uncertainty. Resources for the Future Washington, DC.
- Kummerow, C., Barnes, W., Kozu, T., Shiue, J., and Simpson, J. (1998). The tropical rainfall measuring mission (TRMM) sensor package. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 15(3):809–817.
- Kundu, P. K., Cohen, I. M., and Dowling, D. R. (2015). Fluid Mechanics. Academic Press.
- Lanza, L. and Siccardi, F. (1995). Hydrometeorological hazard in a changing perspective. Surveys in Geophysics, 16(2):137–139.
- Laprise, R. (1992). The Euler equations of motion with hydrostatic pressure as an independent variable. Monthly weather review, 120(1):197–207.
- Larsen, M. A. D., Refsgaard, J., Drews, M., Butts, M. B., Jensen, K., Christensen, J., and Christensen, O. (2014). Results from a full coupling of the HIRHAM regional climate model and the MIKE SHE hydrological model for a Danish catchment. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(11):4733–4749.
- Lim, K.-S. S. and Hong, S.-Y. (2010). Development of an effective double-moment cloud microphysics scheme with prognostic cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) for weather and climate models. Mon. Wea. Rev., 138(5):1587–1612.
- Lin, Y.-L., Farley, R. D., and Orville, H. D. (1983). Bulk parameterization of the snow field in a cloud model. Journal of Climate and Applied Meteorology, 22(6):1065–1092.
- Lorenz, E. N. (1969a). The predictability of a flow which possesses many scales of motion. Tellus, 21(3):289–307.
- Lorenz, E. N. (1969b). Three approaches to atmospheric predictability. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 50(3454):349.
- Loveland, T. R., Merchant, J. W., Brown, J. F., Ohlen, D. O., Reed, B. C., Olson, P., and Hutchinson, J. (1995). Seasonal land-cover regions of the United States. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 85(2):339–355.
- Lowrey, M. R. K. and Yang, Z.-L. (2008). Assessing the capability of a regional-scale weather model to simulate extreme precipitation patterns and flooding in central Texas. Weather and Forecasting, 23(6):1102–1126.
- Maddox, R. A., Hoxit, L. R., Chappell, C. F., and Caracena, F. (1978). Comparison of meteorological aspects of the Big Thompson and Rapid City flash floods. Monthly Weather Review, 106(3):375–389.
- Mahrt, L. and Pan, H. (1984). A two-layer model of soil hydrology. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 29(1):1–20.

- Marshall, C. H., Crawford, K. C., Mitchell, K. E., and Stensrud, D. J. (2003). The impact of the land surface physics in the operational NCEP Eta model on simulating the diurnal cycle: Evaluation and testing using Oklahoma Mesonet data. Weather and forecasting, 18(5):748–768.
- Martinec, J. and Rango, A. (1989). Merits of statistical criteria for the performance of hydrological models1.
- Matheron, G. (1967). Kriging or polynomial interpolation procedures. CIMM Transactions, 70:240–244.
- Matrosov, S. Y., Shupe, M. D., and Djalalova, I. V. (2008). Snowfall retrievals using millimeter-wavelength cloud radars. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 47(3):769–777.
- Mausser, W. and Bach, H. (2009). PROMET—Large scale distributed hydrological modelling to study the impact of climate change on the water flows of mountain watersheds. Journal of Hydrology, 376(3):362–377.
- Mausser, W. and Schädlich, S. (1998). Modelling the spatial distribution of evapotranspiration on different scales using remote sensing data. Journal of Hydrology, 212:250–267.
- Maussion, F., Scherer, D., Finkelnburg, R., Richters, J., Yang, W., and Yao, T. (2011). WRF simulation of a precipitation event over the Tibetan Plateau, China—an assessment using remote sensing and ground observations. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 15:1795–1817.
- Maxwell, R. M., Chow, F. K., and Kollet, S. J. (2007). The groundwater–land-surface–atmosphere connection: Soil moisture effects on the atmospheric boundary layer in fully-coupled simulations. Advances in Water Resources, 30(12):2447–2466.
- Maxwell, R. M. and Kollet, S. J. (2008). Interdependence of groundwater dynamics and land-energy feedbacks under climate change. Nature Geoscience, 1(10):665–669.
- Medina, S. and Houze, R. A. (2003). Air motions and precipitation growth in Alpine storms. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 129(588):345–371.
- Mengelkamp, H.-T., Warrach, K., and Raschke, E. (1999). SEWAB—a parameterization of the surface energy and water balance for atmospheric and hydrologic models. Advances in Water Resources, 23(2):165–175.
- Miguez-Macho, G., Fan, Y., Weaver, C. P., Walko, R., and Robock, A. (2007). Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 2. formulation, validation, and soil moisture simulation. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112(D13).
- Milbrandt, J. and Yau, M. (2005). A multimoment bulk microphysics parameterization. Part I: Analysis of the role of the spectral shape parameter. Journal of the atmospheric sciences, 62(9):3051–3064.

- Miller, D. A. and White, R. A. (1998). A conterminous United States multilayer soil characteristics dataset for regional climate and hydrology modeling. Earth interactions, 2(2):1–26.
- Minasny, B. and McBratney, A. B. (2005). The matérn function as a general model for soil variograms. Geoderma, 128(3):192–207.
- Mishchenko, M. I. and Travis, L. D. (1998). Capabilities and limitations of a current FORTRAN implementation of the T-matrix method for randomly oriented, rotationally symmetric scatterers. Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer, 60(3):309–324.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). The community Noah land-surface model (LSM). User, s Guide, Public Release Version, 2(7):1.
- Mitchell, K. E., Lohmann, D., Houser, P. R., Wood, E. F., Schaake, J. C., Robock, A., Cosgrove, B. A., Sheffield, J., Duan, Q., Luo, L., et al. (2004). The multi-institution North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS): Utilizing multiple GCIP products and partners in a continental distributed hydrological modeling system. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 109(D7).
- Mlawer, E. J., Taubman, S. J., Brown, P. D., Iacono, M. J., and Clough, S. A. (1997). Radiative transfer for inhomogeneous atmospheres: RRTM, a validated correlated-k model for the longwave. J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres (1984–2012), 102(D14):16663–16682.
- Monteith, J. (1965). Light distribution and photosynthesis in field crops. Annals of Botany, 29(1):17–37.
- Monteith, J. and Unsworth, M. (2007). Principles of environmental physics. Academic Press.
- Morbidelli, M., Saltalippi, C., Cifrodelli, M., Flammini, A., Corradini, C., Brocca, L., and Stelluti, M. (2016). Analisi delle precipitazioni intense in Umbria. Morlacchi Editore U. P.
- Moreno, H. A., Vivoni, E. R., and Gochis, D. J. (2013). Limits to flood forecasting in the Colorado Front Range for two summer convection periods using radar nowcasting and a distributed hydrologic model. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 14(4):1075–1097.
- Morgan, M. G., Henrion, M., and Small, M. (1992). Uncertainty: a guide to dealing with uncertainty in quantitative risk and policy analysis. Cambridge university press.
- Morrison, H., Morales, A., and Villanueva-Birriel, C. (2015). Concurrent sensitivities of an idealized deep convective storm to parameterization of microphysics, horizontal grid resolution, and environmental static stability. Mon. Wea. Rev., (2015).

