This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

The impact of climate change on barley yield in the Mediterranean basin / Cammarano, D.; Ceccarelli, S.; Grando, S.; Romagosa, I.; Benbelkacem, A.; Akar, T.; Al-Yassin, A.; Pecchioni, N.; Francia, E.; Ronga, D.. - In: EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF AGRONOMY. - ISSN 1161-0301. - 106:(2019), pp. 1-11. [10.1016/j.eja.2019.03.002]

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

20/11/2024 00:33

1	The impact of climate change on barley yield in the Mediterranean basin
2	Davide Cammarano ^{1,*} , Salvatore Ceccarelli ² , Stefania Grando ³ , Ignacio Romagosa ⁴ ,
3	Abdelkader Benbelkacem ⁵ , Tanek Akar ⁶ , Adnan Al-Yassin ⁷ , Nicola Pecchioni ^{8,9} , Enrico
4	Francia ⁹ , Domenico Ronga ^{1,9,10} .
5	¹ James Hutton Institute, Invergowrie, DD25DA, Scotland, U.K.
6	² Rete Semi Rurali, Italy.
7	³ International Consultant.
8	⁴ Agrotecnio Center, Universitat de Lleida, Spain.
9	⁵ INRAA, Algeria.
10	⁶ Akdeniz University Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Agronomy, Antalya, TURKIYE.
11	⁷ Consultant and barley breeder, National Agricultural Research Center, Amman, Jordan.
12	⁸ Council for Agricultural Research and Economics (CREA) Research Centre for Cereal and
13	Industrial Crops (CREA-CI), S.S. 673 km 25,200, 71122 Foggia, Italy
14	⁹ University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Department of Life Sciences, Via G. Amendola 2,
15	42122 Reggio Emilia, Italy
16	¹⁰ Council for Agricultural Research and Economics – Research Center for Animal Production
17	and Aquaculture (CREA-ZA), Viale Piacenza, 29, 26900, Lodi, Italy.
18	
19	
20	
21	Corresponding author: <u>davide.cammarano@hutton.ac.uk;</u>

22 Abstract

Barley is an important cereal crop for the arid and semi-arid Mediterranean environments. 23 24 Future climate projections show that Mediterranean countries will get drier and hotter. The 25 objectives of the study are to: i) simulate the impacts of different climate projections and different sowing dates on yield; ii) quantify the importance of heat and drought on barley 26 27 vield at different growth stages and sowing dates; iii) quantify the contributions of sources of uncertainty among inter-annual variability, adaptation options and climate projections. Nine 28 locations across the Mediterranean basin were used to calibrate and evaluate the Decision 29 30 Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT) model. At each location the 40 Global Circulation Model (GCM) outputs (RCP4.5, Mid of the Century) showed an increase 31 in mean growing season temperature between 0.9 and 2.16°C, while changes of growing 32 33 season rainfall were between -24 and +24%. Therefore, at each location a drier (Dry), mid (Mid), and wetter (Wet) projection was selected. Overall, there was a 9% reduction in grain 34 yield under climate change; but the mean yield change was -27%, +4%, +8%, for the Dry, 35 Mid, and Wet scenarios, respectively. The results of the simulations under the Wet scenario 36 showed a higher variability of yield response. There was an interaction between the soil type, 37 38 the amount of rainfall, the extractable soil water content and the maximum air temperature. 39 Because of these relationship water-stress during the vegetative stage was experienced, 40 affecting expansive growth. At the same time, the high number of days with $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$ 41 caused higher soil water depletion by the plant and therefore lower yields under the Wet scenario. The inter-annual weather variability impacts barley yield irrespective of the sowing 42 dates and the future projected climate. In conclusion, the impact of future climate on barley 43 44 yield in the Mediterranean is negative but some locations will be less affected than others. **Keywords:** Barley; Mediterranean environment; Climate change; Soil water content; 45

2

drought; Heat; Climate extremes.

1. Introduction 47

Barley is an important cereal crop for the arid and semi-arid Mediterranean environments. It 48 is cultivated from the equator to the Arctic Circle and at different elevations (Ceccarelli et al., 49 50 2011; Dawson et al., 2015). Europe produces about 63% of the world's barley with most of it under rainfed conditions (FAOSTAT, 2018). Evidence suggests that cereals crop yield is 51 52 peaking worldwide, and barley yields in Mediterranean countries follow the same trend (Martre et al., 2015; Dawson et al., 2015). Mediterranean environments are characterised by 53 hot dry summers and humid, cool winters with high variability in patterns of rainfall and 54 temperature impacting yield gains (Brisson et al., 2010). 55

Future projections of climate trends show that Mediterranean countries will get drier and 56 57 hotter and might result in severe yield reduction (Semenov et al., 2014; Senapati et al., 2018). 58 During reproductive development, both heat and drought have negative effects on final yield (Semenov et al., 2014; Asseng et al., 2015). However, both factors are part of the soil-plant-59 60 atmosphere system and they dynamically interact within such system. Mean air temperature is the main driver of canopy and leaf temperature, affecting photosynthetic rates, and higher 61 temperatures will negatively influence yield by damaging reproductive organs and 62 accelerating senescence rates (Asseng et al., 2011). Soil moisture limitation will have 63 negative impacts on crop expansive growth and regulating leaves' stomatal conductance 64 65 (Huntingford et al., 2005). When soil water contents and mean air temperature are not limiting both photosynthesis and transpiration at leaf's level will occur at normal rates 66 (Saseendran et al., 2008). At higher air temperatures and low vapour pressure deficit (VPD) 67 plants open the stomata to avoid heat stress, increasing the inter-cellular CO₂ concentration 68 and biomass growth. When soil water content is the limiting factor the stomata are closed, 69 causing dissection, negative impact on photosynthesis, low intercellular CO₂ concentration 70 and therefore lower biomass (Kobza and Edwards, 1987). In addition, in Mediterranean 71

72 environments, where crops rely on soil moisture stored prior sowing, an adequate level of soil available water content is vital to achieve certain yield levels. Therefore, the patterns of 73 rainfall prior sowing will also be an important determinant of crop yield (Passioura, 2006). 74 75 To explore the impacts of climate variability and changes on grain production, crop simulation models (CM) are generally used. They simulate daily growth, development, and 76 77 yield as influenced by daily weather, soil type, crop features and agronomic management (Cammarano and Tian, 2018). The rationale of using CM to explore the climate impacts is 78 79 because they can extrapolate the daily interactions of soil water and nutrient beyond one single growing season (Jones et al., 2003). In addition to the use of CM, Global Climate 80 Models (GCM) provide the atmospheric input of climate projections to such models. 81 A combination of data and modelling results have been used to explore the impact of 82 83 environmental condition on crop production (O'Leary et al., 2015; Rötter et al., 2012). An ensemble of 30 wheat crop models was tested against field experimentations and at different 84 85 locations worldwide, the application of such ensemble showed that global wheat production will fall by 6% for each °C of temperature increase (Asseng et al., 2015). Overall, on many 86 crops important for food security (e.g. cereal, legumes, sugarcane) even a moderate increase 87 in air temperature will likely have a major negative impact if no adaptation measures are 88 taken. It is expected that negative impacts will be more relevant in developing countries 89 (Rosenzweig et al., 2014; Lobell et al., 2008; Challinor et al., 2014; Porter et al., 2014). 90 Therefore, adaptation options are the best option for maintaining future food needs. Challinor 91 et al. (2014) and Porter et al. (2014) concluded that adaptation options could help to increase 92 mean yield by about 7% regardless of the warming levels. In a recent study it was found that 93 94 global barley yields will decline between 3 to 17%, depending on the geographical location, and in many areas of North Africa, the horn of Africa and South America (where it is an 95

96 important food crop) the negative projected yield changes will impact food security (Grando
97 et al., 2005; Xie et al., 2018).

