



UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Assessment of intrinsic aquifer vulnerability at continental scale through a critical application of the drastic framework: The case of South America

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original

Assessment of intrinsic aquifer vulnerability at continental scale through a critical application of the drastic framework: The case of South America / Rama, F.; Busico, G.; Arumi, J. L.; Kazakis, N.; Colombani, N.; Marfella, L.; Hirata, R.; Kruse, E. E.; Sweeney, P.; Mastrocicco, M.. - In: SCIENCE OF THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT. - ISSN 0048-9697. - ELETTRONICO. - 823:(2022). [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153748]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11566/298652 since: 2024-07-17T10:10:04Z

Publisher:

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153748

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. The use of copyrighted works requires the consent of the rights' holder (author or publisher). Works made available under a Creative Commons license or a Publisher's custom-made license can be used according to the terms and conditions contained therein. See editor's website for further information and terms and conditions.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Politecnica delle Marche (<https://iris.univpm.it>). When citing, please refer to the published version.

note finali coverage

(Article begins on next page)

1 **ASSESSMENT OF INTRINSIC AQUIFER VULNERABILITY AT**
2 **CONTINENTAL SCALE THROUGH A CRITICAL APPLICATION OF THE**
3 **DRASTIC FRAMEWORK: THE CASE OF SOUTH AMERICA**

4 Fabrizio Rama^{1*}, Gianluigi Busico², José Luis Arumi³, Narantzis Kazakis⁴, Nicolò Colombani⁵, Luigi
5 Marfella⁶, Ricardo Hirata⁷, Eduardo E. Kruse⁸, Paul Sweeney¹, Micòl Mastrocicco².
6

7 * Corresponding author

8 ¹. Syngenta – Jealott’s Hill International Research Centre, Environmental Safety, Warfield, Bracknell RG426EY, United
9 Kingdom

10 ². Department of Environmental, Biological and Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technologies, University of Campania
11 “Luigi Vanvitelli”, Via Vivaldi 43, 81100 Caserta, Italy

12 ³. Department of water resources, Faculty of Agriculture Engineering, Centro Fondap CRHIAM, University of
13 Concepción, Chile

14 ⁴. Department of Geology, Laboratory of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,
15 Thessaloniki, 54124, Greece.

16 ⁵. Department of Materials, Environmental Sciences and Urban Planning, Polytechnic University of Marche, Via Brecce
17 Bianche 12, 60131 Ancona, Italy.

18 ⁶. School of Geography, Geology and the Environment, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BG, United Kingdom

19 ⁷. Institute of Geosciences, University of São Paulo (USP); Director CEPAS|USP: Groundwater Research Center; Vice-
20 President of Brazilian Groundwater Association – ABAS; FAPESP Geosciences Coordinator, Sao Paulo (SP), Brazil

21 ⁸. Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo,
22 Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP), Calle 64 #3 (entre 119 y 120), 1900, La Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina
23

24 **HIGHLIGHTS:**

- 25 • First map of intrinsic aquifer vulnerability of South America continent is provided
26 • Outcomes are validated by sensitivity analyses and previous regional assessments
27 • Extensive discussion about data collection and limits of DRASTIC method is provided
28 • The DRASTIC assessment shows a medium to low vulnerability at continental scale
29 • Results show a higher vulnerability of aquifers in Amazon compared to other regions
30

31 **ABSTRACT:**

32 An assessment of the intrinsic aquifer vulnerability of South America is presented. The outcomes
33 represent the potential sensitivity of natural aquifers to leaching of dissolved compounds from the
34 land surface. The study, developed at continental scale but retaining regionally a high resolution, is
35 based on a critical application of the DRASTIC method. The biggest challenge in performing such a
36 study in South America was the scattered and irregular nature of environmental datasets. Accordingly,

37 the most updated information on soil, land use, geology, hydrogeology, and climate at continental,
38 national, and regional scale were selected from international and local databases. To avoid spatial
39 discrepancy and inconsistency, data were integrated, harmonized, and accurately cross-checked,
40 using local professional knowledge where information was missing. The method was applied in a
41 GIS environment to allow spatial analysis of raw data along with the overlaying and rating of maps.
42 The application of the DRASTIC method allows to classify South America into five vulnerability
43 classes, from very low to very high, and shows an overall medium to low vulnerability at continental
44 scale. The Amazon region, coastal aquifers, colluvial Andean valleys, and alluvial aquifers of main
45 rivers were the areas classified as highly vulnerable. Moreover, countries with the largest areas with
46 high aquifer vulnerability were those characterized by extended regions of rainforest. In addition, a
47 single parameter sensitivity analysis showed depth to water table to be the most significant factor,
48 while a cross-validation using existing vulnerability assessments and observed concentrations of
49 compounds in groundwater confirmed the reliability of the proposed assessment, even at regional
50 scale. Overall, although additional field surveys and detailed works at local level are needed to
51 develop effective water management plans, the present DRASTIC map represents an essential
52 common ground towards a more sustainable land-use and water management in the whole territory
53 of South America.

54


55 **Keywords:**

56 Intrinsic groundwater vulnerability; High-resolution maps; GIS; Groundwater; South America;
57 DRASTIC

58

59 **GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT:**

60



61

62

63 1. INTRODUCTION


64 Groundwater is the largest store of available freshwater in the world (Cuthbert et al., 2019). Broadly,
 65 more than half of world’s population depends on subsurface water for any kind of utilizations such
 66 as drinking, irrigation, domestic and industrial purposes (Oki and Kanae, 2006; Gleeson et al., 2010).
 67 It was accounted that this resource provides drinking water for two billion people and irrigation for
 68 40% of cropland (Siebert et al., 2010; Jasechko et al., 2014). However, growing population and
 69 anthropogenic uses trigger depletion and pollution of this water resource, with clear detrimental
 70 effects at both regional and local scales (Aeschbach-Hertig and Gleeson, 2012). For example, aquifers
 71 in United States (US) have lost more than 700 km³ of water during the twentieth century (Konikow
 72 and Kendy, 2005), and future long-term impacts of climate change may intensify this negative pattern.
 73 On top of that, aquifers in every part of the world receive today higher loads of anthropogenic
 74 substances, which may infiltrate through the unsaturated zone and accumulate deep in the subsurface
 75 system (Ascott et al., 2017, Jasechko et al., 2017). Groundwater is consequently a vital and fragile
 76 resource that requires a forward-looking approach in its management. In this framework, assessing
 77 aquifer vulnerability to leaching represents a key preventive tool in terms of screening and
 78 management to achieve a sustainable use of groundwater resources (Alley et al., 1999; Foster et al.,
 79 2013). Knowing the vulnerability of an aquifer in a specific location can help design tailored
 80 management plans and protection strategies, which balance wisely present development and future
 81 needs. The term aquifer vulnerability indicates the degree to which a subsurface system is likely to
 82 be adversely affected by any perturbation or stress from the land surface (Aller et al., 1987). It depends
 83 on the natural attenuation capacity related to a set of physicochemical processes in a certain location