- Moser, B., Gallus, W., Mantilla, R., and Krajewski, W. (2013). The use of radar data assimilation to improve warm season heavy rainfall forecasts for use in hydrologic models. In EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts, volume 15, page 3513.
- National Research Council (US). Committee to Assess NEXRAD Flash Flood Forecasting Capabilities at Sulphur Mountain, California (2005). Flash Flood Forecasting Over Complex Terrain: With an Assessment of the Sulphur Mountain NEXRAD. National Academies Press.
- Neale, R. B., Chen, C.-C., Gettelman, A., Lauritzen, P. H., Park, S., Williamson, D. L., Conley, A. J., Garcia, R., Kinnison, D., Lamarque, J.-F., et al. (2010). Description of the NCAR community atmosphere model (CAM 5.0). NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-486+ STR.
- Neiman, P. J., Martin Ralph, F., Persson, P. O. G., White, A. B., Jorgensen, D. P., and Kingsmill, D. E. (2004). Modification of fronts and precipitation by coastal blocking during an intense landfalling winter storm in southern California: Observations during CALJET. Monthly weather review, 132(1):242–273.
- Neiman, P. J., Ralph, F. M., White, A., Kingsmill, D., and Persson, P. (2002). The statistical relationship between upslope flow and rainfall in California’s coastal mountains: Observations during CALJET. Monthly Weather Review, 130(6):1468–1492.
- Neuman, S. P. (2003). Maximum likelihood Bayesian averaging of uncertain model predictions. Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment, 17(5):291–305.
- Nie, J., Shaevitz, D. A., and Sobel, A. H. (2016). Forcings and feedbacks on convection in the 2010 pakistan flood: Modeling extreme precipitation with interactive large-scale ascent. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems.
- Niu, G.-Y. and Yang, Z.-L. (2004). Effects of vegetation canopy processes on snow surface energy and mass balances. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 109(D23).
- Niu, G.-Y. and Yang, Z.-L. (2006). Effects of frozen soil on snowmelt runoff and soil water storage at a continental scale. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 7(5):937–952.
- Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Dickinson, R. E., and Gulden, L. E. (2005). A simple TOPMODEL-based runoff parameterization (SIMTOP) for use in global climate models. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 110(D21).
- Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Dickinson, R. E., Gulden, L. E., and Su, H. (2007). Development of a simple groundwater model for use in climate models and evaluation with Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment data. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112(D7).
- Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Mitchell, K. E., Chen, F., Ek, M. B., Barlage, M., Kumar, A., Manning, K., Niyogi, D., Rosero, E., et al. (2011). The community noah land surface

- model with multiparameterization options (Noah-MP): 1. Model description and evaluation with local-scale measurements. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 116(D12).
- Noilhan, J. and Mahfouf, J.-F. (1996). The ISBA land surface parameterisation scheme. Global and planetary Change, 13(1):145–159.
- Ogden, F. L. and Saghafian, B. (1997). Green and ampt infiltration with redistribution. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 123(5):386–393.
- Olson, D. A., Junker, N. W., and Korty, B. (1995). Evaluation of 33 years of quantitative precipitation forecasting at the NMC. Weather and Forecasting, 10(3):498–511.
- Orlanski, I. (1975). A rational subdivision of scales for atmospheric processes. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 56:527–530.
- Overgaard, J., Rosbjerg, D., and Butts, M. (2006). Land-surface modelling in hydrological perspective? a review. Biogeosciences, 3(2):229–241.
- Overgaard, J., M. B. B. and Rosbjerg, D. (2007). Improved scenario prediction by using coupled hydrological and atmospheric models. In Quantification and Reduction of Predictive Uncertainty for Sustainable Water Resources Management, volume 313, pages 242–248.
- Palazzi, E., Hardenberg, J., and Provenzale, A. (2013a). Precipitation in the Hindu-Kush Karakoram Himalaya: Observations and future scenarios. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 118(1):85–100.
- Palazzi, E., von Hardenberg, J., and Provenzale, A. (2013b). Precipitation in the Hindu-Kush Karakoram Himalaya: Observations and future scenarios. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 118:85–100.
- Pan, H.-L. and Mahrt, L. (1987). Interaction between soil hydrology and boundary-layer development. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 38(1-2):185–202.
- Parodi, A. and Tanelli, S. (2010). Influence of turbulence parameterizations on high-resolution numerical modeling of tropical convection observed during the TC4 field campaign. J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 115(D10).
- Penman, H. L. (1948). Natural evaporation from open water, bare soil and grass. In Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, volume 193, pages 120–145. The Royal Society.
- Pieri, A. B., von Hardenberg, J., Parodi, A., and Provenzale, A. (2015). Sensitivity of Precipitation Statistics to Resolution, Microphysics, and Convective Parameterization: A Case Study with the High-Resolution WRF Climate Model over Europe. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 16(4):1857–1872.