Recent scientific efforts using CM focused on the effect of heat stress on development and 98 yield (Asseng et al., 2016; Asseng et al., 2015). Xie et al. (2018) studied the impacts of 99 climate extremes on global barley yields, focusing on drought and heat stresses. However, 100 101 there are, to the best of our knowledge, virtually no simulation studies on barley specific for the Mediterranean conditions where the impacts of projected changes of heat and drought on 102 barley is explored; as well as the impact of agronomic adaptation options. Tao et al. (2018) 103 104 developed a triple-ensemble probabilistic assessment by using a combination of CMs, model 105 parameters, and climate projections to find the main source of uncertainty. The study did not 106 focus on the impacts of climate change on barley per-se but helped to quantify that the major 107 uncertainty was in the models' structure rather than the climate projections.

We hypothesize that, depending on the climate projection (e.g. drier or wetter), the impacts 108 of changing agronomic practices might offset the negative impacts of climate change. In 109 addition, the importance of future drought and heat stresses on barley yield will be explored 110 prior sowing, at vegetative and reproductive stages. Finally, the sources of uncertainty 111 112 coming from inter-annual climatic variability, adaptation strategy, and climate scenario were analysed. The objectives of the study are to: i) simulate the impacts of different climate 113 projections and different sowing dates on yield; ii) quantify the importance of heat and 114 drought on barley yield at different growth stages and prior sowing; iii) quantify the 115 contributions of sources of uncertainty among inter-annual variability, adaptation options and 116 climate projections. 117

118

120 **2.** Materials and Methods

121 *2.1.Study area*

The study area comprises the Mediterranean basin; nine locations spanning from Northern 122 Africa to Southern Europe were selected because data were available from a study of Francia 123 et al. (2011), where several genotypes were tested in these locations for three years (2003, 124 2004, and 2005). No remarkable incidence of biotic stresses was recorded at any site. During 125 the three years, two locations had additional irrigation and all the others were rainfed. The 126 geographical distribution of the locations is shown in Figure 1. Information regarding the 127 128 sowing, anthesis, maturity and yield were available in Francia et al. (2011). In addition, 129 information on the soil water holding capacity were also available, and the co-authors of that study provided information regarding the soil texture and organic carbon levels. 130

131 *2.2.Weather data*

One growing season of daily weather data was available at each site. Daily values of solar 132 radiation (MJ m⁻² d⁻¹), maximum temperature (°C), minimum temperature (°C), and rainfall 133 (mm) were used. To have a long-term weather data series, needed as baseline for our study, 134 135 the daily data at each location were reconstructed for the period 1980-2010 using the NASA AgMERRA product (Ruane et al., 2015). Such dataset has been used in many climate change 136 impact studies worldwide (Rosenzweig and Hilell, 2015; Elliot et al., 2015). To quantify the 137 quality of the constructed time series the observed year of weather data was compared against 138 the NASA AgMERRA. 139

140 *2.3.Climate projections*

141 The climate projections were obtained using the global Coupled Model Intercomparison

142 Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) data for temperature, precipitation, and solar radiation (Taylor et al.,

143 2012). To generate perturbed daily weather data, the DSSAT-Perturb software was used

(ClimSystem, 2018). The software used the baseline weather data at each location, and by 144 integrating the CMIP5 from 40 Global Circulation Models (GCM; Tab. A1), generates 145 projected daily weather data. More details about algorithms behind the software are found in 146 Yin et al. (2013). At each location, the future daily output of 40 GCMs were produced at a 147 Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5 (RCP 4.5) Mid of the Century (Tab. A2). At each 148 location, the percentage change in terms of growing season rainfall and temperature with 149 respect to the baseline was calculated for each GCM. Then, a similar approach detailed in the 150 study of Ruane and McDermid (2017) for each location was chosen to pick 3 site-specific 151 152 GCMs. But, to narrow down the number of GCMs chosen, at each location three GCMs were selected. They were selected to provide similar amount of growing season temperature 153 increase but "drier", "little" and "wetter" changes of rainfall with respect to the baseline. 154 2.4.Crop simulation 155 156 The DSSAT v4.7 was used for this study (Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer), the CERES-Barley model was the crop-specific used (Jones et al., 2003; 157 Hoogenboom et al., 2010). The input data for the model were the ones obtained at each 158 experimental site, and a generic barley cultivar was calibrated (Tab. A3) using the 159 observations reported in Table 1 in the study of Francia et al. (2011). The initial soil water 160 and nitrogen content, known as "initial conditions", are two important parameters 161 determining the quality of the simulation runs. In this study, the date of the initial conditions 162 (when the crop model started running) were assumed to be after the generic harvest date for 163 each location. Therefore, this allowed to start with a relatively dry soil profile (10% above the 164 soil Lower Limit), while for the initial nitrogen in the soil experts' opinion from agronomists 165

166 from each site were used. The nitrogen fertilizer management was also derived from experts'

167 opinion and from local researchers at each location. The crop model was calibrated using the

168 two irrigated sites and evaluated on the remaining sites.

169 The sowing dates used for the simulations ranged from mid-September to mid-January (sowing happening every 15 days; S1 to S8) at each location and were run for the baseline 170 and for each of the 3 scenarios. The atmospheric CO₂ concentration used by the model for the 171 172 baseline runs (1980-2010) was 360ppm while at RCP4.5 it was 499ppm. The model's runs were set up to re-initialize every growing season. Every growing season the models started 173 with the same initial conditions, same sowing date, and same fertilizer management. The only 174 thing that changed was the weather conditions. In this way, the impacts of climate and 175 weather variability can be quantified. 176

177 2.5.*Statistical analysis*

The goodness of fit of the simulated vs. observed data for calibration and evaluation wascalculated using the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) as follows:

180
$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}$$
 [1]

181 where y_i are the observations, \hat{y}_i the simulations, and *n* is the number of comparisons. In 182 addition, the Wilmott index of agreement (D-Index) was calculated (Wilmott, 1982). The 183 index ranges from 0 (poor model) to 1 (good model). The index is a descriptive measure and 184 can be widely applied to make cross-comparison between models (Wilmott, 1982). It is 185 calculated as follows:

186
$$d - Index = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (|y_i - \bar{y}| + |\hat{y}_i - \bar{y}|)^2}$$
[2]

187 Were \bar{y} is the mean of the observed values. The relative grain yield change was calculated as:

188
$$RY = \frac{y_{future,k,i} - y_{baseline,i}}{y_{baseline,i}} * 100$$
 [3]