84 (e.g. filtration, biodegradation, hydrolysis, adsorption, dilution, volatilization, and dispersion).
85 Accordingly, intrinsic vulnerability refers to the natural protection afforded by local hydrogeological
86 setting, while specific vulnerability also includes specific land uses, management practices, and
87 chemical characteristics of the compounds (Stigter et al., 2006; Gimsing et al., 2019). Alternatively,
88 for the latter case, some authors (Foster and Hirata, 1988; Foster et al., 2013) prefer the term aquifer
89 hazard as an interaction between pollutant load activities and intrinsic aquifer vulnerability,
90 recognizing that elevated hazard occurs only when a high pollutant load affects a highly vulnerable
91 area. Aquifer vulnerability can be estimated using different approaches (US-NRC, 1993), which vary
92 in terms of complexity, computation effort, and data requirement: (a) overlay/index methods, (b)
93 process-based models, (c) statistical methods and, raised in the last two decades, (d) hybrid methods.
94 “Index methods” classify main drivers of leaching process one-by-one (i.e. indexes), assigning a
95 “rating” and sum them up with a linear combination in a GIS-environment (Gogu and Dassargues,
96 2000; Neshat et al., 2014; Massone and Barilari, 2020). They are simple and easy-to-use, generally
97 require minimal data and are scalable to large domains but produce only single static value for
98 vulnerability. For this reason, they are deployed as a screening tool for extended domains (e.g.,
99 regional to national). Conversely, “process-based methods” aim to develop a comprehensive and
100 transient-over-time model of the natural domain, which is controlled by physically based relations
101 (Wachniew et al., 2016). They are complex and powerful tools, but time and data consuming.
102 Accordingly, they are mostly used on small domains (e.g., field to regional) as require extensive
103 parametrization and high computational effort to obtain a strictly site-specific assessment. “Statistical
104 methods” such as conditional probability analysis, weight of evidence (WOE) multiple linear
105 regression (MLR) or geostatistical interpolation (kriging) define the vulnerability of an aquifer based
106 on available observations rather than analysing natural mechanisms and local conditions (Roy-Roura
107 et al., 2013; Busico et al., 2018; Javadi et al., 2020; Rahmani et al., 2021). They allow assessment of
108 groundwater exposure and its uncertainty by processing large sets of data, but consequently, rely on
109 availability and quality of that data, which can be difficult to obtain. Lastly, “hybrid methods”
110 recombine previous approaches using recent numerical algorithms e.g. genetic algorithms, machine
111 learning (Nadiri et al., 2018; Jahromi et al., 2021, Sadeghfam et al., 2021) or combining different
112 modelling approaches (Keuskamp et al., 2012; Jia et al., 2019). They try to overcome the limitations
113 of other methods by reducing the subjectivity of ratings and by modifying the limits of vulnerability
114 classes. For example, DRASTIC and SINTACS were fully hybridized by a calibration process using
115 parameter weights and scores (Kazakis and Voudouris, 2015; Busico et al., 2017; Busico et al., 2020).
116 An exhaustive review of those approaches along with limitations and future challenges is available
117 in Machiwal et al. (2018a; b) and Goyal et al. (2021). Most of the applicability of a specific method

118 depends on the availability and quality of data (i.e., observations of groundwater quality and local
119 conditions to characterize the domain or constrain the model). Accordingly, simpler, and faster
120 approaches, which require less data and time to run, are still the most employed worldwide. Index
121 and rating methods such as DRASTIC (Aller et al., 1987), AVI (Van Stemproot et al., 1993),
122 SINTACS (Civita and De Maio, 2004) and GOD (Foster, 1987; Foster and Hirata, 1988), COP (Vias
123 et al., 2006) which summarize complex hydrogeological settings in few intuitive indexes, are the most
124 applied for assessment of aquifer vulnerability of extended areas. In the last years, vulnerability
125 assessments have started to be developed at very large scale in different parts of the world. Although
126 lacking in a comprehensive continental map, North America and Asia boasted a considerable
127 scientific production about aquifer vulnerability on international indexed journals, developing studies
128 at very large scale (Fritch et al., 2000; Huan et al., 2012; Li and Merchant, 2013; Yin et al., 2013). At
129 the same time, pan continental maps of groundwater vulnerability have been developed in Europe
130 (Kumar et al., 2020; Nistor, 2020) and Africa (Ouedraogo et al., 2016). These assessments
131 represented the initial attempts of using remote sensing and open data to estimate the aquifer
132 vulnerability locally, but in a consistent continental framework. However, they missed an extensive
133 discussion about limitations of the available datasets and the strong link of the results with the quality
134 of input data. In addition, continental maps of groundwater vulnerability in Europe and Africa have
135 pixel dimensions of about 15 km or more, which result in map scales lower than 1:60M. Nevertheless,
136 territorial planning issues usually require cartographies with larger scales to allow municipal (e.g.,
137 1:25k-1:50k) or state/provincial (e.g., 1:100k-1:500k) operators to correctly manage land use or
138 establish priority-action policies for a sustainable groundwater management. This shift in map scaling
139 may entail that academically valid contributions have in practice little scope in terms of management
140 by authorities and policymakers. Given that a continental vulnerability assessment of groundwater is
141 less well established in South America, the present paper aims to fill this gap. However, it aspires to
142 do so, by providing a continental map that maximizes the local resolution of hydrogeological features.
143 In South America, aquifer vulnerability started gaining visibility in scientific literature only in the
144 last two decades, having most of the indexed works published in the last 10 years. Although land use
145 change is a hot topic for groundwater depletion in South America (De Sy et al., 2015), aquifer
146 vulnerability and water quality degradation represent two environmental topics only recently well
147 understood (Bocanegra et al., 2010). Furthermore, availability of reliable and continuous datasets
148 with environmental data is scarce and scattered. Accordingly, the spatial distribution of indexed
149 vulnerability studies in South America is far from uniform (Fig. 1). Literature research on Scopus
150 database (i.e. Elsevier) has showed that only Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, and Chile have at least one
151 indexed study in English on groundwater vulnerability at local and regional scale (Table S0). Most

152 of the studies focused on Brazil and Argentina, which count more than ten and five studies,
153 respectively. In Brazil, the two most applied methods are DRASTIC (Herlinger and Viero, 2007;
154 Nobre et al., 2007; Seabra et al., 2009; Caprario et al., 2019; Giacomazzo and de Almeida, 2020) and
155 GOD, (Hirata et al., 1991; Gomes et al., 2018; Peixoto and Cavalcante, 2019), followed by COP
156 (Tayer and Velasquez, 2017; Aragão et al., 2020), which is specific for karst regions. The first and
157 largest application of a rating method in South America was also in Brazil, where a GOD vulnerability
158 assessment in 1991 was developed for the entire Sao Paulo state (Hirata et al., 1991). In Argentina,
159 DRASTIC method is the most deployed for both, intrinsic (Massone et al., 2010; Montoya et al.,
160 2019) or specific vulnerability (Lima et al., 2011), followed by GOD (Boujon and Sanci, 2014).
161 Finally, Colombia (Betancur et al., 2013; Agudelo Moreno et al., 2020) and Chile (Duhalde et al.,
162 2018) only showed two and one studies, respectively. Conversely, there are plenty of unindexed
163 articles and reports in Portuguese and Spanish (roughly more than 1,000) using different assessment
164 methods to address groundwater vulnerability at local scale. In many regions of Brazil, Costa Rica,
165 Argentina, and Colombia, GOD is also used by governs and authorities as an official tool to control
166 land use. Such a disjointed range of regional assessments would benefit from a pan continental study,
167 which aims to harmonize vulnerabilities from different countries of South America in a common
168 framework and to provide an international showcase for a large unpublished literature (i.e.
169 government documents) on aquifer vulnerability. Moreover, in South America there are 29
170 transboundary aquifers (IGRAC, 2015) and a pan continental study would also ease international
171 cooperation on water resources management, promoting the sound development of joint projects
172 specific to groundwater (Villar, 2016). Furthermore, none of the previous studies offered a robust
173 validation of the proposed methodology or a quality check of the results. Accordingly, this paper
174 presents the very first DRASTIC-based assessment of intrinsic groundwater vulnerability at
175 continental scale in South America, which retains a high resolution of final maps. Local and
176 international databases were combined to maximize spatial discretization and resolution of the
177 proposed map in GIS (250m pixel resolution, which results in about 1:500k of map scale). In the
178 manuscript, the authors go through a quality check of the input datasets used in the method, validate
179 the vulnerability map against groundwater concentrations of different compounds (e.g., NO_3^- , Cl^- ,
180 PO_4^{3-}) and previous assessments at local scale, and discuss main limitations of DRASTIC
181 methodology. Only freely available sources and datasets were used in this work. The data collection
182 is fully documented and stored in a dedicated repository (Rama et al., 2021).

183



184


185 **Fig. 1:** Distribution of local and regional studies on groundwater vulnerability in South America from a
 186 literature review. The review was conducted on Scopus database (Elsevier), focused on regional and local
 187 studies (Base map from ESRI Digital Globe 2021).