- Pineda, N., Jorba, O., Jorge, J., and Baldasano, J. (2004). Using NOAA AVHRR and SPOT VGT data to estimate surface parameters: application to a mesoscale meteorological model. International journal of remote sensing, 25(1):129–143.
- Pinty, J.-P., Mascart, P., Richard, E., and Rosset, R. (1989). An investigation of mesoscale flows induced by vegetation inhomogeneities using an evapotranspiration model calibrated against HAPEX-MOBILHY data. Journal of Applied Meteorology, 28(9):976–992.
- Prakash, S., Mitra, A. K., Rajagopal, E., and Pai, D. (2015). Assessment of TRMM-based TMPA-3B42 and GSMaP precipitation products over India for the peak southwest monsoon season. International Journal of Climatology.
- Prater, B. and Evans, J. (2002). Sensitivity of modeled tropical cyclone track and structure of hurricane Irene (1999) to the convective parameterization scheme. Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics, 80(1-4):103–115.
- Qu, W., Henderson-Sellers, A., Pitman, A., Chen, T., Abramopoulos, F., Boone, A., Chang, S., Chen, F., Dai, Y., Dickinson, R., et al. (1998). Sensitivity of latent heat flux from PILPS land-surface schemes to perturbations of surface air temperature. Journal of the atmospheric sciences, 55(11):1909–1927.
- Ralph, F. M., Neiman, P. J., Wick, G. A., Gutman, S. I., Dettinger, M. D., Cayan, D. R., and White, A. B. (2006). Flooding on California’s Russian River: Role of atmospheric rivers. Geophysical Research Letters, 33(13).
- Ramsay, B. H. (1998). The interactive multisensor snow and ice mapping system. Hydrological Processes, 12(10):1537–1546.
- Rasmussen, K. L., Hill, A. J., Toma, V. E., Zuluaga, M. D., Webster, P. J., and Houze, R. A. (2014). Multiscale analysis of three consecutive years of anomalous flooding in Pakistan. Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.
- Reed, S., Schaake, J., and Zhang, Z. (2007). A distributed hydrologic model and threshold frequency-based method for flash flood forecasting at ungauged locations. Journal of Hydrology, 337(3):402–420.
- Refsgaard, J. C., Storm, B., and Refsgaard, A. (1995). Recent developments of the Systeme Hydrologique Europeen(SHE) towards the MIKE SHE. International Association of Hydrological Sciences, Publication, (231):427–434.
- Reinking, R. F. and Boatman, J. F. (1986). Upslope precipitation events. In Mesoscale Meteorology and Forecasting, pages 437–471. Springer.
- Richard, E., Cosma, S., Benoit, R., Binder, P., Buzzi, A., and Kaufmann, P. (2003). Inter-comparison of mesoscale meteorological models for precipitation forecasting. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 7(6):799–811.

- Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. (2000). Ecohydrology: A hydrologic perspective of climate-soil-vegetation dynamics. Water Resources Research, 36(1):3–9.
- Rogers, E., Black, T., Ferrier, B., Lin, Y., Parrish, D., and DiMego, G. (2001). NCEP Meso Eta Analysis and Forecast System: Increase in resolution, new cloud microphysics, modified precipitation assimilation, modified 3DVAR analysis. NWS Tech. Proced. Bull., 488:1–15.
- Rotunno, R. and Ferretti, R. (2001). Mechanisms of intense Alpine rainfall. Journal of the atmospheric sciences, 58(13):1732–1749.
- Santanello Jr, J. A., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Kennedy, A., and Kumar, S. V. (2013). Diagnosing the nature of land–atmosphere coupling: a case study of dry/wet extremes in the US Southern Great Plains. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 14(1):3–24.
- Sardar, S., Ahmad, I., Raza, S. S., and Irfan, N. (2012). Simulation of south Asian physical environment using various cumulus parameterization schemes of MM5. Meteor. Appl., 19(2):140–151.
- Schaake, J. C., Koren, V. I., Duan, Q.-Y., Mitchell, K., and Chen, F. (1996). Simple water balance model for estimating runoff at different spatial and temporal scales. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 101(D3):7461–7475.
- Schlosser, C. A., Slater, A. G., Robock, A., Pitman, A. J., Vinnikov, K. Y., Henderson-Sellers, A., Speranskaya, N. A., and Mitchell, K. (2000). Simulations of a boreal grassland hydrology at Valdai, Russia: PILPS Phase 2 (d). Monthly Weather Review, 128(2):301–321.
- Segal, M., Avissar, R., McCumber, M., and Pielke, R. (1988). Evaluation of vegetation effects on the generation and modification of mesoscale circulations. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 45(16):2268–2293.
- Sellers, P., Randall, D., Collatz, G., Berry, J., Field, C., Dazlich, D., Zhang, C., Collelo, G., and Bounoua, L. (1996). A revised land surface parameterization (SiB2) for atmospheric GCMs. Part I: Model formulation. Journal of climate, 9(4):676–705.
- Senatore, A., Mendicino, G., Gochis, D. J., Yu, W., Yates, D. N., and Kunstmann, H. (2015). Fully coupled atmosphere-hydrology simulations for the central Mediterranean: Impact of enhanced hydrological parameterization for short and long time scales. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 7(4):1693–1715.
- Seneviratne, S. I., Lüthi, D., Litschi, M., and Schär, C. (2006). Land–atmosphere coupling and climate change in Europe. Nature, 443(7108):205–209.
- Shrestha, P., Sulis, M., Masbou, M., Kollet, S., and Simmer, C. (2014). A scale-consistent terrestrial systems modeling platform based on COSMO, CLM, and ParFlow. Monthly weather review, 142(9):3466–3483.

- Shuttleworth, W. J. and Wallace, J. (1985). Evaporation from sparse crops-an energy combination theory. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 111(469):839–855.
- Skamarock, W., Klemp, J., Dudhia, J., Gill, D., Barker, D., Duda, M., Huang, X., Wang, W., and Powers, J. (2008). A description of the advanced research WRF version 3. NCAR technical note NCAR/TN/u2013475, pages 1–113.
- Slater, A. G., Schlosser, C. A., Desborough, C., Pitman, A., Henderson-Sellers, A., Robock, A., Vinnikov, K. Y., Entin, J., Mitchell, K., Chen, F., et al. (2001). The representation of snow in land surface schemes: Results from PILPS 2 (d). Journal of Hydrometeorology, 2(1):7–25.
- Smith, J. and Eli, R. N. (1995). Neural-network models of rainfall-runoff process. Journal of water resources planning and management, 121(6):499–508.
- Smith, M. B., Seo, D.-J., Koren, V. I., Reed, S. M., Zhang, Z., Duan, Q., Moreda, F., and Cong, S. (2004). The distributed model intercomparison project (DMIP): motivation and experiment design. Journal of Hydrology, 298(1):4–26.
- Smith, R. B. (1979). The influence of mountains on the atmosphere. Advances in geophysics, 21:87–230.
- Somerville, R. C. (1987). The predictability of weather and climate. In Forecasting in the Social and Natural Sciences, pages 239–246. Springer.
- Stein, J., Richard, E., Lafore, J., Pinty, J., Asencio, N., and Cosma, S. (2000). High-resolution non-hydrostatic simulations of flash-flood episodes with grid-nesting and ice-phase parameterization. Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics, 72(2-4):203–221.
- Stephens, G. L., Vane, D. G., Tanelli, S., Im, E., Durden, S., Rokey, M., Reinke, D., Partain, P., Mace, G. G., Austin, R., et al. (2008). CloudSat mission: Performance and early science after the first year of operation. J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 113(D8).
- Strahler, A. N. (1952). Hypsometric (area-altitude) analysis of erosional topography. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 63(11):1117–1142.
- Summit, E. (1992). Agenda 21. The United Nations programme for action from Rio.
- Tanelli, S., Durden, S. L., Im, E., Pak, K. S., Reinke, D. G., Partain, P., Haynes, J. M., and Marchand, R. T. (2008). CloudSat’s cloud profiling radar after two years in orbit: Performance, calibration, and processing. Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on, 46(11):3560–3573.
- Tanelli, S., Im, E., Durden, S. L., Facheris, L., and Giuli, D. (2002). The effects of nonuniform beam filling on vertical rainfall velocity measurements with a spaceborne Doppler radar. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 19(7):1019–1034.