189	where $y_{future,i}$ is the simulated yield predicted by the GCM k, and for the growing season i,
190	and $y_{baseline,i}$ is the baseline yield simulated for the growing season <i>i</i> . The box and whiskers
191	plots show the distribution of responses for each growing season. The horizontal line
192	represents the median, the box delimits the 25 th and 75 th percentiles, and the whiskers the 10 th
193	and 90 th percentile, respectively.
194	From the start of simulation to the day of sowing (SP), from sowing to anthesis (PA), and
195	from anthesis to maturity (AM) the delta (Δ) changes of rainfall and days of daily maximum
196	temperature > 34°C (T_{max} >34°C) was calculated. This temperature threshold was chosen
197	because it was linked to heat stress and yield reductions due to acceleration in senescence
198	rates (Asseng et al., 2011). It was calculated as follows:
199	$\Delta = RCP_{var,i} - Baseline_{var,i} $ [4]
200	where $RCP_{var,i}$ is the variable under each of the scenario and each sowing time (<i>i</i>), and
201	<i>Baseline</i> _{var,i} is the variable under baseline conditions and each sowing time (<i>i</i>).
202	The extractable water content values for each location, each sowing and each climate
203	scenario were calculated as Delta respect to the start of the simulation date.
204	$\Delta Extractable water = ewc_d - ewc_s $ [5]
205	ewc_d represents the extractable soil water content at either Planting (P), anthesis (A),
206	Maturity (M) and ewc_s is the extractable soil water content at the start of simulation (S).
207	To calculate the magnitude of yield variability coming from the inter-annual baseline
208	climate variability, future climatic variability, the sowing date and the three climate
209	projections (Dry, Mid, Wet) the approach described in Asseng et al. (2013) was considered.
210	For each location and at baseline, the variability across sowing date and within each sowing
211	date (inter-annual variability) was calculated by computing the averages of yield. Then, the

standard deviation between years and between locations was computed. For each scenario,
the delta yield between baseline and future was calculated. Then the averages and standard
deviations between the scenarios and the sowing dates was calculated. Once all the average
and standard deviations were calculated the Coefficient of Variation was calculated for the
inter-annual variability, the Sowing-Baseline, Sowing-Future, and Scenarios. All the figures
were drawn using the library GGPLOT2 from the statistical package R (Wickham, 2016).

218

219 **3. Results**

The calibration of the generic barley cultivar following the information presented on the 220 study of Francia et al. (2011) showed a good agreement between simulated and observed data 221 222 for both phenology and yield, with d-Index values always above 0.5 (Table 1). For the evaluation of the model, not all the sites had the phenology information, and, when available 223 they were used. Overall, phenology was well simulated, with a RMSE of 6 and 10 days for 224 anthesis and maturity, respectively (Tab. 1). The observed yield values for the calibration and 225 evaluation dataset are reported in Supplemental Material (Table A4). Overall, the yields 226 under irrigated conditions did not vary too much, while under rainfed conditions observed 227 yields ranged between 70 kg DM ha⁻¹ in Jordan to 5400 kg DM ha⁻¹ in Syria (Table A4). The 228 simulated yields for the evaluation dataset showed that in some location's yields were under-229 estimated. For example, in Jordan (JORB) yields were 70 kg DM ha⁻¹ for the observed and 230 1439 kg DM ha⁻¹ for the simulated one (Tab. A4). 231 The reconstructed long-term weather series using AgMERRA, when compared with the 232

- observed growing season data showed good agreement between the data (Supplemental
- Material Figs. 1-4). For solar radiation the RMSE was 3.7 MJ $d^{-1} m^{-2}$ (Fig. A1), while for
- daily maximum and minimum temperature it was 2.8 and 3.5°C, respectively (Figs. A2 and

A3). Growing season rainfall was compared by plotting the bar plots of the frequency of
rainfall at every 2mm intervals and a good agreement between the observed and the
AgMERRA data was found (Fig. A4).

The list of the 40 GCMs for the RCP4.5 Mid of the Century is shown in Supplemental

Table 1. At RCP4.5 all the GCM projected an average mean growing season temperature increase between 7 and 18% (Tab. 2). On the other hand, the differences in changes in growing season rainfall were rather large among GCMs. The overall range of coefficient of variations of the growing season rainfall ranged between 108 and 380%. The three GCM at each location were named as "Dry", "Mid", and "Wet" and had an overall growing season rainfall change of -19%, 0.2%, and +18%, respectively (Tab. 2).

The mean growing season temperature was higher for GCMs with respect to the baseline 246 247 and among the 3 GCMs it was higher for the drier scenario; it increased for later sowing dates at all location (Fig. A5). There was a degree of variability among locations, with Jordan and 248 249 Turkey showing the greatest variability of mean temperature, especially for the Dry scenario (Fig. A5). Growing season rainfall showed higher variability than temperature even for the 250 baseline climate data. Some locations (e.g. Jordan-Ramtha, Spain and Turkey) had little 251 252 variability of growing season rainfall for any sowing dates, while others (e.g. Italy Fiorenzuola) where rather variable (Fig. A6). 253

Simulated impacts of climate change on grain yield showed an overall mean yield change of
-27%, +4%, +8%, for the Dry, Mid, and Wet scenarios, respectively (Fig. 2). There was a
strong location effect with positive mean changes for all the scenarios at Italy-Fiorenzuola,
and with strong negative effects for all the scenarios at Jordan-Rabba (Fig. 2). The negative
impact of the Dry scenario was consistently high at Jordan-Ramtha with -65% simulated
yield. However, at the same location, the Wet scenario showed an overall increase of 25% of

260 grain yield (Fig. 2). The results of the simulations under the Wet scenario showed a higher variability of yield response at each sowing date. The impact of sowing dates on simulated 261 yield depends on the scenario and location considered. Under the Dry scenario late sowings 262 263 caused an overall 44% yield reduction with respect to early sowing, consistently reducing yield at each location (Fig. 2). On the other hand, under the Wet scenario there was an overall 264 50% increase of simulated yield with later sowing dates. There is less consistency among 265 266 locations; for example, at Jordan-Rabba and Spain there was no yield benefit from later sowing (Fig. 2). 267

268 The impact of heat and drought on simulated grain yield is shown in Figure 3. The negative values of the Δ indicated that the values under baseline conditions were higher than the ones 269 270 under the given scenario and the given crop stage. The amount of rainfall that fell before 271 sowing (defined as the period from a generic harvest time and the sowing date and referred to as fallow rainfall) was -22, 2, and 25mm under the Dry, Mid, and Wet scenarios, respectively 272 (Fig. 3a, red symbols). There was little response of yield changes as changes in fallow 273 rainfall, except with the Wet scenario where at given increased of Δ rain corresponded 274 increases of Δ yield (Fig. 3a; red squares). Between sowing to anthesis (PA, yellow symbols) 275 276 the simulated yield under the dry scenario showed negative responses to changes in rainfall 277 during the vegetative stage. There was a change from -13 to -100 mm of rainfall during this 278 stage across the locations and sowing dates, and this showed a decline in yield between -49 to -1351 kg DM ha⁻¹ (Fig. 3a). From anthesis to maturity (AM; green symbols) there were little 279 changes in rainfall which might not be cause of the changes in simulated yields (Fig. 3a). The 280 Δ number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C was higher for the Dry scenarios at SP, PA, and AM (Fig. 281 282 3b). The Δ yield under the Wet scenario ranged between -259 to 845 kg DM ha⁻¹ (Fig. 3b). The number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C was between 6 to 24 days, and 0 and 15 days, at SP and 283 PA across the GCMs, respectively (Fig. 3b). The main difference was between AM when the 284

number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C diverged between the Dry and Wet scenarios, with the former showing on average 5 additional days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C (Fig. 3b).