188

189 **2. STUDY AREA**

190 The study area is represented by the fourth largest continent in the world: South America (Fig. 2a).
 191 The continental limit is defined by the frontier between Colombia (in) and Panama (out), having as a
 192 Northernmost point Punta Gallinas, Colombia (12°27'31"N-71°40'8"W), Southernmost point Cape

193 Froward, Chile (53°53'47"S -71°17'40"W), Westernmost point Punta Pariñas, Peru (4°40'58"S-
194 81°19'43"W) and Easternmost point Ponta do Seixas, Brazil (7°9'19"S-34°47'35"W). It includes 13
195 countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname,
196 Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela) and many other territories. Most of the continent is
197 located above a large tectonic plaque, whose movement to West was producing the subduction of
198 Nazca Plaque, which generated Andean Cordillera (Capitanio et al., 2011). Thus, from the
199 hydrogeological point of view, the Andes divide South America into two major regions. On the one
200 hand, the Pacific region (i.e., tectonically active), where basins and aquifers are relatively small, being
201 limited by the topography of the intermontane valleys. On the other hand, the Atlantic region, which
202 is tectonically inactive, hosts large basins (e.g., the Orinoco and Amazon systems), plains of
203 extremely low slope (e.g., Chaco-Pampean plain in the Rio de la Plata basin), and transboundary
204 groundwater bodies (e.g., Guarani aquifer across Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Argentina).
205 Accordingly, the map of groundwater resources (Fig. 2b) obtained from the World-wide
206 Hydrogeological Mapping and Assessment Programme (WHYMAP) (Richts et al, 2011) shows that
207 large groundwater basins, which include the entire Amazon basin in Brazil, Venezuela, and Guyana,
208 along with the transboundary Guarani aquifer system, are mainly located in the Atlantic region.
209 Conversely, complex hydrogeological systems, which refer to fractured and karstified systems, and
210 local aquifers are quite extensive in the Pacific side and on the top of Andean Cordillera. In addition,
211 South America presents a slightly variable regime of temperature and precipitation on the land
212 surface, having most of the climates of the world (Fig. 2b). The Andean Cordillera affects air mass
213 circulation in atmosphere, intercepting most of the large rain systems from both sides associated with
214 Atlantic Westerlies and Pacific Frontals systems (Garreaud et al., 2009). This interception produces
215 intense rainfall concentrated in specific regions, for example the Orinoco-Amazonas watershed
216 (Yoon et al., 2010), and the Paramos of the tropical Andes, which consequently represent important
217 and fragile sources of freshwater (Célleri and Feyen, 2009). Conversely, those focused precipitations
218 produce extremely dry areas, such as the Latin-American diagonal of aridity, which interest most of
219 the cost of Peru, North and central Chile, and South Argentina (Núñez and Verbist, 2018). The wide
220 variability of climate conditions in the continent is also affected by irregular and periodic large-scale
221 variations in wind circulations, such as El Niño-Southern Oscillations (ENSO), the Pacific Decadal
222 Oscillation and the Atlantic Oscillation (Garreaud, 2009). In terms of land use, about 50% of South
223 America is covered by forests, followed by grasslands 26%, agriculture 24%, barren 3%, and water
224 bodies 1% (Fig. 2c). Percentage of forests in each country ranges from 9.5% in Uruguay to 96.5% in
225 French Guiana (Giri and Long, 2014).



226

227 **Fig. 2:** South America overview: a) Administrative limits (ESRI Digital Globe 2021); b) Distribution of
 228 groundwater resources (adapted from WHYMAP, Richts et al, 2011); c) Koppen-Geiger climate classification
 229 (adapted from Beck et al., 2018); d) Land use as reported in Corine Land Cover (adapted from European Union,
 230 Copernicus Land Monitoring Service 2018). Detailed legends for c) Koppen-Geiger climate classification and
 231 d) for CLC are available in the Supplementary Material (Fig. S2).

232

233 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

234 3.1. DRASTIC method

235 DRASTIC is an index and rating method based on the overlapping of a set of factors (i.e. indexes),
236 which represent a synthesis of available information to characterize specific hydrogeological settings
237 in a certain area (Aller et al., 1987). Those settings affect the sensitivity of an aquifer to a potential
238 contamination from the land surface (i.e. intrinsic), but do not take into account specific land uses or
239 chemical characteristics of dissolved compounds (e.g. persistence, mobility, adsorption) required for
240 a risk/hazard assessment (i.e. specific). In DRASTIC, indexes represent Depth to water table (D), net
241 Recharge (R), Aquifer type (A), Soil media (S), Topography (T), Impact of vadose zone (I), and
242 hydraulic Conductivity (C). The method, designed as a linear combination of the ratings of those
243 indexes in every pixel i , is described by:

$$244$$
$$245 V_i = D_w * D_{r,i} + R_w * R_{r,i} + A_w * A_{r,i} + S_w * S_{r,i} + T_w * T_{r,i} + I_w * I_{r,i} + C_w * C_{r,i} \quad (1)$$
$$246$$

247 Where V_i is the overall DRASTIC score in every pixel i (i.e. unit grid cell), which represents the
248 intrinsic aquifer vulnerability score in that location.

249 Theoretically, each index should be an independent variable that describe a specific process or
250 condition related with leaching process in a seven-dimension space. Indexes can be rated from 1
251 (aquifer not vulnerable to that factor) to 10 (highly vulnerable to that factor) based on specific settings
252 in a certain location (subscript r in Eq.1). In addition, each index is weighted from 1 to 5 based on its
253 relative importance in the overall leaching process (subscript w in Eq.1). Consequently, DRASTIC
254 is subject to interpretation and expert judgement in the selection of weighting and rating values of the
255 indexes. More details about the classification of ratings and weights in DRASTIC are available in the
256 supplement (Table S1). DRASTIC scores may range from 23 (minimum vulnerability) to 226
257 (maximum vulnerability). However, scores close to the minimum and maximum are quite unlikely,
258 as is the occurrence of all highly unfavourable (or favourable) environmental conditions for
259 groundwater leaching in the same place. From a statistical point of view, the population of those
260 scores have a gaussian distribution with most of data assembled around the mean (Fig. S2). Therefore,
261 less than 10% of overall scores would be higher than 160, which is the limit of high vulnerability by
262 Aller et al. (1987). Consequently, to better reproduce the effective vulnerability, many researchers
263 have adapted the limits of the classes according to the distribution of scores in the specific study area.
264 Numerous classifications were proposed, and among those, the geometrical interval is one of the most
265 employed (Kazakis and Voudouris, 2015; Busico et al., 2020). Based on these considerations, the
266 limits of the five vulnerability classes in this paper were based on the analysis of the statistical

267 distribution of DRASTIC scores in South America. Thus, intrinsic aquifer vulnerability is classified
268 from very low (i.e., scores lower than 90) to very high (scores higher than 180), passing through low
269 (scores: 90-115), moderate (scores: 115-140), and high vulnerability (scores: 140-180). Using such
270 limits for the classes allows low (green), medium (yellow) and high (red) scores to be more balanced
271 in terms of cumulative density function, having ~33% of population in each class (Fig. S2).
272 Vulnerability classes inform on groundwater protection needs at local scale (Foster et al., 2013) and
273 can be used to compare those needs between locations in different countries, having a common
274 conceptual framework developed at continental scale.

275

276 **3.2. Data collection and screening of selected datasets**

277 The most important but challenging steps in assessing groundwater vulnerability by index and rating
278 methods are: i) a comprehensive data collection, ii) a quality control and consistency analysis of input
279 data, and iii) a data harmonization that focus on granularity of results. In theory, a vulnerability
280 assessment should rely on robust field data and make use of a comprehensive understanding of natural
281 processes. In practice, it mostly represents a “best professional synthesis” of already available
282 information (Foster et al., 2013). This can be satisfactory for local applications since usually datasets
283 are more detailed and anyway accompanied by field monitoring. For larger scales, where technical
284 knowledge of field-level conditions decreases and uncertainties/artefacts in datasets increase, an
285 extended data collection, harmonization and quality control is required to build this professional
286 synthesis on comprehensive and reliable information. Nowadays, large availability of global datasets
287 enhances technical possibilities and global applications of methods. However, uncritical uses of
288 global databases can prove to be erroneous and dangerous in a vulnerability assessment, regardless
289 of the method chosen. While avoiding looking into artefacts and incongruencies in a global input
290 layer can produce a visually suitable outcome in terms of mapping, it will also incorporate
291 inconsistencies and uncertainties in the vulnerability assessment difficult to be isolated in a final
292 score. The result would be a poor prediction of actual aquifer vulnerability, which is based on local
293 specific conditions, undermining practical uses of the calibrated assessment. For this reason, the first
294 phases of a well-conducted vulnerability assessment should entail: (1) gathering as much information
295 as possible, both globally and locally, (2) checking quality and consistency of data in the specific area
296 of interest, (3) challenging global data against field measurements (if available), local information
297 and professional knowledge, and finally (4) integrating and harmonizing datasets with different
298 spatial resolution/extent or scale. Accordingly, the present work is based on a wide collection of open-
299 access datasets at different scale (i.e., regional/national/continental/global), processed and spatially
300 integrated in a GIS environment, cross-checked using location and descriptive attributes from

301 different sources and technical judgment of local experts. All the maps were rasterized using a fixed
 302 250 m squared pixel as spatial resolution, which results in a cartographic scale of 1:500k (Tobler,
 303 1987). Data sources and data specifications are extensively described in Table S2 and can be accessed
 304 by a dedicated repository (Rama et al., 2021).