- Tanelli, S., Tao, W.-K., Hostetler, C., Kuo, K.-S., Matsui, T., Jacob, J. C., Niamsuwan, N., Johnson, M. P., Hair, J., Butler, C., et al. (2011). NASA's integrated Instrument Simulator Suite for Atmospheric Remote Sensing from spaceborne platform (ISSARS). Earth Sci.
- Tanelli, S., Tao, W.-K., Matsui, T., Hostetler, C. A., Hair, J. W., Butler, C., Kuo, K.-S., Niamsuwan, N., Johnson, M. P., Jacob, J. C., et al. (2012). Integrated instrument simulator suites for Earth Science. In SPIE Asia-Pacific Remote Sensing, pages 85290D–85290D. International Society for Optics and Photonics.
- Tao, W.-K., Simpson, J., and McCumber, M. (1989). An ice-water saturation adjustment. Monthly Weather Review, 117(1):231–235.
- Tarpanelli, A., Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Lacava, T., and Wagner, W. (2012). Utilizzo di dati satellitari per applicazioni idrologiche nel bacino dell' alto-medio Tevere. In XXXIII Convegno Nazionale di Idraulica e Costruzioni Idrauliche, Brescia 10-15 Settembre 2012.
- Tewari, M., Chen, F., Wang, W., Dudhia, J., LeMone, M., Mitchell, K., Ek, M., Gayno, G., Wegiel, J., and Cuenca, R. (2004). Implementation and verification of the unified NOAA land surface model in the WRF model. In 20th conference on weather analysis and forecasting/16th conference on numerical weather prediction, pages 11–15.
- Thompson, G., Field, P. R., Rasmussen, R. M., and Hall, W. D. (2008). Explicit forecasts of winter precipitation using an improved bulk microphysics scheme. Part II: Implementation of a new snow parameterization. Mon. Wea. Rev., 136(12):5095–5115.
- Thompson, P. D. (1957). Uncertainty of initial state as a factor in the predictability of large scale atmospheric flow patterns. Tellus, 9(3):275–295.
- Tian, Y. and Peters-Lidard, C. D. (2010). A global map of uncertainties in satellite-based precipitation measurements. Geophys. Res. Lett., 37(24).
- Tiedtke, M. (1989). A comprehensive mass flux scheme for cumulus parameterization in large-scale models. Monthly Weather Review, 117(8):1779–1800.
- Ullah, K. and Shouting, G. (2013). A diagnostic study of convective environment leading to heavy rainfall during the summer monsoon 2010 over Pakistan. Atmos. Res., 120:226–239.
- USGS (2016). The water cycle - usgs water science school. [Online; accessed 9-December-2016].
- Ushiyama, T., Sayama, T., Tatebe, Y., Fujioka, S., and Fukami, K. (2014). Numerical simulation of 2010 Pakistan flood in the Kabul River Basin by using lagged ensemble rainfall forecasting. J. Hydrometeor., 15(1):193–211.

- van den Hurk, B. J., Graham, L. P., and Viterbo, P. (2002). Comparison of land surface hydrology in regional climate simulations of the Baltic Sea catchment. Journal of Hydrology, 255(1):169–193.
- Verri, G., Navarra, A., Coppini, G., Vukicevic, T., and Shea, D. (submitted). A meteorological hydrological modeling study for flood events in the Ofanto river catchment. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences.
- Vieux, B. E. and Moreda, F. G. (2003). Ordered Physics-Based Parameter Adjustment of a Distributed Model. Calibration of Watershed Models, pages 267–281.
- Viterbo, A., Berni, N., Natazzi, L., Pandolfo, C., and Stelluti, M. (2011). Valutazione degli impatti dei cambiamenti climatici nella gestione delle Risorse Idriche: esperienze della Regione Umbria nell’ambito del progetto SECLI - Risultati preliminari. Le modificazioni climatiche e i rischi naturali.
- Viterbo, F., von Hardenberg, J., Provenzale, A., Molini, L., Parodi, A., Sy, O. O., and Tanelli, S. (2016). High-Resolution Simulations of the 2010 Pakistan Flood Event: Sensitivity to Parameterizations and Initialization Time. Journal of Hydrometeorology, 17(4):1147–1167.
- Vivoni, E. R., Ivanov, V. Y., Bras, R. L., and Entekhabi, D. (2004). Generation of triangulated irregular networks based on hydrological similarity. Journal of hydrologic engineering, 9(4):288–302.
- Wackernagel, H. (1995). Multivariate geostatistics.
- Wagner, T. and Gupta, H. V. (2005). Model identification for hydrological forecasting under uncertainty. Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment, 19(6):378–387.
- Wagner, S., Fersch, B., Kunstmann, H., Yuan, F., Yang, C., and Yu, Z. (2013). Hydrometeorological modelling for Poyang Lake Region, China. IAHS-AISH publication, pages 152–157.
- Walko, R. L., Band, L. E., Baron, J., Kittel, T. G., Lammers, R., Lee, T. J., Ojima, D., Pielke Sr, R. A., Taylor, C., Tague, C., et al. (2000). Coupled atmosphere-biophysics-hydrology models for environmental modeling. Journal of applied meteorology, 39(6):931–944.
- Warner, T. T. (2010). Numerical weather and climate prediction. Cambridge University Press.
- Webster, P., Toma, V. E., and Kim, H.-M. (2011). Were the 2010 Pakistan floods predictable? Geophysical research letters, 38(4).
- White, P. (2002). IFS Documentation, ECMWF. Reading, UK, page 40.