At reproductive stage, the number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C showed a strong location effect and 287 degrees of variability for each sowing date (Fig. 4). When simulations were run under 288 baseline weather, the average number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C ranged across locations between 289 0 and 20. Later sowing dates showed the highest number of days of $T_{max}>34$ °C (Fig. 4). The 290 inter-annual variability, represented by the individual boxplot, did not differ too much within 291 and across locations. One location, Italy Fiorenzuola, did not have any day of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$, 292 while a location like Syria-Breda showed the highest number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C ranging 293 from an average 10 at S1 to 20 at S8. Under the Dry scenario, the number of days of 294 T_{max} >34°C increased at all the locations, with two location showing evident changes with 295 296 respect to the others. At Italy-Fiorenzuola, the number of days $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C changed from 0 to an average of 2.5, and at Jordan-Rabba they increased from an average of 5.5 to 18 days (Fig. 297 4). At the latter location, such increase is more evident for later planting time; while in Syria-298 Breda where at S8 there was an increase of 10 days with respect to the baseline (Fig. 4). The 299 number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C under the Wet scenario was still high but slightly lower than 300 301 the Dry one. For example, in Syria-Breda, the number of days $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$ at S8 was on 302 average 22, 28, and 25 under the Baseline, Dry, and Wet, respectively (Fig. 4). However, at 303 Jordan-Rabba such variable increased by 15% across all the sowing dates with evident 304 changes at S7 and S8 where the number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C was 27 and 30, respectively (Fig. 4). 305

The cumulative rainfall from the start of simulation to planting to anthesis and to maturity is shown in Figure 5. At Sowing, the cumulative amount increased from the early to the later sowing dates for each location and each scenario. However, the cumulated amount at anthesis did not show such difference. At Jordan-Rabba, there was more rainfall at planting for the

310	later sowing dates across all the different scenarios. At the same location, the cumulative
311	rainfall at anthesis was on average of 347, 232, and 417 mm for the baseline, Dry and Wet
312	scenarios, respectively (Fig. 5). At maturity, there was only an additional 5, 5, and 7 mm of
313	rainfall added under the baseline, Dry, and Wet scenario. On the other hand, in the same
314	country but at different location (Jordan-Ramtha), there was lower cumulated rainfall at
315	anthesis, with 235mm for the baseline, 175mm for the Dry scenario, and 291mm for the Wet
316	scenario (Fig. 5). The inter-annual variability, expressed by the boxes' length, was higher for
317	Italy-Fiorenzuola, Algeria, and Italy-Foggia, but for all the other locations, the inter-annual
318	variability of cumulative rainfall was lower. The number of rainy days was higher for the
319	vegetative stage, but it decreased for later sowing dates (Fig. A7).
320	The cumulative amount of rainfall that fell between summer and sowing determine the
321	amount of water stored in the soil. Such information is plotted in Figure 6 and calculated
322	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in
322 323	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was
322 323 324	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the
322 323 324 325	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were
 322 323 324 325 326 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to
 322 323 324 325 326 327 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing,
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and 174mm for the baseline, -70 to 159mm for the Dry scenario, and -72 and 186mm for the Wet
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and 174mm for the baseline, -70 to 159mm for the Dry scenario, and -72 and 186mm for the Weth Scenario (Fig. 6). At anthesis, the extractable water content ranged between values of -81 to
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and 174mm for the baseline, -70 to 159mm for the Dry scenario, and -72 and 186mm for the Wet Scenario (Fig. 6). At anthesis, the extractable water content ranged between values of -81 to 126mm, -75 to 92, and -72 to 125mm for the baseline, Dry and Wet scenarios, respectively
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and 174mm for the baseline, -70 to 159mm for the Dry scenario, and -72 and 186mm for the Wet Scenario (Fig. 6). At anthesis, the extractable water content ranged between values of -81 to 126mm, -75 to 92, and -72 to 125mm for the baseline, Dry and Wet scenarios, respectively (Fig. 6). In addition, such values decreased further at maturity ranging between -81 to 28mm
 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 	using equation [5]. The flat lines represent the initial extractable soil water content in summer, when crop simulation was started. The negative values indicated that there was more water at the start of the simulation with respect to a point in time. It does not show the dynamic, but from the simulated daily soil extractable water content key points in time were selected (Fig. S8). The initial conditions of soil water slightly differ among locations due to the information used as initial values from the work of Francia et al. (2011). At sowing, across all the locations and sowing dates there was a range of extractable water of -70 and 174mm for the baseline, -70 to 159mm for the Dry scenario, and -72 and 186mm for the Wet Scenario (Fig. 6). At anthesis, the extractable water content ranged between values of -81 to 126mm, -75 to 92, and -72 to 125mm for the baseline, Dry and Wet scenarios, respectively (Fig. 6). In addition, such values decreased further at maturity ranging between -81 to 28mm for the baseline, -80 to 7mm for the Dry scenario and -83 to 54mm for the Wet scenario. At

335 amount of extractable water content (Fig. 6). For Italy-Fiorenzuola, from S3 to S8 the extractable soil water content was higher than the initial one; but, similar patterns were found 336 for Italy-Foggia, and Syria-Tel Hadya. At this latter location, however, the impact of later 337 338 sowing dates on the extractable soil water content was evident. In fact, at planting date S1 the average extractable soil water was -17mm with a very narrow inter-annual variability, at 339 anthesis it was 10mm, with some year having -40mm and other years reaching 50mm (Fig. 340 341 6). On the other hand, at planting date S8 there was an average of 70 mm with some years showing extractable soil water of 134mm. However, by anthesis, the average soil water 342 343 content was -17mm, and even the year with the high extractable soil water showed a -13 mm of extractable water (Fig. 6). There was a high inter-annual variability at planting for 344 extractable soil water content, it was mirroring the amount of cumulated rainfall (Fig. 5); but 345 346 it was sowing date- and location-specific.

At Jordan-Rabba, the Wet scenario results showed negative yield changes at each sowing 347 date (Fig. 2). At this specific location there was a high number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$ which 348 were negatively related to simulated yield (Fig. 7a). At anthesis, for the Wet scenarios, there 349 was up to 400 mm of cumulated rainfall, but the simulated yield was only 2200 kg DM ha⁻¹ 350 351 and there was no yield increase beyond 300 mm of rainfall cumulated at anthesis (Fig. 7b). A similar relationship was observed between rain, grain yield and the Δ -extractable soil water 352 353 content at anthesis (Fig. S9). There was also a linear negative relationship between Δ 354 extractable soil water content at anthesis and number of days of $T_{max}>34$ °C (Fig. 7c). In fact, for the Dry scenario at 26 days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C there was the maximum Δ of extractable soil 355 water content of -65mm (Fig. 7c). The relationship between Δ extractable soil water content 356 357 at anthesis and cumulative rainfall at anthesis was linear, with high rainfall corresponding to lower Δ extractable soil water content at anthesis (Fig. 7d). 358

359 The variation due to inter-annual weather patterns was the component that carried most of the variability at each of the locations, ranging from 19 to 100% (Fig. 8). The different 360 scenarios also showed higher variability, ranging from 5 to 79% across locations. The 361 variability given by sowing dates under future conditions was lower than the ones under 362 baseline conditions, probably due to the impact of the different scenarios used. Some 363 locations showed higher variability than others, especially Jordan-Ramtha, Jordan-Rabba and 364 Spain, where the inter-annual variability ranged between 77 to 100% (Fig. 8). At those 365 location, the future scenarios also had higher variability with values ranging from 52 to 79%. 366 367 In Italy-Foggia, the variability due to the scenarios was slightly higher than the inter-annual variability and in Italy-Fiorenzuola, except the inter-annual variability, all the other factors 368 did not show higher values of variability (Fig. 8). 369

370

4. Discussion

Different climate projections showed contrasting impacts of simulated barley yield at each 372 location across the Mediterranean environment due to rainfall and temperature changes. At 373 some location (e.g. Italy), the impact of extractable soil water content was more relevant than 374 the heat stress, while in others the number (e.g. Jordan) of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$ caused 375 significant yield decrease. Agronomic adaptations, such as shifting sowing dates minimize 376 the negative impacts of climate change. The inter-annual weather variability impacts barley 377 yield irrespective of the sowing dates and the future projected climate. 378 The results of the barley model evaluation are in line with the ones reported in other studies 379

where the coefficient of determination for simulated yield was 0.88 (Trnka e al., 2004); Al-

Bakri et al. (2010) reported values of RMSE for simulated yields of 586 kg DM ha⁻¹, while

values ranging between 292 and 720 kg DM ha^{-1} were reported in Fatemi et al. (2014).