305

306 **3.3. Sensitivity analysis (SA)**

307 The main drawback of rating methods is their high sensitivity to scores and weighs of the indexes,
 308 which are essentially subject to a technical judgment of an expert and can be even seen as arbitrary
 309 values. For this reason, vulnerability assessments need to objectify and challenge their assumptions
 310 with mathematical procedures, such as sensitivity and uncertainty analysis. A sensitivity analysis
 311 (SA) helps in addressing the significance of a subjective component, establishing the importance of
 312 the weigh assigned to a certain parameter. Single parameter SA allows comparing original or
 313 “theoretical” weights used in a rating method (Table S1) with effective or actual weights of each
 314 parameter computed by the map (Napolitano and Fabbri, 1996). It represents a univariate analysis of
 315 the effective weigh of each parameter, performed in a spatially variable domain of ratings like a raster
 316 map. By following Eq. 2, it is possible to establish in every pixel (i) the effective importance of a
 317 single parameter over the overall vulnerability score (V_i), rather than the “theoretical” DRASTIC
 318 weight by Eq. 3:

319

$$320 \quad EW_i = \left(P_{r,i} \times \frac{P_w}{V_i} \right) \quad (2)$$

$$321 \quad OW = \frac{P_w}{\sum_{j=1}^{n=7} P_{w,j}} \quad (3)$$

322

323 where EW_i is the effective weight of each parameter in every pixel i , $P_{r,i}$ is the rating assigned to an
 324 index in a pixel i (i.e., spatially variable), P_w is the original weight of this index (i.e., fixed) assigned
 325 by the DRASTIC framework, and V_i is the overall vulnerability score in the DRASTIC map.

326 Finally, to assess the sensitivity of the DRASTIC score to a single index of the method, a map removal
 327 SA was also performed (Lodwick et al. 1990). This map removal is carried out by neglecting a single
 328 index in the DRASTIC method and estimating the effect of the removal over the overall score. The
 329 method is described by the Eq. 4:

330

$$331 \quad S_i = \left(|V_i/n - V_i'/n'| / V_i \right) \quad (4)$$

332 where S_i is the sensitivity rate, representing the average effect of removing indexes from the
333 methodology, V_i is the overall DRASTIC score in every pixel i , V'_i is the vulnerability score
334 neglecting the removed indexes, n and n' are the number of data layers used to calculate V_i and V'_i .
335 Both methodologies have been applied by many authors, alone or in combination, in groundwater
336 vulnerability assessment, seawater intrusion and fire-risk mapping at different scales (Babiker et al.,
337 2005; Huan et al., 2012; Neshat et al., 2014; Kazakis and Voudouris, 2015; Pacheco et al., 2015;
338 Ouedraogo et al., 2016; Busico et al., 2019; Kazakis et al., 2019)

339

340 **3.4. Validation of DRASTIC map**


341 Validation is the task of confirming that the outputs of a model are acceptable with respect to an
342 independent set of data that represents a certain mechanism. The validation of a DRASTIC map,
343 representing the intrinsic vulnerability of groundwater across a continent, is a challenging exercise.
344 For this reason, the assessment presented here was validated by checking its accuracy and reliability
345 using different approaches. First, a spatial cross-validation with previous regional vulnerability
346 assessments was performed. The merit of assessments with smaller extension is to be closer to
347 territories and communities, use input data with higher resolution and have a better understanding of
348 natural processes, details, and exceptions. However, local assessments with too small extension (e.g.
349 field or basin) were considered unreliable for a cross-validation of a continental map and for this
350 reason neglected in this study. Therefore, two regional vulnerability assessments in completely
351 different environments were selected for this purpose: the vulnerability map of São Paulo state, Brazil
352 (Hirata et al., 1991) and Rapel district assessment, Chile (Arumi and Jara, 2009). For consistency in
353 the comparison, both maps were developed using the GOD method. Second, a comparison of
354 DRASTIC score versus point measures of groundwater quality was performed. Groundwater
355 concentrations from ~150 wells across Chile (DGA, 2019) and 50 monitoring locations for NO₃- in
356 São Paulo state (CETESB, 2021) were used in this step. It is worth stressing that such a comparison
357 of an intrinsic vulnerability map versus point measures is a controversial exercise. Vulnerability maps
358 represent a static picture of the sensitivity of aquifers to vertical leaching through soil and unsaturated
359 zone. Conversely, groundwater concentrations monitored at individual wells can be affected by
360 transport and accumulation, being usually summoned by water withdrawals and drawdown cones
361 (e.g., pumping wells). In addition, multiple measures from wells, even if averaged over time,
362 represent seasonality of subsurface natural processes and anthropic pressure. Therefore, these two
363 kinds of information should be considered complementary rather than interchangeable to achieve a
364 comprehensive assessment of groundwater protection needs. For all these reasons, correlations
365 between concentrations and DRASTIC scores at point level is always very poor (Lasagna et al.,

366 2016). Consequently, to try improving overall correlation with point measures, a normalization with
367 upgradient distances is proposed. The upgradient distance indicates a linear average space between
368 the well and the subsurface watershed and may represents an indirect measure of the probability of
369 collecting solute concentrations from sources located upgradient to the well.

370

371 **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

372 The development of this first groundwater vulnerability assessment at continental scale for South
373 America is now introduced. To appreciate all strengths and weaknesses implied in the vulnerability
374 score, each index of the method is presented and discussed in a dedicated section before introducing
375 the overall DRASTIC map at continental scale.



376

377 **Fig. 3:** Representation of rating classification of single DRASTIC parameters for South America (based on
 378 DRASTIC weights and classes described in Table S1). High-resolution version of those maps is stored in a
 379 dedicated repository (Rama et al., 2021).

380

381 **4.1. Depth to water table (D)**

382 The depth to water table index (D) represents the maximum extent of the leaching process, defining
 383 the travel distance (and thereby time) of dissolved pollutants into the vadose zone (Aller et al., 1987).

384 It is based on an average water table position in the pixel (i.e., average hydraulic head of unconfined
385 aquifer), by considering the aquifer as a steady-state water body. This assumption brings to two major
386 conceptual limitations: (1) the discontinuity (i.e., averaged over the pixel) and wide range of depths
387 encompassed in the map, which make difficult to look at the vulnerability as a continuum at
388 continental scale, and (2) the misrepresentation of transient mixing and vertical flux processes near
389 the top of the aquifer with a stationary water table. It was demonstrated that water-table fluctuations
390 increase mass transfer and transport of dissolved compounds by affecting their dissolution, dispersion
391 and mixing (Goode and Konikow, 1990; Davis et al., 1999; Vanderborght et al., 2000; Dobson et al.,
392 2007; Rama et al., 2019). However, the major practical issue in including water table fluctuations in
393 a sort of “transient” D index is given by the absence of those data, especially for large domains.
394 Accordingly, in this paper, D index relies on a simulated estimation of the stationary water table depth
395 for South America at ~250 m planar resolution (Fan and Miguez-Macho, 2010; Miguez-Macho and
396 Fan, 2012a, b), which provide enough granularity to go from regional to local scale. This map,
397 specific for South America, was preferred to the global outcome at ~1 km resolution (Fan et al., 2013)
398 and to other outcomes from hydrological models such as PCR-GLOBWB v2.0 (de Graaf et al., 2015;
399 2019) in reason of its higher resolution. It is worth stressing that the high-resolution depth to water
400 map has been calibrated and validated using measures of water table coming from more than 30k
401 monitoring stations located all over the continent (Fan et al., 2013). Based on D ratings, about 60%
402 of South America is classified as vulnerable for depth to water (Fig. 3), having about 35% of the
403 continent with very shallow aquifers (<5 m). Next steps of this work would investigate the impact of
404 water table fluctuations, including transient groundwater levels into the intrinsic vulnerability
405 assessment, especially in regions with shallow aquifers affected by large water table fluctuations.