- Wigmosta, M. S. and Lettenmaier, D. P. (1999). A comparison of simplified methods for routing topographically driven subsurface flow. Water Resources Research, 35(1):255–264.
- Wigmosta, M. S., Vail, L. W., and Lettenmaier, D. P. (1994). A distributed hydrology-vegetation model for complex terrain. Water resources research, 30(6):1665–1679.
- Wikipedia (2016). Water cycle — wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. [Online; accessed 9-December-2016].
- Winiger, M., Gumpert, M., and Yamout, H. (2005). Karakorum–Hindukush–western Himalaya: assessing high-altitude water resources. Hydrological Processes, 19(12):2329–2338.
- Wood, E. F., Lettenmaier, D. P., Liang, X., Lohmann, D., Boone, A., Chang, S., Chen, F., Dai, Y., Dickinson, R. E., Duan, Q., et al. (1998). The project for intercomparison of land-surface parameterization schemes (PILPS) phase 2 (c) Red–Arkansas river basin experiment: 1. Experiment description and summary intercomparisons. Global and Planetary Change, 19(1):115–135.
- Xue, M., Droegemeier, K. K., and Wong, V. (2000). The Advanced Regional Prediction System (ARPS)—A multi-scale nonhydrostatic atmospheric simulation and prediction model. Part I: Model dynamics and verification. Meteorology and atmospheric physics, 75(3-4):161–193.
- Yang, R. and Friedl, M. A. (2003). Modeling the effects of three-dimensional vegetation structure on surface radiation and energy balance in boreal forests. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 108(D16).
- Yang, Z.-L. and Niu, G.-Y. (2003). The versatile integrator of surface and atmosphere processes: Part 1. Model description. Global and Planetary Change, 38(1):175–189.
- Yang, Z.-L., Niu, G.-Y., Mitchell, K. E., Chen, F., Ek, M. B., Barlage, M., Longueveergne, L., Manning, K., Niyogi, D., Tewari, M., et al. (2011). The community noah land surface model with multiparameterization options (Noah-MP): 2. Evaluation over global river basins. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 116(D12).
- Yilmaz, K. K., Gupta, H. V., and Wagener, T. (2008). A process-based diagnostic approach to model evaluation: Application to the NWS distributed hydrologic model. Water Resources Research, 44(9).
- York, J. P., Person, M., Gutowski, W. J., and Winter, T. C. (2002). Putting aquifers into atmospheric simulation models: An example from the Mill Creek Watershed, northeastern Kansas. Advances in Water Resources, 25(2):221–238.
- Yu, X. and Lee, T.-Y. (2010). Role of convective parameterization in simulations of a convection band at grey-zone resolutions. Tellus, 62(5):617–632.

- Yu, Z., Pollard, D., and Cheng, L. (2006). On continental-scale hydrologic simulations with a coupled hydrologic model. Journal of Hydrology, 331(1):110–124.
- Yucel, I., Onen, A., Yilmaz, K., and Gochis, D. (2015). Calibration and evaluation of a flood forecasting system: Utility of numerical weather prediction model, data assimilation and satellite-based rainfall. Journal of Hydrology, 523:49–66.
- Yucel, I., Shuttleworth, W. J., Washburne, J., and Chen, F. (1998). Evaluating NCEP Eta model-derived data against observations. Monthly weather review, 126(7):1977–1991.
- Zabel, F. and Mauser, W. (2013). 2-way coupling the hydrological land surface model PROMET with the regional climate model MM5. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 17(5):1705–1714.
- Zängl, G. (2002). An improved method for computing horizontal diffusion in a sigma-coordinate model and its application to simulations over mountainous topography. Monthly Weather Review, 130(5):1423–1432.
- Zeng, X., Shaikh, M., Dai, Y., Dickinson, R. E., and Myneni, R. (2002). Coupling of the common land model to the NCAR community climate model. Journal of Climate, 15(14):1832–1854.
- Zhang, C., Wang, Y., and Hamilton, K. (2011). Improved representation of boundary layer clouds over the southeast pacific in ARW-WRF using a modified Tiedtke cumulus parameterization scheme*. Monthly Weather Review, 139(11):3489–3513.
- Zhang, F., Odins, A. M., and Nielsen-Gammon, J. W. (2006). Mesoscale predictability of an extreme warm-season precipitation event. Weather and forecasting, 21(2):149–166.
- Zhang, G. J. and McFarlane, N. A. (1995). Sensitivity of climate simulations to the parameterization of cumulus convection in the Canadian Climate Centre general circulation model. Atmosphere-ocean, 33(3):407–446.
- Zobler, L. (1986). A world soil file for global climate modeling. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Institute for Space Studies.

List of Figures

1.1	Forecast error growth and predictability (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	8
1.2	Meteorological typical spatial and temporal scales (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	10
1.3	Range of space and time of hydrological processes from Dingman (2015) .	12
1.4	Governing equations of numerical weather modelling (Source: COMET UCAR Program). A more detailed of these equations is reported in appendix A.1	13
1.5	Schematic of the typical structure of an atmospherical modelling system. Adapted from Warner (2010)	15
1.6	Principal storages and pathways of water in the hydrological cycle from Dingman (2015)	20
2.1	WRF-Hydro modelling structure from Gochis et al. (2013)	33
3.1	Large scale circulation of geopotential (a panels), temperature (b panels) and specific humidity (c panels) at 500 hPa on July 28 th at 00 UTC as simulated by WRF J24 (a1, b1, c1), J26 (a2, b2, c2), J28 (a3, b3, c3), J28R (a4, b4, c4) runs and by ERA-Interim reanalysis (a5, b5, c5).	45
3.2	Large scale circulation of geopotential (a panels), temperature (b panels) and specific humidity (c panels) at 500 hPa on July 29 th at 00 UTC, as simulated by WRF J24 (a1, b1, c1), J26 (a2, b2, c2), J28 (a3, b3, c3), J28R (a4, b4, c4) runs and by ERA-Interim reanalysis (a5, b5, c5).	46
3.3	The two nested domains used for the simulations: external domain d01 (red box) resolved at 14 km resolution and inner domain d02 (white box) resolved at 3.5 km. The color levels report the orography of the region, provided by the ETOPO1 dataset.	47
3.4	WRF Quantitative Precipitation Forecasts and TRMM daily rainfall. From left to right: Exp-WSM6 (a1, b1), KF-WSM6 (a2, b2), Exp-Thompson (a3, b3), KF-Thompson (a4, b4), TRMM (a5, b5) and raingauge observations (a6, b6). All fields have been aggregated at 0.25°resolution in the study area. The top row refers to July 28 th 2010 (a) and the bottom row refers to July 29 th (b). The blue lines represent CloudSat tracks and the white contour represent the object identified by MODE analysis.	53