- 383 The simulation of barley phenology was also in line with RMSE for heading of 5.6 days
- reported by Travasso and Magrin (1998). In this study, the RMSE for the simulated yield at
- evaluation was slightly higher, but this is due by three experiments in Jordan having observed
- yields of 70, 500, and 800 kg DM ha⁻¹, which caused an overestimation of yield at such
- 387 locations. The reason for some other lack of fit between observed and simulated data was
- because at some locations it was observed a severe frost impact (e.g. in Fiorenzuola), while in
- others, there was a poor canopy vigour leading to lower observed yields. The crop model was
- 390 set up for running in conditions of good establishment and any damages other than heat and
- drought are currently not considered. Table A4 showed the reasons why some simulated
- 392 yields could not reproduce the observed values (frost or poor canopy vigour), but in one case,
- JORB there were no indications on why 70 kg DM ha⁻¹ were observed. Due to the length of
- time passed from that field experiment there was no record of what really happened. It was
- 395 decided to keep it for the sake of clarity.

The gap-filling process using the AgMERRA dataset was made only after comparing the 396 observed dataset available with the downloaded data. Overall, the results are in line with the 397 reported outputs from Ruane et al. (2015) indicating the suitability of using the AgMERRA 398 399 product for the baseline period (1980-2010). Such dataset has been used in numerous studies 400 of climate change impacts as baseline period, allowing meaningful comparisons of climate 401 impacts during the 1980-2010 period (Xie et al., 2018; Asseng et al., 2013; 2015; 2016; 402 Rosenzweig et al., 2014; Elliot et al., 2015). In the current study, some locations (e.g. Turkey) showed an over-estimation of solar radiation by AgMERRA and an under-estimation 403 of minimum and maximum temperature (Figs. A1-A3). On the other hand, locations like 404 405 Syria-Breda and Jordan-Ramtha showed the opposite behaviour. Such bias could impact the simulated yield because an overestimation of daily temperature means that crops will be 406

407 subjected to higher than normal temperatures and therefore exacerbate the response to heat

408 stress. However, the over/underestimation of weather variable on the baseline simulation has been quantified to be on average 15% for simulated yield. Taylor et al. (1999) reported that 409 the variation of wheat yields in field experiments is about 13.5%. Therefore, we considered 410 that our bias introduced by the AgMERRA product to be in the range of the observed error. 411 Reported changes in simulated yield in this study were disaggregated by the type of climate 412 413 scenario used at a given RCP. Overall, the average climate impact on grain yield across the three scenarios was 9%, in line with the 15% reported results in Al-Bakri et al. (2010) for 414 Jordan and with the mean global reduction of 10% reported in Xie et al. (2018). And, it is 415 416 also in line with experimental results on other cereal crops (wheat) as reported in field experiments (Ottman et al., 2012; Asseng et al., 2015). The simulation study of Al-Barki et 417 al. (2010) could be used as benchmark against our simulated results in Jordan. However, their 418 419 results were obtained by adding incremental changes of either rainfall or temperature. As a result, they could evaluate the sensitivity of rainfall changes at a given temperature level (e.g. 420 keeping temperature constant but varying rainfall). In this study, the dynamic changes of 421 temperature and rainfall were analysed together because they will most likely act as a system. 422 In fact, results of this study showed that under the Dry scenario the mean growing season 423 424 temperature tends to be slightly higher than the one under the Wet scenarios, which is likely to be caused by more radiation under a Dry scenario than under a cloudy Wet scenario. 425 There was an interaction between the amount of rainfall, the extractable soil water content 426 and the maximum air temperature as evident in Jordan-Rabba. In that location at higher 427 maximum temperatures there was less extractable soil water and lower yields. However, the 428 impact of the different amount of rainfall and heat differs among locations in the same 429 country. For example, in Jordan the Wet scenarios showed contrasting results at the two 430 locations. Both Rabba and Ramtha had clay soils, with similar plant available water content; 431 at Jordan-Ramtha there was on average 137 mm of available soil water content for the soil 432

433 depth, while at Jordan-Rabba was 142 mm (Tab. A2). However, Jordan-Rabba had higher number of days of T_{max}>34°C and even if it had a higher extractable soil water content it did 434 not counteract the impact of higher temperatures. The high number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}C$ 435 436 caused higher soil water depletion from the plant and therefore lower yields under the wet scenario. In addition, Asseng et al., (2011) concluded that daily maximum temperatures 437 above 34°C means that leaf senescence rates are accelerated 3-folds, and such higher 438 temperature has also a negative impact of grain filling rates and grain abortion rates (Fisher, 439 1980). Liu et al. (2016) compared simulated and observed data of the impacts of heat stress at 440 441 anthesis and grain filling stages. They found that for every unit increase of heat degree-days grain yield was reduced by 1.0–1.6%. The CERES-Wheat model used in this study has also 442 been evaluated in many locations across Asia, Europe, and America encompassing a variety 443 444 of pedo-climatic conditions (Koo and Rivington, 2005. Timsina & Humphreys, 2006). Crop growth is directly related to the amount of soil water/rainfall, solar radiation, and nutrient 445 availability to the crop. These factors are interrelated, because while roots are responsible to 446 447 uptake water and nutrients the canopy is responsible for capturing solar radiation and CO₂. and then transform these into biomass (Jamieson and Ewert, 1998; Sadras and Angus, 2006). 448 Therefore, the results of this study are an attempt to start considering the whole system 449 together where the impact of temperature is not considered *per-se*, but it is also analysed as 450 451 function of the location-specific soil characteristics. By running the crop simulation model 452 from the summer prior sowing this study accounted also the water stored prior sowing which in such environments is an important determinant of grain yield as found in other studies 453 (Basso et al., 2010, 2011, 2012; Sadras, 2002; Sadras et al., 2012). The overall amount of 454 455 stored water in the soil over the winter period would also help to minimize the impact of the inter-annual variability on grain yield under current and future climate projections. This was 456 evident in some locations like Foggia (Italy) were simulated yields responded positively to 457

the Wet scenario and for the late sowing dates. In that location, the number of days of
Tmax>34°C is similar for the Dry and Wet scenarios but simulated yields were higher for the
Wet than the Dry scenario (Figure 2). Figure 6 showed that for the Wet scenario Foggia held
higher extractable water content for later sowing dates as a result of accumulation of stored
water. This means that respect to the earlier sowing dates, later sowing will take advantage of
more stored water to help their growth, especially in the earlier phases.

To preserve the soil water content and improving grain yield, farmers will need to adopt 464 different sustainable agronomic practices. On the one hand, the shifting of sowing dates is a 465 viable adaptation option for escaping terminal drought in this environment. Another 466 agronomic practice that was not considered in this study, aimed at increasing soil water 467 content is through the improvement of the soil organic carbon (Rawls et al., 2003). Anjum et 468 469 al. (2011) studying maize (Zea mays L.) suggested that, exogenous applications of fulvic acid substantially ameliorated the adversities of drought increasing canopy chlorophyll. These 470 beneficial effects might be tested also on barley when cropped in the Mediterranean basin. 471 Ceccarelli et al. (2000) suggested that along with agronomy, breeding is an important aspect 472 to take into consideration. Timing and duration of reproductive stages are two important 473 474 factors affecting breeding strategies. In fact, matching the crop development to the environmental resources is one the greatest challenge for achieving higher yields in new 475 genotypes (Ceccarelli et al., 2000). In Mediterranean environments terminal drought is a 476 known problem and results of this study show that it will be exacerbated by climate change. 477 Because of the different nature and intensity of the terminal drought, traits such as root 478 architecture (Richards et al., 2010) or prostrate habit, vigorous seedling growth, good ground 479 cover, early ear emergence, many ears m⁻² and large grains (Acevedo et al. 1991) may play a 480 different role in different locations. 481

482 There are several limitations to this study, the cultivar used is a generic barley variety calibrated in the Mediterranean basin and does not consider genetic differences among 483 cultivars as done in Zheng et al. (2013). Furthermore, it does not consider current and future 484 485 breeding activities for adaptation that may lead to more resilient barley genotypes. This is particularly relevant for this species, with genotypes locally adapted to a diversity of potential 486 extreme growing conditions. In addition, the model does not use canopy temperatures in the 487 488 simulations. The canopy temperature can be cooler than the air temperature by several degrees during transpiration due to evaporative cooling (Kumar & Tripathi, 1991) or can be 489 490 warmer by several degrees in situations where there is no soil water available for transpiration (Fischer, 1980). Although important for such kind of studies there is a recent 491 scientific effort to understand the best modelling approach for considering canopy 492 493 temperature impacts (Webber et al., 2017;2018).