406

407 **4.2. Net recharge (R)**

408 The net recharge index (R) in DRASTIC represents water inputs into the aquifer system. Accordingly,
409 net recharge can be seen as the total quantity of water that reach the aquifer in a certain period,
410 generally given as a column of water over a year (e.g., mm/y). In this framework, precipitation is
411 considered as the main driver of leaching, which moves pollutants from topsoil to the aquifer through
412 infiltration and percolation. Accordingly, a simplistic approach to DRASTIC recharge would only
413 include precipitation and would neglect any other water input, like irrigation, wastewater, and
414 artificial recharge (Aller et al., 1987). To tackle this issue, in this paper recharge was estimated from
415 the subsurface water balance of PCR-GLOBWB v2.0 (Sutanudjaja et al., 2018), a grid-based global
416 hydrology model able to simulates all water exchanges between soil, atmosphere, and groundwater
417 reservoirs (Fig. S3). Recharge values come from the outputs of a transient run between 1995-2015,

418 averaged and summed up over time. Therefore, the recharge values used to establish the R index also
419 include water volumes from irrigation, evapotranspiration, runoff, interflow, and main anthropic
420 activities. Such numeric outputs were preferred to the recharge estimates from an empirical model
421 (Mohan et al., 2018), to a direct elaboration of precipitation data from WorldClim v2.1 (Fick and
422 Hijmans, 2017), and to a simple water balance based on ERA5-Land data from ECMWF web site
423 (Muñoz-Sabater, 2019), which would have neglected other water inputs into the system. The
424 classification of R index confirms that highly vulnerable areas for recharge (>250 mm/y) are located
425 in tropical and subtropical regions of South America (Amazon Forest, Orinoco, and La Plata system),
426 while less vulnerable areas characterize arid and semi-arid regions like Northern Chile and Northeast
427 of Brazil (Fig. 3). The major limitation of recharge data is the spatial resolution, having PCR-
428 GLOBWB v2.0 a computational grid of 5 arcminute (~10 km at the equator). To further improve
429 spatial resolution and overall accuracy, next steps should investigate other recharge estimates as
430 inputs for the R index (e.g., outputs from different global models as WaterGAP and H-TESEL or
431 approaching other analytical calculation to estimate the recharge). Those products may provide a finer
432 resolution or a better estimation of recharge fluxes in critical areas, such as dry and wet regions. In
433 addition, if recharge is the sum of main water inputs in an area, it will progressively change over time,
434 and is massively affected by human activities. However, this fact clashes with an intrinsic
435 vulnerability definition, which should neglect anthropogenic activities. For this reason, next steps of
436 this work would investigate the use of recharge volumes in the definition of pollution loads for a
437 specific vulnerability assessment. Finally, it is worth stressing that linear relation of recharge and
438 score in DRASTIC neglects dilution as a possible mechanism reducing aquifer vulnerability in areas
439 with massive precipitation. This assumption was maintained in the present work as worst-case
440 scenario, but authors would recommend adopting a more physically based description of vulnerability
441 by recharge that includes dilution, as for example is done in SINTACS methodology (Civita and De
442 Maio, 2004).

443

444 **4.3. Aquifer type (A)**

445 The aquifer index (A) describes unconsolidated deposits and consolidated lithology that host the
446 aquifer itself and may affect with their characteristics the local flow system. Once dissolved
447 compounds have reached the saturated zone, the residual attenuation capacity of subsurface system
448 is related with four main mechanisms: i) dispersion, ii) dilution, iii) absorption, and iv) chemical
449 reactivity of the media. Being mostly affected by tortuosity of filtration paths (i.e. travel length and
450 time), those processes are summarized through the geological characteristics of media, ranging from
451 less sensitive formations (e.g. shale and metamorphic rock) to most vulnerable ones (e.g. karst and

452 coarse unconsolidated environments) (Table S1). In this work A index was obtained by integrating a
453 continental geological map of South America at 1:5M (Gómez et al., 2019) with more detailed
454 hydrogeological datasets of Brazil, Chile, and Argentina (Table S2). Different layers were combined
455 in a new one using spatial analysis tools in GIS, achieving local enhancements of spatial
456 discretization. Geologically, whole continent was divided in seven main domains (i.e. Sedimentary,
457 Porous/Fissured, Carbonates, Crystalline, Volcanic, Metamorphic, and Cenozoic). The vulnerability
458 of each feature was classified by the information on its geological domain, aquifer type (i.e. karst,
459 fissured/fractured, porous, mixed), degree of fractures (i.e. no, low, medium, high), aquifer
460 productivity (i.e. non-productive, extremely low, low, medium, and high) and transmissivity (with K
461 ranging from $>E-4$ to $<E-8$). The highest vulnerability (ratings 9-10) to “aquifer type” was assigned
462 to karst environments and very conductive porous media like main river valleys and coastal areas,
463 while non-productive volcanic and crystalline bedrocks received the lowest ratings 2-3. A rate of 5
464 to 6 were instead assigned to fractured and metamorphic formation outcropping in Brazil and
465 Argentina (Fig. 3).

466

467 **4.4 Soil attenuation (S)**

468 The soil index (S) accounts for the attenuation capacity of topsoil media in the leaching process. Soil
469 is the upper layer of the vadose zone, more organic and weathered, characterized by an intense
470 biological activity, which represents the initial natural barrier to the pollutant infiltration (Aller et al.,
471 1987). In DRASTIC, all attenuation mechanisms that may depend on soil properties (e.g.,
472 biodegradation, adsorption, fixation) are summarized by the USDA textural class, which only
473 depends on percent content of silt, clay, and sand. Accordingly, fine materials (e.g., clay and silt),
474 which are less permeable, are classified as less vulnerable than coarse textures (e.g., sand and gravel)
475 that allows a more rapid infiltration. This assumption entails a homogeneous medium and a uniform
476 chromatographic flow in the column, and completely overlooks anisotropies (e.g., root and
477 earthworm channels, fissures and interaggregate voids) that usually drive non-equilibrium water flow
478 in the first 50-100 cm of soil. It is worth stressing that this simplification of soil complexity can bring
479 in some cases to a misrepresentation of infiltration, as it happens for heavy/aggregated soils where
480 bypass flow and preferential pathways can control the leaching process (Jarvis, 2007; van der Heijden
481 et al., 2013). However, by looking processes on average over extended areas (i.e., 250 m pixel), a
482 chromatographic flow controlled by main textural class still seems to be a reasonable representation
483 of infiltration through the soil column, since at larger scales the preferential pathways effects are
484 usually mediated while other features like surface depressions, faults and discontinuous layers prevail
485 (Hendrickx and Flury, 2001). In this paper, S index was defined by combining datasets with different

486 spatial extent (Table S2). A preliminary distribution of soil texture for the continent was defined with
487 the Harmonized World Soil database (FAO, 2012), a vectorial geodatabase obtained from a 30”
488 resolution map. The distribution was refined using 3,000 soil columns from World Soil Information
489 Service (Batjes et al., 2020). Finally, information from two extensive databases at national scale as
490 HYBRAS (Ottoni et al., 2018) and PRONASOLOS (Cooper et al., 2005) allowed a more detailed
491 discretization of topsoil properties in Brazil with more than 30,000 soils profiles. Dominant soil
492 textures at continental scale are loams, suggesting a relative low vulnerability to leaching (ratings 2-
493 6) in most of South America (Fig. 3).

494

495 **4.5 Slope or topography (T)**

496 The topography index (T) accounts for the impact of land surface onto the leaching mechanism. In
497 terms of water balance, precipitation generates three fluxes (i.e., runoff, recharge,
498 evapotranspiration), whose equilibrium is controlled by local conditions of climate, topography, and
499 hydrogeology. Therefore, topography index would represent a qualitative indication of the ratio of
500 runoff to infiltration based on terrain’s slope only. Unlike more recent “overlay and index” methods
501 designed for karst (e.g., COP and PaPRIKa), T index in DRASTIC neglects any interaction of
502 topography with other surface features (e.g., hydrology network, colluvial deposits, sinkholes) or
503 geology (e.g., impervious formations). For this reason, it should be considered as a simple indication
504 of terrain slope, rather than a sophisticated link between topography and infiltration. In this work,
505 surface slope was estimated in a GIS environment from MERIT DEM, which is an unbiased ~90 m
506 resolution global map of terrain elevation (Table S2). It was developed using existing spaceborne
507 DEMs as SRTM3 v2.1 and AW3D-30m v1, by removing multiple error components such as absolute
508 bias, stripe noise, speckle noise, and tree height bias (Yamazaki et al., 2017). A clear gap is shown in
509 the classification of T index (Fig. 3) between flat morphology (0–4%) that dominates major river
510 valleys and large continental flatlands (ratings 9-10), and steep geography that characterizes Andean
511 regions along the Pacific coast (ratings 1-2).