3.5	Comparison between probabilities of exceedence (1-CDF) for daily rainfall from WRF simulations and TRMM estimates, for July 28 th (left panel) and July 29 th (right panel). Spatial resolution is 0.25° and the results refer to the whole study area.	56
3.6	First row: 24-hr rainfall cumulates on July 28 th given by: J24 (a1), J26 (a2), J28 (a3), J28S (a4), J28R (a5), TRMM (a6) and raingauge stations (a7). Second row: 24-hr rainfall accumulation on July 29 th given by: J24 (b1), J26 (b2), J28 (b3), J28S (b4), J28R (b5), TRMM (b6) and raingauge stations (b7). All rainfall fields have been aggregated at 0.25° horizontal resolution. The blue lines represent CloudSat tracks and the white contour represent the object identified by MODE analysis.	58
3.7	Comparison between probabilities of exceedence (1-CDF) obtained from WRF using different initialization days and those derived from TRMM estimates. Left panel: July 28 th ; right panel: July 29 th . The spatial resolution is 0.25° and the results refer to the whole study area.	59
3.8	Surface temperature at the time of initialization (28 th at 00 UTC) and on 29 th at 00 UTC for the J28 and J28R runs. Upper row: Temperature field at 2m in the J28 run on July 28 th at 00 UTC (a1); the same for the J28R run (a2); pixel-by-pixel difference between these two temperature fields (a3). Bottom row: Temperature field at 2m for the J28 run on July 29 th at 00 UTC (b1); the same for the J28R run (b2); pixel-by-pixel difference between these two temperature fields (b3). Temperature fields are plotted at 0.75° horizontal resolution.	63
3.9	Moisture transport field for the J28 run on July 28 th at 00 UTC (a1); the same for the J28R run (a2); moisture transport for the J28 run on July 29 th at 00 UTC (a3); the same for the J28R run (a4). Moisture transport fields are plotted at the resolution of WRF simulations (3.5 km). The colors indicate the intensity and the vectors represent the directions of the moist transport.	64
3.10	Vertical structure of the atmosphere on July 28 th at 21 UTC. From the upper to the lower panel: CloudSat observation (Granule 22608) (a) and DS3 CloudSat simulations for Exp-WSM6 initialized on J24 (b), Exp-WSM6 initialized on J26 (c), Exp-WSM6 initialized on J26 with different microphysical assumptions (d), Exp-WSM6 at 23 UTC initialized on J26 (e), KF-WSM6 initialized on J26 (f), KF-Thompson initialized on J26 (g), KF-Thompson initialized on J26 with different microphysical assumptions (h), Exp-Thompson initialized on J26 (i), Exp-WSM6 initialized on J28 (j), Exp-WSM6 at 23 UTC initialized on J28 (k).	65
4.1	Simple schematization of the experiment. Adapted from figure from Noah-MP website (http://www.jsg.utexas.edu/noah-mp/)	73
4.2	The two nested domains used for the simulations: external domain d01 resolved at 12 km resolution and inner domain d02 resolved at 4 km.	76

4.3	Meteorological stations over the d02 domain. In blue the meteorological stations inside the basin.	77
4.4	Soil moisture stations inside the basin.	78
4.5	Flux stations inside the domain.	79
4.6	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of August. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	83
4.7	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of December. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	83
4.8	Cumulative Distribution functions (CDFs) for the different model configurations: Explicit Thompson (blu line), Explicit WSM6 (green line) and raingauge observations (red line). CDFs from (a) to (n) refer to the different months of the year 2012 (from January (a) to December 2012 (n) from left to right and from the top to the bottom).	85
4.9	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of August.	86
4.10	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of February. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	87
4.11	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of February.	87
4.12	Average hourly rainfall over the d02 domain for the month of February 2012: comparison between WRF model simulations and interpolated raingauge observations.	88
4.13	Daily rainfall scatterplots for the year 2012. Panel (a) represent the Explicit Thompson configuration and panel (b) shows explicit WSM6 configuration.	89
4.14	Comparison between the calibration run with REFKDT=0.4 (black line) and the streamflow observations (red line) at the Monte Molino river section.	96
4.15	Comparison between the calibration run with REFKDT=0.4 and RET-DEPFRAC=0 (blu line) and the other run with REFKDT=0.4 and RET-DEPFRAC=500 (black line) at the Monte Molino river section.	97
4.16	Comparison between the calibration run with SATKDT=default + 0.9×10^{-6} and REFKDT=0.3 (black line) and the streamflow observations (red line) at the Monte Molino river section.(m ³ /sec)	99
4.17	Flow duration curve for the best calibration runs, compared with the observations.	99

4.18	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITCA1 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	100
4.19	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITCA1 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	101
4.20	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Petrelle station site.	103
4.21	Comparison between the best calibration run with SATKDT=default + 0.9 x 10 ⁻⁶ and REFKDT=0.3 (blue line) and the streamflow observations (red line) at the Monte Molino river section for the period 2012 (calibration)- 2013 (validation) (m ³ /sec)	105
4.22	Hourly soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Petrelle station site.	107
4.23	Averaged daily rainfall comparison over the Tiber river basin for year 2012.	111
4.24	Averaged daily rainfall comparison over the Tiber river basin.	112
4.25	pixel-by-pixel daily rainfall RMSE between WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF over the Tiber river basin.	113
4.26	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 14 September 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	114
4.27	Annual accumulated rainfall differences map between WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF for the year 2012 over the d02 domain.	116
4.28	Soil moisture comparison at the Petrelle station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red).	117
4.29	Soil moisture comparison at the Petrelle station site for summer period (from July 15 th to August 15 th) at SM2. Panel (a) shows the soil moisture content for the different simulations and as observed. Panel (b) shows the associated daily rainfall for the different simulations and raingauge observations.	119
4.30	Soil moisture comparison at the Petrelle station site for fall period (from October 10 th to December 1 st) at SM2. Panel (a) shows the soil moisture content for the different simulations and as observed. Panel (b) shows the associated daily rainfall for the different simulations and raingauge observations.	119
4.31	Average evapotranspiration comparison over the Tiber river basin between WRF/WRF-Hydro (blue) and WRF (black) configurations.	123
4.32	Average accumulated evapotranspiration comparison over the Tiber river basin between WRF/WRF-Hydro (blue) and WRF (black) configurations (panel (a)) and daily differences (panel (b)).	124