494

495 **5.** Conclusions

The impact of future climate on barley yield in the Mediterranean is negative. Such impact 496 497 differs among locations, with some areas being worse off than others are. However, the negative impact of climate change depends on the climate projection considered, as some of 498 the GCMs showed an increase in growing season rainfall. The increase in rainfall does not 499 always translates into higher yields because the number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C at reproductive 500 stage offsets such gains. The current sowing window across the Mediterranean basin (Sep-501 Dec) will still be relevant under future conditions, linking climate forecasts systems with crop 502 503 simulation models could help to refine the sowing window for each growing season.

504

505

506 Acknowledgments

507 Prof. A. Suleiman for kindly providing soil information at the locations in Jordan. We also
508 thank the referees for the valuable comments and suggestions that helped to improve the
509 manuscript.

510

511 **References**

- 512 Acevedo E., Craufurd P.Q., Austin R.B., Perez-Marco P. (1991). Traits associated with high
- 513 yield in barley in low-rainfall environments. The Journal of Agricultural Science, 116(1),
- 514 23-36.
- Al-Bakri J., Suleiman A., Abdulla F., Ayad J. (2010). Potential impact of climate change on
 rainfed agriculture of a semi-arid basin in Jordan. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, 35,
- 517 125-134.
- 518 Anjum, S.A., Wang L., Farooq M., Xue L., Ali S. (2011). Fulvic acid application improves
- the maize performance under well-watered and drought conditions. Journal of Agronomy
- 520 and Crop Science, 197(6), 409-417.
- 521 Asseng S., Cammarano D., Basso B., Chung U., Alderman P.D., Sonder K., Reynolds M.,
- 522 Lobell D.B. (2016). Hot spots of wheat yield decline with rising temperatures. Global
- 523 Change Biololgy. doy: 10.1111/gcb.12530
- Asseng S., Ewert F., Martre P., et al. (2015). Rising temperatures reduce global wheat
- production. Nature Climate Change, 5, 143–147.
- 526 Asseng S., Ewert F., Rosenzweig C., Jone, J.W., Hatfield J.L., Ruane A.C., Boote K.J.,
- 527 Thorburn P.J., Rotter R.P., Cammarano D., Brisson N., et al. (2013). Uncertainty in
- simulating wheat yields under climate change. Nature Climate Change. doi:
- 529 10.1038/nclimate1916.

- Asseng S., Foster I., Turner N.C. (2011). The impact of temperature variability on wheat
 vields. Global Change Biology, 17, 997–1012.
- 532 Basso B., Cammarano D., Troccoli A., Chen D., Ritchie J.T. (2010). Long term wheat
- response to nitrogen in a rainfed Mediterranean environment: Field data and simulation
- analysis. European Journal of Agronomy, 33, 132–138.
- Basso B., Fiorentino C., Cammarano D., Cafiero G., Dardanelli J. (2012). Analysis of rainfall
- distribution on spatial and temporal patterns of wheat yield in Mediterranean environment.
- 537 European Journal of Agronomy, 41, 52-65.
- Basso B., Ritchie J.T., Cammarano D., Sartori L. (2011). A strategic and tactical management
- approach to select optimal N fertilizer rates for wheat in a spatially variable field. European
- 540 Journal of Agronomy, 35, 215–222.
- 541 Brisson N., Gate P., Gouache D., Charmet G., Oury F.X., Huard F. (2010). Why are wheat
- 542 yields stagnating in Europe? A comprehensive data analysis for France. Field Crop
- 543 Research, 119, 201-212.
- 544 Cammarano D., Tian D. (2018). The effects of projected climate and climate extremes on a
- 545 winter and summer crop in the southeast USA, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 248:
- 546 109–118.
- 547 Challinor, A.J., Watson J., Lobell D.B., Howden S.M., Smith D.R., Chhetri N. (2014). A
- meta-analysis of crop yield under climate change and adaptation. Nature Climate Change, 4,
 287–291.
- 550 CLIMsystems Ltd, New Zealand, <u>www.climsystems.com</u> (verified October 2018).
- 551 Ceccarelli S., Grando S., Tutwiler R., Baha J., Martini A., Salahieh H., Goodchild A.,
- 552 Micheal M. (2000). A methodological study on participatory breeding I. Selection phase.
- 553 Euphytica, 111, 91-104.

554	Ceccarelli S., Grando S., Capettini F. (2011). Barley Breeding History, Progress, Objectives,
555	and Technology, Near East, North and East Africa and Latin America. In: S.E. Ullrich (ed.),
556	Barley: Production, Improvement and Uses, Wiley-Blackwell, Ames (Iowa), USA, 210-
557	220.

- 558 Dawson I.K., Russel J., Powell W., Steffenson B., Thomas W.T.B., Waugh R. (2015).
- 559 Barley: a translational model for adaptation to climate change. New Phytologist, doi:

560 10.111/nhp. 13266

- Elliott J., Muller C., Deryng D., Chryssanthacopoulos J., Boote K.J., Buchner M., Foster I.,
- Glotter M., et al. (2015) The global gridded crop model intercomparison: data and modeling
- protocols for phase 1 (v1.0). Geoscientific Model Development. doi: 10.5194/gmd-8-261-

564 2015

- 565 FAOSTAT, 2018. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle
- Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy (<u>http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#home</u>; accessed
 Nov 2018).
- 568 Fatemi Z., Pknejad F., Amiri E., Eilkaee M.N. (2014). Capability of the CERES-Barley
- 569Model for Prediction of Barley Varieties Growth under Deficit Irrigation. Journal of

570 Biology, 2, 1-7.

- 571 Fischer R.A. (1980) Influence of water stress on crop yield in semiarid regions.
- 572 In: Adaptation of Plants to Water and High Temperature Stress (eds Turner NC, Kramer
- 573 PJ), pp. 323–339. Wiley, New York.
- 574 Francia E., Tondelli A., Rizza F., Badeck F.W., et al. (2011). Determinats of bazrely grain
- 575 yield in a wide range of Mediterranean environments. Field Crop Research, 120, 169-178.
- 576 Grando S., Gormez Macpherson H. (eds.) (2005) Food Barley: Importance, Uses and Local
- 577 Knowledge. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Food Barley Improvement, 14-
- 578 17 January 2002, Hammamet, Tunisia. ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria, x+156 pp.