512

513 **4.6 Impact of vadose zone (I)**

514 The index I aims to estimate the attenuation capacity afforded by unsaturated zone, which lays
515 between the topsoil and the aquifer (or, more precisely, the top of capillary fringe). Unfortunately,
516 spatial information and global datasets characterizing this zone are rare and generally scattered. For
517 example, only few databases provide consistent information of lithology depth, differentiating
518 surficial and deep deposits. Therefore, to address I index is common interpolating more widely
519 available data of topsoil and aquifers. In this paper, the impact of vadose zone was based on the ratio

520 of depth-to-bedrock (DTB) (Shangguan et al., 2017) to depth-to-water (DTW) (Fan et al., 2013),
521 following Eq. 5 (map showed in supplement, Fig. S4):

$$522$$
$$523 \quad 0 \quad IF (DTW < DTB)$$
$$524 \quad 1 + \frac{DTB}{DTW} \quad IF (DTB \geq DTB) \quad (5)$$
$$525$$

526 The ratio represents the percentage importance of unconsolidated materials and deep lithologies on
527 the characteristics of vadose zone, and thereby, the classification of I index. Accordingly, a value
528 close to 1 (i.e., $DTW \gg DTB$) would indicate an aquifer hosted in deep lithological materials and a
529 little importance of unconsolidated deposits, while a value close to 2 (i.e., $DTW \sim DTB$) would suggest
530 a major impact of unconsolidated materials on overall vadose zone. Conversely, a value of 0 would
531 represent a water table hosted in the unconsolidated materials, having a vadose zone only affected by
532 the characteristics of those deposits. Information about unconsolidated deposits were obtained from
533 a global high-resolution dataset of soil parameters, 1-3 m deep (Dai et al., 2019). The USDA textural
534 class is estimated first, by the percentage content of sand-clay-silt, and then information on coarse
535 deposits (e.g., gravel) and organic matter (e.g., peat and muck) is added (Fig. S5). For deep
536 lithologies, already available geological data were used, as presented in Section 4.3 (A index). An in-
537 depth description of all employed datasets is available in Table S2. The resulting map of I index (Fig.
538 3) confirms that most of South America have low to medium vulnerability geological media, as
539 already anticipated by A and S indexes.

541 **4.7 Hydraulic conductivity (C)**

542 The index C represents the ability of the aquifer itself to transmit water, and thereby, how water will
543 flow under the land surface where the vulnerability is assessed. Accordingly, this factor will
544 ultimately summarize the rate at which contaminant move away from the infiltration point. It is based
545 on horizontal hydraulic conductivity of the saturated zone (Ks). In this work, C index was estimated
546 combining two versions of a global dataset of log permeabilities (GLHYMPS v1.0 and v2.0) (Gleeson
547 et al., 2014; Huscroft et al., 2018), whose characteristics were summarized in Table S2. To use those
548 data, a prior quality check of spatial consistency was performed. Data were checked against
549 geological and hydrogeological maps (Gómez et al., 2019; CPRM website), removing boundary
550 artefacts, fixing spatial discrepancies, and even reshaping polygons on the borders to match the
551 permeability map with the underneath geological map. The Ks information was also challenged
552 against the description of deposits (i.e., information stored in datasets at national level) and fixed if
553 they were not consistent (e.g., same deposits having different hydraulic conductivity on different sides

554 of a national border). It is worth remembering that global datasets are powerful sources of data for
 555 risk assessments. However, they can include artefacts and spatial discrepancies (especially on the
 556 national borders), unavoidably coming from complex integration of different data sources in different
 557 languages. Such discrepancies are though extremely relevant for a local vulnerability assessment and
 558 need to be (manually) fixed and double-checked with local experts before using such layers. Overall,
 559 classification of C index did not show a wide variability of ratings across the continent, being most
 560 of the territory characterized by Ks of 0.1 to 10 m/d (ratings 1-2) and having less than 20% of aquifers
 561 a Ks greater than 10 m/d (Fig. 3).

562

563 **4.8 Intrinsic aquifer vulnerability: map of DRASTIC score**

564 The intrinsic aquifer vulnerability of South America was estimated by DRASTIC (Fig 4), combining
 565 seven relevant indexes (Fig. 3) through a linear combination (Eq.1). Obtained scores in the map
 566 ranged from 35 to 212. They were classified in 5 classes of vulnerability from very low (dark green)
 567 to very high (red) using intervals described in the methodology (Section 3.1).

568

569 **Table 1:** Summary of main statistics of DRASTIC indexes.


Parameter	Min	Max	Mean	St.Dev.	CV (%)
D	1	10	7.86	2.50	31.81
R	1	9	5.48	3.84	70.07
A	3	10	5.85	2.05	35.04
S	1	9	4.52	1.56	34.51
T	1	10	7.58	3.19	42.08
I	1	10	4.62	1.64	35.50
C	1	10	2.74	2.41	87.96

570

571 The main statistics of the seven hydrogeological factors are shown in Table 1. Indexes D and T present
 572 the highest mean values (i.e. 7.86 and 7.58, respectively), which are driven by the typical
 573 characteristics of the continent: large basins with shallow aquifers and extensive regions with plateaus
 574 and plains (see Section 2 for more details). On the other hand, indexes C and R show higher
 575 coefficient of variation (CV) than the other parameters (i.e. 87.96 and 70.07%, respectively).
 576 Statistically, the CV represents the extent of variability in relation to the mean of the population,
 577 which indicates a high spatial variability of the ratings of those indexes across the continent (Vu et
 578 al., 2019). A simplified representation of each index is given in a ridgeline plot (Fig. 5a), where is
 579 possible to appreciate, graphically, the previous assumptions by a summary of the distribution of
 580 about 1M pixels in each raster. In addition, a detailed histogram (bin width=1) shows the probability
 581 density function of final DRASTIC scores in South America (Fig. 5b), underlining the proposed

582 classification of vulnerabilities. The graphical outcome has a pixel dimension of 250 m and a
583 cartography scale of 1:500k. However, it should not be inferred that intrinsic vulnerability has been
584 strictly mapped to this precision in all the continent, having some of the inputs a coarser resolution,
585 even after combining local and international datasets.

586



587


588 **Fig. 4:** Intrinsic aquifer vulnerability map of South America based on a DRASTIC assessment (Base map from
589 © Google Satellite 2021). High-resolution version of this raster is available on a dedicated repository (Rama
590 et al., 2021).

591

592 The results indicate that most of the continent has a very low to moderate intrinsic vulnerability
593 (~70%), probably due to quite deep aquifers, very rich/heavy soils and extended areas with surficial

594 crystalline formations that may prevent infiltration. About 10% of the continent shows a very low
 595 vulnerability (dark green), which suggests the concurrent presence of hydrogeological conditions that
 596 favour the attenuation capacity in at least 4-5 indexes. For example, Atacama region (North
 597 Chile/Argentina and South Peru) presents very low to low vulnerability driven by very deep aquifers
 598 and very low precipitation per year, despite a quite permeable soil/subsurface system. Exceptions to
 599 this low vulnerability trend are represented by alluvial valleys of major rivers, continental aeolian
 600 sands, sandy areas near the coast, or rainy valleys with colluvial deposits in Andean Cordillera. Those
 601 regions show high or very high aquifer vulnerability (in total about 30% of the territory), having
 602 hydrogeological settings that drive a fast infiltration of high rainfall volumes. However, only a small
 603 part of the continent (i.e. about 0.6%) presents DRASTIC scores higher than 180, with only 0.0015%
 604 of the pixels having more than 200.

605




606

607 **Fig. 5:** Distribution of scores in single indexes and proposed DRASTIC map. (a) Ridgeline plot of the indexes
 608 showing their simplified distribution. (b) Probability density function of DRASTIC scores in South America,
 609 showing the limits of adopted vulnerability classes.