4.33	Different contributions in terms of water balance for the year 2012. WRF and WRF Hydro comparisons in terms of cumulated runoff (panel (a)), cumulated daily evapotranspiration (panel (b)), cumulated daily rainfall (panel (c)) and average hourly soil moisture inside the basin (panel (d)).	126
4.34	Hydrograph comparison among WRF, WRF/WRF-Hydro and the observations at the Monte Molino closing section, for the year 2012.	127
A.1	Governing equations of numerical weather modelling (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	136
A.2	Equation (1a): Wind forecast equation, West-to-East component. Equation (1a) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	137
A.3	Equation (1b): Wind forecast equation, South-to-North component. Equation (1b) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	137
A.4	Continuity equation. Equation (2) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	137
A.5	Temperature forecast equation. Equation (3) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	138
A.6	Moisture forecast Equation. Equation (4) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	138
A.7	Hydrostatic or vertical momentum equation. Equation (5) of Figure A.1 (Source: COMET UCAR Program).	139
B.1	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of January. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	140
B.2	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of February. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	141
B.3	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of March. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	142
B.4	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of April. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	143

B.5	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of May. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	144
B.6	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of June. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	145
B.7	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of July. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	146
B.8	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of August. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	147
B.9	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of September. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	148
B.10	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of October. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	149
B.11	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of November. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	150
B.12	Accumulated monthly rainfall map analysis for the month of December. Total accumulated rainfall values over the month ((a)-(c)), accumulated rainfall over a first sample of 15 random days ((d)-(f)), accumulated rainfall over a second sample of 15 random days (for (g)-(i) for (from left to right) Exp-Thom, Exp-WSM6 and observations.	151
B.13	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of January.	152
B.14	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of February.	153
B.15	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of March.	153

B.16	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of April.	154
B.17	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of May.	154
B.18	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of June.	155
B.19	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of July.	155
B.20	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of August.	156
B.21	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of September.	156
B.22	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of October.	157
B.23	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of November.	157
B.24	Average precipitation diurnal cycle over the month of December.	158
C.1	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITCA1 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	159
C.2	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITCA2 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	160
C.3	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITCA3 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	160
C.4	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITRO4 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	161
C.5	Daily latent and sensible heat partitioning between WRF-Hydro best calibration run (black) and observations (blue) at the ITCOL station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	161
C.6	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITCA1 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	162
C.7	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITCA2 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	163
C.8	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITCA3 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	163
C.9	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITRO4 station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	164
C.10	Net radiation scatterplot between WRF-Hydro best calibration run and observations at the ITCOL station site, with the associated statistics in terms of RMSE, R^2 and regression coefficient.	164

C.11 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Torre dell' Olmo station site.	165
C.12 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Solomeo station site.	165
C.13 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at San Benedetto station site.	166
C.14 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Pieve Santo Stefano station site.	166
C.15 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Petrelle station site.	167
C.16 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Monterchi station site.	167
C.17 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Foligno station site.	168
C.18 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Ficulle station site.	168
C.19 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at Cerbara station site.	169
C.20 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at PgIng1 station site.	169
C.21 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2012 at PgIng2 station site.	170
C.22 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Torre dell' Olmo station site.	170
C.23 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at San Benedetto station site.	171
C.24 Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Pieve Santo Stefano station site.	171

C.25	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Petrelle station site.	172
C.26	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Monterchi station site.	172
C.27	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Ficulle station site.	173
C.28	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at Cerbara station site.	173
C.29	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at PgIng1 station site.	174
C.30	Soil moisture dynamic for level SM1=0.1 m (panel (a)) and SM2=0.3 m (panel (b)) soil depths and rain and temperature variations (panel (c)) for the year 2013 at PgIng2 station site.	174
D.1	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 24 July 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	175
D.2	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 3 September 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	175
D.3	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 14 September 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	176
D.4	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 13 October 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	176
D.5	Daily rainfall map comparison for the 18 November 2012 among WRF/WRF-Hydro (panel (a)), WRF (panel (b) and the gauge observations (panel (c)).	176
D.6	Soil moisture comparison at the Olmo station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red).	177
D.7	Soil moisture comparison at the Solomeo station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	178
D.8	Soil moisture comparison at the San Benedetto station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	178
D.9	Soil moisture comparison at the Pieve Santo Stefano station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red).	179

D.10	Soil moisture comparison at the Petrelle station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	179
D.11	Soil moisture comparison at the Monterchi station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	180
D.12	Soil moisture comparison at the Foligno station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	180
D.13	Soil moisture comparison at the Ficulle station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	181
D.14	Soil moisture comparison at the Cerbara station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	181
D.15	Soil moisture comparison at the PgIng1 station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	182
D.16	Soil moisture comparison at the PgIng2 station site for the different simulations for the SM1 and SM2 soil layers: WRF-Hydro calibration run (blue), WRF/WRF-Hydro (yellow), WRF (violet) and observed (red). . .	182

List of Tables

2.1	Summary of the main microphysics options in the WRF model.	25
2.2	Summary of the main cumulus parameterization schemes options in the WRF model.	26
2.3	Summary of the main PBL schemes in the WRF model.	27
2.4	Summary of the main radiation schemes (longwave and shortwave) in the WRF model.	28
2.5	Summary of the main LSM schemes in the WRF model.	29
3.1	Experiment configurations.	52
3.2	Statistical score analysis for the different configurations for July 28 th (upper panel) and for July 29 th (lower panel). The first part of the table shows the values of MODE verification analysis of centroid distance, area ratio and and interest. The MODE evaluation refers to the highest intensity object identified in each run that matches with the corresponding TRMM object. The matched objects are shown in Fig.3.4. In the second part the different percentiles (median, 60 th , 90 th and 95 th) are shown . In the third part are reported MB and RMSE. The fourth part of the table shows MB and RMSE calculated between raingauge station measures and associated nearest neighbour WRF grid point. The first three parts of the table use TRMM as reference dataset. The fourth part of the table shows MB and RMSE calculated between raingauge station measures and associated nearest neighbour WRF grid point.	54
3.3	Summary of all the different runs performed in the second part of the experiment.	57