- 579 Hoogenboom G., Jones J.W., Wilkens P.W., Porter C.H., et al. (2010). Decision Support
- 580 System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT), Version 4.5 (CD-ROM). University of
- 581 Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.
- 582 Huntingford C., Hugo Lambert F., Gash J.H.C., Taylor C.M., Challinor A.J. (2005). Aspects
- of climate change prediction relevant to crop productivity. Philosophical Transactions of the
- 584 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 360, 1999–2009.
- Jamieson P.D., Ewert F. (1999). The role of roots in controlling soil water extraction during
 drought: an analysis by simulation. Field Crop Research, 60, 267-280.
- Jones J.W., Hoogenboom G., Porter C.H., Boote K.J., et al. (2003). The DSSAT cropping
- system model. European Journal of Agronomy, 18, 235–265.
- 589 Kobza J., Edwards G.E. (1987). Influences of leaf temperature on photosynthetic carbon
- 590 metabolism in wheat. Plant Physiology, 83, 69–74.
- 591 Koo J., Rivington M. (2005). Report on the Meta-analysis of Crop modelling for Climate
- 592 Change and Food Security Survey Climate Change. Agriculture and Food Security
- 593 (CCAFS), Challenge Program, Denmark.
- 594 Kumar A., Tripathi R.P. (1991). Relationships between Leaf Water Potential, Canopy
- 595 Temperature and Transpiration in Irrigated and Non-irrigated Wheat. Journal of Agronomy
- and Crop Science, 166, 19-23.
- 597 Liu B., Asseng S., Muller C., Ewert F., Elliot J., et al. (2016). Similar estimates of
- temperature impacts on global wheat yield by three independent methods. Nature Climate
- 599 Change. doi: 10.1038/nclimate3115.
- Lobell D.B., Burke M.B., Tebaldi C., Mastrandrea M.D., Falcon W.P., Naylor R.L. (2008).
- 601 Prioritizing climate change adaptation needs for food security in 2030. Science, 319, 607–
- 602 610.

603	Martre P., He J., Le	Gouis J., Semenov	M.A. (2015).	In silico system	analysis of
	, , ,	,		2	2

- 604 physiological traits determining grain yield and protein concentration for wheat as
- 605 influenced by climate and crop management. Journal of Experimental Botany, 66, 3581–606 3598.
- 607 O'Leary G.J., Christy B., Nuttal J., Huth N., Cammarano D., et al. (2015). Response of wheat
- growth, grain yield and water use to elevated CO_2 under a Free-Air CO_2 Enrichment
- (FACE) experiment and modelling in a semi-arid environment. Global Change Biology, 21,
 2670–2686.
- 611 Ottman M.J., Kimball B.A., White J.W., Wall G.W. (2012) Wheat growth response to
- 612 increased temperature from varied planting dates and supplemental infrared heating.
- 613 Agronomy Journal, 104, 7–16.
- Passioura J., 2006. Increasing crop productivity when water is scarce—from breeding to field
 management. Agricultural Water Management, 80, 176-196.
- 616 Porter J.R., Xie L., Challinor A.J., Cochrane K., Howden M., Iqbal M.M., Lobell D.B.,
- 617 Travasso M.I. (2014). Chapter 7. Food security and food production systems. Climate
- change 2014: impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Working Group II Contribution to the
- 619 IPCC 5th Assessment Report. Geneva, Switzerland.
- 620 Rawls W.J., Pachepsky, Y.A., Ritchie J.C., Sobecki T.M., Bloodworth H. (2003). Effect of
- soil organic carbon on soil water retention. Geoderma, 116(1-2), 61-76.
- 622 **Richards** R.A., Rebetzke G.J., Watt M., Condon A.G., Spelmeyer W., Dolferus R. (2010).
- Breeding for improved water productivity in temperate cereals: phenotyping, quantitative
- trait loci, markers and the selection environment. Functional Plant Biology, 37, 85-97.
- Rosenzweig C., et al. (2014). Assessing agricultural risks of climate change in the 21st
- 626 century in a global gridded crop model intercomparison. Proceedings of the National
- 627 Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111, 3268–73.

- 628 Rosenzweig C., Hillel, D. (Eds.) (2015). Handbook of Climate Change and Agroecosystems:
- 629 The Agricultural Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP) Integrated
- 630 Crop and Economic Assessments. ICP Series on Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation, and
- 631 Mitigation Vol. 3. Imperial College Press, doi:10.1142/p970.
- 632 Rötter R.P., Palosuo T. Kersebaum K.C., Angulo C., Bindi M., et al. (2012). Simulation of
- spring barley yield in different climatic zones of Northern and Central Europe: A
- 634 comparison of nine crop models. Field Crop Research, 133, 23–26.
- Ruane A.C., Goldberg R., Chryssanthacopoulos J. (2015). Climate forcing datasets for
- agricultural modeling: merged products for gap-filling and historical climate series
- estimation Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 200, 233–48.
- 638 Ruane A.C., McDermid S.P. (2017). Selection of a representative subset of global climate
- 639 models that captures the profile of regional changes for integrated climate impacts
- 640 assessment. Earth Perspectives. doi: 10.1186/s40322-017-0036-4.
- 641 Sadras V.O. (2002). Interaction between rainfall and nitrogen fertilization of wheat in
- 642 environments prone to terminal drought: economic and environmental risks analysis. Field
- 643 Crop Research, 77, 201-215.
- 644 Sadras V.O., Angus J.F. (2006). Benchmarking water-use efficiency of rainfed wheat in dry
- 645 environments. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research, 57, 847-856.
- 646 Sadras V.O., Lawson C., Hooper P., McDonald G. (2012). Contribution of summer rainfall
- and nitrogen to the yield and water use efficiency of wheat in Mediterranean-type
- 648 environments of South Australia. European Journal of Agoronomy, 36, 41-54.
- 649 Saseendran S.A., Ahuja L.R., Timlin D., Stockle C.O., Boote K.J., Hoogenboom G. (2008).
- 650 Current water deficit stress simulations in selected agricultural system models. In: Response
- of Crops to Limited Water: Understanding and Modeling Water Stress Effects on Plant

- Growth (Ahuja L.R., Reddy V.R., Saseendran S.A., Qiang Y., Eds.). Advances in
- Agricultural Systems Modeling 1. American Society of Agronomy, Inc., WI, USA.
- 654 Semenov M.A., Stratonovitch P., Alghabari F., Gooding M.J. (2014). Adapting wheat in
- Europe for climate change. Journal of Cereal Science, 59, 245–256.
- 656 Senapati N., Stratonovitch P., Paul M.J., Semenov M.A. (2018). Drought tolerance during
- reproductive development is important for increasing wheat yield potential under climate
- change in Europe. Journal of Experimental Botany. doi: 10.1093/jxb/ery226
- Tao F., Rotter R.P., Palosuo T., Diaz-Ambrona C.G.H., Ines Mingues M., et al. (2018).
- 660 Contribution of crop model structure, parameters and climate projections to uncertainties in
- climate change impact assessments. Global Change Biology, doi: 10.1111/gcb.14019
- 662 Taylor, S.L., Payton, M.E., Raun, W.R. (1999). Relationship between mean yield, coefficient
- of variation, mean square error, and plot size in wheat field experiments. Communication in
 Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 30, 1439–1447.
- Taylor K.E., Stouffer R.J., Meehl G.A. (2012). An Overview of CMIP5 and the experiment
- design. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 93, 485-498.
- Timsina J., Humphreys E. (2006). Performance of CERES-rice and CERES-wheat models in
- rice-wheat systems: a review. Agricultural Systems, 90, 5-31
- 669 Travasso M.I., Magrin G.O. (1998). Utility of CERES-Barely under Argentine conditions.
- 670 Field Crop Research, 57, 329-333.
- 671 Trnka M., Dubrovsky M., Zalud, Z. (2004). Climate change impacts and adaptation strategies
- in spring barley production in the Czech Republic. Climatic Change, 64, 227-255.
- 673 Webber H., Martre P., Asseng S., Kimball B., White J., Ottman M., et al. (2017). Canopy
- temperature for simulation of heat stress in irrigated wheat in a semi-arid environment: A
- multi-model comparison. Field Crop Research, 202, 21-35.