610

611 It is worth underlining that within a DRASTIC framework, Amazon area (i.e., equatorial climate)
 612 would present a higher vulnerability compared to dry regions (e.g., Northeast Brazil, Southwest
 613 Bolivia, North Chile), because of its higher cumulated precipitation across the year and regardless of
 614 local hydrogeological setting. However, due to the flat topography, small depth to water table, and
 615 quite permeable deposits, Amazon aquifers seem to be among the most sensitive to anthropic
 616 pollutants in the whole South America. Similarly, valuable aquifers in tropical regions of Colombia
 617 are classified as highly vulnerable as Amazon aquifers. Finally, other highly vulnerable areas are
 618 found in central/South Chile driven by the low depth to water table and the high Ks of colluvial
 619 deposits present in the valleys of the Southern Andean Cordillera.

620 In addition, given the high spatial resolution of DRASTIC map, it was possible to address the
 621 percentage of aquifer vulnerability classes in each country (Fig. 6). The analysis was performed by a
 622 spatial analysis in GIS, summarizing the initial five classes of vulnerability into three classes: low
 623 (by combining very low and low), medium, and high (by combining high and very high). As
 624 mentioned, hydrogeological settings and environmental conditions of Amazon Forest results in
 625 intrinsically more vulnerable aquifers in those regions. Consequently, countries with extended
 626 regions of Amazon rainforest showed wider vulnerable groundwater resources, in order: Colombia
 627 (63%), Peru (41%), Ecuador (35%), Guyana (32%), and Brazil (32%). In those regions, a strong land
 628 use change at the expense of rainforest coverage may lead to a fast degradation of groundwater
 629 resources. Conversely, most extended areas with low vulnerability are concentrated in Argentina
 630 (72%), Chile (60%), and Bolivia (45%) due to their arid climate and deep aquifer systems.



631
 632 **Fig. 6:** Stacked bar chart of intrinsic vulnerability classes in each country of South America.
 633

634 **4.9 Sensitivity analysis**

635 A map removal SA was performed by neglecting a single index per time from DRASTIC, and
 636 accounting for its effect on the overall score. A summary of the main statistics from the analysis is
 637 presented on Table 2. The D index shows far the highest impact on the DRASTIC score, both on
 638 average across the continent (i.e. mean 2.7% and median 2.9%) and locally in certain regions of the

639 map (i.e. maximum value 13.9%). As expected, the second most important index was R. Conversely,
 640 index A and I showed high local impacts on the vulnerability score (max: 4.66% and 6.78%,
 641 respectively) but quite low effect on average (mean: 0.66% and 1.16%, respectively). This may be
 642 caused by a statistical concurrency of high and low ratings of those indexes across the map, which
 643 would result on average in a small effect over the vulnerability score of the continent.

644
 645 **Table 2:** Summary of main statistics of the map removal sensitivity analysis.

Removed Index	Included Indexes	Sensitivity rate (Si) [%]				
		Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max
D	RASTIC	2.72	2.93	1.37	0.00	13.91
R	DASTIC	1.75	1.76	0.62	0.00	6.07
A	DRSTIC	0.66	0.59	0.47	0.00	4.66
S	DRATIC	1.15	1.21	0.52	0.00	3.50
T	DRASIC	1.37	1.31	0.45	0.00	2.30
I	DRASTC	1.16	0.92	0.99	0.00	6.78
C	DRASTI	1.46	1.64	0.57	0.00	4.76


646
 647 A single parameters SA was also applied to assess the effectiveness of index weights (EW) within
 648 the DRASTIC application in South America. The main outcomes of this analysis are summarised in
 649 Table 3. They indicate that most of variability is driven by only four indexes: D (depth-to-water), R
 650 (recharge), A (aquifer type), and I (vadose zone media). In the proposed DRASTIC map, on average,
 651 these four parameters together have an effective weight of 81%. The results remarked the importance
 652 of water inputs (i.e., recharge), travel distance (i.e., depth to water table) and hydrogeological
 653 characteristics of crossed media (i.e., aquifer type and vadose zone) in defining the overall attenuation
 654 capacity, and consequently, the intrinsic groundwater vulnerability in a specific location.

655
 656 **Table 3:** Summary of theoretical and effective weight obtained (on average) from a single parameter
 657 sensitivity analysis of DRASTIC indexes in South America.

Indexes	P _w - Original weight by DRASTIC	OW - Theoretical weight by DRASTIC (%)	EW – Effective weight by SA (%)
D	5	21.74	30.61
R	4	17.39	16.29
A	3	13.04	14.08
S	2	8.7	7.62
T	1	4.35	6.04
I	5	21.74	19.12
C	3	13.04	6.32

658

659 However, depth-to-water (D) was the only parameter in showing a relevant positive increase of its
660 weight from theoretical to effective (~ 9%). This entails that not only it is on average the most
661 important parameter to define by DRASTIC the intrinsic aquifer vulnerability of South America, but
662 also that its contribution is more important in regions where, due to the low ratings of other indexes,
663 it ends up making a difference in the overall vulnerability score. At the end, D index alone affects the
664 vulnerability score by over 30% on average. Conversely, hydraulic conductivity (C) showed a clear
665 drop in its importance over the DRASTIC score (~ -7%) driven by an unfavourable distribution of its
666 low ratings across the map. This fact seems confirming an arithmetical intuition coming from the
667 ridgeline plot (Fig. 5a): only parameters with positively unbalanced distributions (i.e. centred on high
668 ratings), like D, T and A, increased their weight in the sensitivity analysis, as opposed to negatively
669 unbalanced distributions (e.g. C index) that decrease their importance in the analysis. However, most
670 of the indexes (e.g. R, A, S, T, I) showed no significant variations in their weight, having a
671 difference between theoretical and effective of about 1-2% (Table 3). Overall, both map removal and
672 single parameter SA underlined the importance of depth-to-water (D) over the intrinsic vulnerability
673 assessment of South America by DRASTIC. This index is followed in terms of importance by
674 recharge (R), which impacts regions with high vulnerability across the continent, and hydraulic
675 conductivity (C), which affects most regions with low DRASTIC scores. In addition, spatial
676 variability of the effective weight of the indexes is mapped across the continent (Fig. 7), allowing to
677 check which parameters matter most in each region. The maps confirm the same trend of average
678 analysis, with D, R, I, and A having the highest effective weights. Interestingly, regions with high
679 hydraulic conductivity show that C index had an important impact there over the DRASTIC score.
680



681

682 **Fig. 7:** Spatial distribution of EW_i (i.e. effective weight of indexes over the DRASTIC score), assessed by
 683 single parameter SA and given as a percentage. High-resolution version of those maps is available on a
 684 dedicated repository (Rama et al., 2021).

685


686 It is worth underlining that the outcomes may have been partially influenced by the original spatial
 687 discretization of input files. By excluding R index, which come from model outputs on a regular grid
 688 (~10 km), there is a strong difference between parameters rasterized from maps/polygons at coarser
 689 scale (i.e., A, S, I, and C) and indexes estimated from high resolution raster (i.e., D and T). First type

690 includes intrinsically less variability than the latter one, in terms of details and spatial discretization.
691 High resolution maps allow to spatially define relevant features with extreme conditions (e.g., very
692 high or very low vulnerability of certain features), as opposite to polygons at greater scale, which
693 present average values over very large areas (i.e., no extremes). This fact may represent also a limit
694 to the actual granularity of results in the final map, having three out of the four most important indexes
695 in terms of effective weight with a limited spatial resolution (i.e. A, R, I).

696

697 4.10. Map validation and discussion

698 The main outcomes of spatial cross-validation showed a good visual agreement between DRASTIC
699 map of South America and previous regional assessments (Fig. 8). The two regional GOD-based
700 assessments of Rapel, Chile (Arumi and Jara, 2009) and Sao Paulo district, Brazil (Hirata et al., 1991)
701 were compared with the DRASTIC-based map at continental scale to check overall consistency and
702 point out differences.



703

704 **Fig. 8:** Spatial cross-validation of DRASTIC map: a) GOD-based vulnerability assessment at Rapel district,
705 Chile (Arumi and Jara, 2009); b) Aquifer vulnerability map of Rapel extracted from the present DRASTIC-
706 based assessment of South America; c) GOD-based vulnerability assessment of São Paulo state, Brazil (Hirata
707 et al., 1991); d) Aquifer vulnerability map of São Paulo extracted from the present DRASTIC-based assessment
708 of South America. Base maps from ESRI Digital Globe 2021.