3.4	Statistical score analysis for the different initializations, for July 28 th (upper panel) and for July 29 th (lower panel). The first part of the table shows the values of MODE verification analysis of centroid distance, area ratio and interest. The MODE evaluation refers to the highest intensity object identified in each run that matches with the corresponding TRMM object. The matched objects are shown in Fig.3.6. In the second part the different percentiles (median, 60 th , 90 th and 95 th) are shown. In the third part are reported MB and RMSE. The fourth part of the table shows MB and RMSE calculated between raingauge station measures and associated nearest neighbour WRF grid point. The first three parts of the table use TRMM as reference dataset. The fourth part of the table shows MB and RMSE calculated between raingauge station measures and associated nearest neighbour WRF grid point.	60
4.1	Experiment configurations.	81
4.2	Statistical score analysis at basin scale with total accumulated rainfall over the month (TotRainfall), monthly accumulated differences with the observed fields (DiffObs) and RMSE for every simulation and observations.	90
4.3	Summary statistics for the different calibration runs analyzed.	95
4.4	Quantitative analysis of flux comparison of sensible and latent heat partitioning and net radiation	102
4.5	Mean, variance and correlation coefficients for soil moisture comparison between the best calibration run (WRF-Hydro) and observations (OBS) at all the stations sites inside the basin for the year 2012.	104
4.6	Summary statistics for the best calibration run (2012), validation run (2013) and for the total analysis period (2012 and 2013)	106
4.7	Mean, variance and correlation coefficients for soil moisture comparison between the best calibration run (WRF-Hydro) and observations (OBS) at all the stations sites inside the basin for the validation year 2013 at hourly scale.	108
4.8	Summary of the days with highest differences between WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF from the daily differences analysis and RMSE evaluation.	113
4.9	Monthly rainfall differences (mm) averaged over the Tiber river basin between WRF/WRF-Hydro and observations (first column), WRF and observations (second columns), WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF (third column).	115
4.10	Mean distribution values of modelled soil moisture of WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF with the observations for the two soil moisture depths SM1 and SM2.	120
4.11	Variance of modelled soil moisture distributions of WRF/WRF-Hydro, WRF and observations for the two soil moisture depths SM1 and SM2.	121
4.12	Correlation coefficients of modelled soil moisture of WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF with the observations for the two soil moisture depth SM1 and SM2.	122

4.13 Streamflow evaluation for the WRF/WRF-Hydro and WRF in terms of maximum peak (m ³ /s), time of the peak, RMSE (m ³ /s), RHO, Nash-Sutcliffe	127
--	-----

Acknowledgements

This Ph.D. thesis would not have been successful without the help and collaboration of a lot of people from all the world that professionally and morally helped and supported me during this path.

I would like to thank my supervisors Antonio Parodi and Jost von Hardenberg for their important tutorship in these three years, for all their efforts, for their valuable teachings and for all the opportunities they gave me.

I would like to thank very much Dr. Antonello Provenzale, for his scientific contributions, good advices and for having always believed in me.

I'm really grateful to Luca Molini and Fabio Delogu for their fundamental scientific and moral help. I have discovered not only two good colleagues but also two very good friends.

I sincerely thank Elisa Palazzi, for always being a person I can always count on and for her very good advices about work, but also about poetry, literature and life in general. I sincerely admire and thank this woman for being such a great scientist and person.

I am really grateful to David Gochis for being my host at RAL-NCAR for six months and for his fruitful collaboration and guidance that changed my professional life forever, opening new perspectives and future great opportunities. I would also like to thank all the rest of the WRF-Hydro group at RAL for their collaboration and for always trying to answer to my questions, creating very interesting discussions during scientific meetings and amazing time during happy hours. Thanks to Aubrey Dugger, Kevin Sampson, James McCreight, Arezoo RafieeiNasab, Wei Yu, David Yates, Logan Karsten.

I thank all the CNR-IRPI office for its collaboration during all my PhD, for being always open to my questions and for being a source of inspiration to this work. In particular I want to thank Tommaso Moramarco, Luca Brocca, Luca Ciabatta, Silvia Barbeta, Stefania Camici, Angelica Tarpanelli and all the other guys and girls of the office. I am also grateful to the Regione Umbria office for sharing with me their observational data and for being always nice and supportive to my research. A special thank to Marco Stelluti and Nicola Berni.

I want to thank Alfonso Senatore, Amir Givati, Ismail Yucel for their answers to my questions and for the scientific discussions.

Special thanks to my three external reviewers Tommaso Moramarco, David Gochis and Raquel Lorente-Plazas for having read this thesis carefully, and for their useful suggestions. Many thanks also to my Ph.D. Coordinator, Prof.ssa Simona Sacone, for

always being helpful, polite and cooperative in every step of my Ph.D.

I spent part of my Ph.D. period in different cities such as Savona, Torino and Boulder.

I want to thank all the colleagues at CIMA for sharing four years with me.

I am grateful to all my friends at ISAC-CNR and Turin. We spent a great time together that I will never forget. I felt really appreciated and free to be totally myself. We had a great time together and they helped me with moral (and chocolate) support every time. I think I have found some friends I will never forget. Now everybody is taking different roads, but I am sure that distance and time will never break our close relationships and friendship. Thank you very much to Donatella, Silvia, Elisa, Luca, Paolo, Alex, Valentina, Marco and Riccardo.

I sincerely thank all the friends I have met in Boulder and made my stay there such a positive experience. Special thanks to Ben, Camille, Marta, Alvaro, Pablo, Raquel, Lisa, Nans, Arezoo, Marie, Mike, Patrick, Domingo, Mathias, Scott, Rod, Eric, Chris, Ryan, Alessandro, the two Andreas, Marijan, Jiah and all the special and brave girls of my english class. Thanks to all the guys who shared with me the ENSO concerts, the happy hours, the crazy bike trips and visited USA with me. Thanks to my family in Colorado: Marialaurea and Francesco. I will be too sad for not being at your marriage, but we will soon be together.

During the three years of the PhD I participated in numerous conferences, courses and summer school during which I met many researchers from all over the world, that dedicated their life to an idea, following their personal inspiration with passion, strength and dignity. Some of them has now became friends for life. Thank you to all the PhD days fellows and to all the Valsavarance summer school friends. Thank you to Maria, the "fenicottero rosa"'s team, to Andrea, Matteo, Alessio, Caterina, Alessandro, Leò, Ned, Azusa and many others.

Thank you to all my friend from Perugia and from Puglia, that shared with me important moments of my life and give me happiness to face all the difficult moments.

A very big thank to my parents and all my family (my granparents, uncles and aunts, "little cousins"). Their love and support is unconditioned, even if I know their are going to suffer for my future choices. I will try to never let you feel alone even if I will be far. Thank you to my little dog, that is old enough to deserve a big thank you.

Francesca