- 676 Webber H., White J.W., Kimball B.A., Ewert F., Asseng S., Rezaei E.E., et al. (2018).
- 677 Canopy temperature for simulation of heat stress in irrigated wheat in a semi-arid
- environment: A multi-model comparison. Field Crop Research, 216, 75-88.
- Wickham, H (2016). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag NewYork, 2016.
- 1011, 2010
- 681 Wilmott C.J. (1982). Some comments on the evaluation of model performance. Bulletin
- American Meteorological Society, 63, 1309–1313.
- Kie W., Xiong W., Pan J., Ali T., Cui Q., Guan D., Meng J., Mueller N.D., Lin E., Davis S.J.
- 684 (2018). Decreases in global beer supply due to extreme drought and heat. Nature Plants.
- 685 doi.org/10.1038/s41477-018-0263-1
- Yin, C., Li, Y., Urich, P., 2013. SimCLIM 2013 Data Manual. CLIMsystems Ltd, New
 Zealand (available at <u>www.climsystems.com</u>).
- Zheng B., Biddulph B., Li D., Kuchel H., Chapman S. (2013). Quantification of the effects of
- VRN1 and Ppd-D1 to predict spring wheat (Triticum aestivum) heading time across diverse
- environments. Journal of Experimental Botany. doi:10.1093/jxb/ert209
- 691
- 692
- 693
- 694
- 054
- 695
- 696

698

r² Variable RMSE d-Index Step 0.99 Heading 0.99 4 *d* Maturity 9 *d* 0.98 Calibration 0.96 587 kg DM ha⁻¹ Yield 0.85 0.60 0.99 Heading 0.97 6 *d* 10 d 0.99 Evaluation Maturity 0.82 1200 kg DM ha⁻¹ Yield 0.55 0.80 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724

Table 1. Results of the calibration and evaluation of the generic barley cultivar at three irrigatedlocation for calibration and for the remaining locations for the evaluation.

Table 2. List of the three Global Circulation Models (GCMs) selected at each location and

their simulated changes of growing season mean temperature and rainfall respect to the

727 baseline.

ID	GCM	Site ID	Growing season rainfall	Growing season temperature
			changes	changes
			(%)	(%)
DRY	MIROC4H	Algeria	-13.63	17.12
DRY	INMCM4	Italy-Foggia	-18.81	7.61
DRY	INMCM4	Italy-Fiorenzuola	-16.41	11.60
DRY	MIROC4H	Jordan-Ramtha	-23.94	14.09
DRY	MIROC4H	Jordan-Rabba	-31.72	12.21
DRY	GFDL-ESM2M	Spain	-15.22	10.65
DRY	MIROC4H	Syria-Breda	-14.66	13.60
DRY	MIROC4H	Syria-Tel Hadya	-14.33	13.46
DRY	GFDL-ESM2G	Turkey	-20.82	18.36
MID	HADCM3	Algeria	1.50	8.83
MID	BBC-CSM1-1	Italy-Foggia	1.14	9.09
MID	CANESM2	Italy-Fiorenzuola	0.24	12.39
MID	BBC-CSM1-1	Jordan-Ramtha	-0.12	10.01
MID	ACESS-1.3	Jordan-Rabba	0.28	7.63
MID	NORESM1-M	Spain	0.45	11.37
MID	GFDL-ESM2M	Syria-Breda	-2.47	8.79
MID	NORESM1-ME	Syria-Tel Hadya	0.93	10.07
MID	GFDL-ESM2M	Turkey	0.24	11.59
WET	BBC-CSM1-1	Algeria	20.98	9.83
WET	HADCM3	Italy-Foggia	10.82	9.02
WET	CNRM-CM5	Italy-Fiorenzuola	16.56	10.96
WET	MPI-ESM-MR	Jordan-Ramtha	24.27	7.15
WET	FGOALS-G2	Jordan-Rabba	20.10	11.71
WET	MIROC4H	Spain	14.59	17.09
WET	INMCM4	Syria-Breda	23.96	7.02
WET	INMCM4	Syria-Tel Hadya	23.67	6.95
WET	CNRM-CM5	Turkey	5.07	12.78



731	Figure 1. The re	ed dots indicate the	locations of the study	of Francia et al.	(2011) used in the current
	1 001	1 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			0 1 1 1 1

731 732	Figure 1. The red dots indicate the locations of the study of Francia et al. (2011) used in the current work. The green area indicates the barley growing area and the intensity of the cultivation
733	work. The green alea materies the burley growing area and the mensity of the cultivation.
734	
735	
700	
/36	
737	
738	
739	
740	
741	
742	
743	
711	
/44	
745	





Figure 2. Simulated relative grain yield change for the eight sowing dates and for the "Dry"
(red boxplots), "Mid" (green boxplots), and "Wet" (blue boxplots) scenarios. For each
boxplot, the end of the vertical line represents, from top to the bottom, the 10th percentile and

the 90th percentile. The horizontal line of the box, from the top to the bottom represents the

752 25th, median, and 75th percentile, respectively.



Figure 3. Relationship between Δ simulated grain yield and (*a*) Δ cumulative rainfall and (*b*) number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C. The three different GCMs were reported in symbols' shape, with circle being the "Dry", diamond being the "Mid", and square being the "Wet". The different stages were reported with different colour-code, start of simulation to sowing (SP,

- red), sowing to anthesis (PA, yellow), and anthesis to maturity (AM, green).



Figure 4. Number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C at the reproductive stage for the eight sowing dates and for the Baseline (grey boxplots), "Dry" (red boxplots), "Mid" (green boxplots), and "Wet" (blue boxplots) scenarios. For each boxplot, the end of the vertical line represents, from top to the bottom, the 10th percentile and the 90th percentile. The horizontal line of the

box, from the top to the bottom represents the 25^{th} , median, and 75^{th} percentile, respectively.







Figure 5. Cumulative growing season rainfall at sowing (blue box), at anthesis (green box)
and at maturity (yellow box) for the baseline, "Dry", "Mid", and "Wet" scenarios. For each
boxplot, the end of the vertical line represents, from top to the bottom, the 10th percentile and
the 90th percentile. The horizontal line of the box, from the top to the bottom represents the
25th, median, and 75th percentile, respectively.





Figure 6. Extractable soil water content at the start of the simulation (full horizontal line), at

sowing (blue box), at anthesis (green box) and at maturity (yellow box) for the baseline,
"Dry", "Mid", and "Wet" scenarios. For each boxplot, the end of the vertical line represents,

from top to the bottom, the 10^{th} percentile and the 90^{th} percentile. The horizontal line of the

- box, from the top to the bottom represents the 25^{th} , median, and 75^{th} percentile, respectively.

- - -





Figure 7. Relationship between (*a*) number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C at reproductive stage and simulated grain yield; (*b*) cumulative rainfall at anthesis and grain yield; (*c*) Δ extractable soil water content at anthesis and number of days of $T_{max}>34^{\circ}$ C at reproductive stage; and (*d*) Δ extractable soil water content at anthesis and cumulative rainfall at anthesis for the baseline (grey dots), Dry (red dots), Mid (green dots), and Wet (blue dots) scenarios at Jordan-Rabba.



Figure 8. Coefficient of variation due to the inter-annual variation (Yearly; blue bars), the
sowing dates under the baseline conditions (Sowing-Base; orange bars), the sowing dates
under future conditions (Sowing-Future; grey bars); and the different scenarios used

886 (Scenarios; yellow bars).