709

710 In Chile, the assessments with GOD (Fig. 8a) and DRASTIC (Fig. 8b) shows a comparable
711 classification pattern, highlighting almost the same areas with high and low vulnerability. Especially
712 highly vulnerable areas seem to be quite consistent each other. Conversely, definition of vulnerability
713 seems to be more uncertain in the mountain area of the region (i.e., far right side of the domain),
714 where DRASTIC assessment identified less vulnerable aquifers and GOD classified them with
715 moderate vulnerability. In Brazil, also, the two maps show a very consistent visual pattern. In the São
716 Paulo state, GOD (Fig. 8c) and DRASTIC (Fig. 8d) classifications point out highly vulnerable areas
717 (orange) mainly adjacent to surface water bodies and low vulnerabilities (green) in regions with heavy
718 soils and low conductive deposits. In both regions, the worst spatial correspondence was found within
719 the medium vulnerability class, which characterizes a relevant portion of GOD maps. It is worth
720 underlining that poor discretization of moderate vulnerability is a common and well-known drawback
721 of index methods (Hu et al., 2018; Kazakis et al., 2019). For this reason, to avoid an oversized area
722 with moderate vulnerability, the present DRASTIC assessment of South America proposed a
723 different, domain-specific, set of limits for vulnerability classes. Accordingly, DRASTIC maps in
724 those two regions showed smaller medium vulnerability areas compared to the GOD ones. To try to
725 quantify this spatial validation, a simple statistical analysis of DRASTIC scores within the areas
726 defined by the three vulnerability classes in GOD was also performed (Table 4). Values represent the
727 average, minimum and maximum DRASTIC score within the green (i.e. low vulnerability), yellow
728 (i.e. medium vulnerability), and red (i.e. high vulnerability) regions of the GOD assessments (Fig. 8a
729 and 8c). Results show to be consistent with visual assessment, having for both regions that DRASTIC
730 scores are considerably increasing from low to high, and its mean falls in the same class of
731 vulnerability as in GOD. Therefore, average DRASTIC scores within low vulnerability areas in GOD
732 resulted 105.1 and 101.5, in Sao Paulo and Rapel respectively, which is consistently lower than the
733 average DRASTIC score in high vulnerability areas (146.5 and 142.8, respectively). In addition, the
734 overlapping areas with the same vulnerability classes in GOD and DRASTIC were estimated by a
735 spatial analysis in a GIS environment and summarized in supplementary material (Table S3). For
736 consistency, very low and low vulnerabilities in DRASTIC were compared with low/negligible
737 vulnerability in GOD, as well as high and very high classes in DRASTIC were represented by high
738 vulnerability in GOD. Spatial agreement among low vulnerabilities within the two methods was 70-
739 75% in the two regions. Similarly, the spatial overlapping of high vulnerabilities on the two regions
740 ranged between 70 and 85%.

741 **Table 4:** Statistics of DRASTIC scores in areas of low, medium, and high vulnerability from previous
 742 assessments (GOD).

Sao Paulo (Brazil)	LOW VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)	MEDIUM VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)	HIGH VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)
DRASTIC Mean	105.1	119.8	146.5
DRASTIC Min	56.0	62.2	89.2
DRASTIC Max	171.3	178.9	184.8
Rapel (Chile)	LOW VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)	MEDIUM VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)	HIGH VULNERAB. AREAS (GOD)
DRASTIC Mean	101.5	115.9	142.8
DRASTIC Min	58.8	69.7	81.7
DRASTIC Max	149.2	160.8	173.3

743

744 Finally, a point comparison between groundwater concentration of target compounds and intrinsic
 745 vulnerability was performed. In Chile, statistically representative values from ~150 wells were plotted
 746 versus DRASTIC scores in the same locations. As expected, a generally poor correlation (mainly
 747 negative) was found between most of the data (Fig. S6 – Graphs at row 1 and 3). However, the
 748 correlation increases drastically by normalizing raw groundwater concentrations with upgradient
 749 distance within the basin (Fig. S6 – Graphs at row 2 and 4). This quantity normalizes the absolute
 750 concentrations in an individual point with the probability to have been transported there from
 751 somewhere else rather than infiltrate by leaching. The more the distance from basin watershed, the
 752 more the chance to receive upgradient contamination affecting that measure. For the São Paulo state,
 753 a satisfactory agreement among NO₃⁻ concentrations and final DRASTIC classification was also
 754 found, having in general higher groundwater concentration in areas of more pronounced vulnerability
 755 (Fig. S7).

756

757 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

758 Assessing aquifer vulnerability world-wide is progressively becoming an essential screening tool to
 759 achieve a sustainable management of groundwater resources. This exercise is strictly related with the
 760 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be achieved by 2030, especially with targets: 6.3 “Improve
 761 water quality by reducing pollution”, 6.5 “Implement integrated water resources management”, and
 762 6.6 “Protect and restore water-related ecosystems”. This is the first time that the intrinsic groundwater
 763 vulnerability of South America has been mapped at continental scale employing an index and rating
 764 methodology (i.e. DRASTIC). The assessment represents the comparative sensitivity of aquifers in
 765 South America to leaching of compounds from the land surface. The proposed map divides the

766 continent in five classes of vulnerability going from very low to very high, with a general trend of
767 medium to low vulnerability. In many regions, this tendency seems to be driven by deep groundwater,
768 low recharge (e.g., infrequent precipitation) and not much hydraulically conductive deposits (e.g.,
769 rich soils, crystalline formations, high clay content). Conversely, alluvial valleys along main rivers
770 and coastal aquifers, which are characterized by shallow groundwater in coarse sediment and high
771 recharge from precipitation, showed a high vulnerability. Both sensitivity analyses (i.e. map removal
772 and single parameter) confirmed the major influence of depth-to-water (D index) on the final
773 DRASTIC score. However, also recharge (R) and hydraulic conductivity (C) showed to have an
774 impact on the assessment of groundwater vulnerability in South America. The cross-validation of the
775 map in two different environmental settings at regional scale (i.e. Rapel, Chile and São Paulo, Brazil)
776 gave satisfactory results with a good agreement between previous and current assessments. To
777 achieve consistent results, a great deal of effort was put into control, collection, and integration of
778 data from international and local databases with different spatial resolution. Data were managed in a
779 GIS environment, which provides an effective tool for handling large amounts of spatial data with
780 different datums, scales, and geometries. Accordingly, the use of international datasets of "open data"
781 should be fostered in this kind of applications as they enable a "pre-screening" of the vulnerability
782 even in regions with sparse and scattered information. Although open datasets would always require
783 an initial quality check to be used, which challenges the reliability and robustness of values
784 themselves, they represent a valuable resource for environmental and geo- scientists. In addition, the
785 present application highlighted the importance of developing a common conceptual framework for
786 the aquifer vulnerability at a transboundary (and even global) scale, applicable in many different
787 hydrogeological settings (e.g. porous, karst, fissured). Thus, possible next steps of this study would
788 be to work towards the development of this common framework at global scale, which potentially
789 may include a broader set of mechanisms of environmental fate (i.e. accumulation, transport, dilution,
790 dispersion). Overall, the present DRASTIC map of South America, in combination with detailed
791 hydrogeological surveys at local scale, may represent a valuable initial step to achieve a sustainable
792 land-use and water management, and in promoting cooperation among states for shared resources, by
793 planning a balanced use of territory and by reducing the anthropic pressure in those areas naturally
794 prone to groundwater leaching.

795

796 **Acknowledgments**

797 The authors want to acknowledge Syngenta PS for the financial and material support to this work. We thank
798 Prof. Ying Fan Reinfelder and Prof. Gonzalo Miguez-Macho for the depth-to-water maps and the fruitful
799 technical discussions on the quality of data. A special mention is also needed for Prof. Miguel Cooper from
800 University of São Paulo (ESALQ-USP) and EMBRAPA (Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária) for

801 the help in addressing the complexity of soils in Brazil. In addition, we acknowledge the support of CHRIAM
802 Water research center (Project ANID/FONDAP/15130015) for the analysis of Chilean data. Finally, we would
803 like to acknowledge Prof. Everton de Oliveira, Director of Groundwater Project and President of IAH
804 (Brazilian Chapter), for his valuable suggestions, Eng. Roberto Kirchheim for the help in familiarizing
805 ourselves with the extensive hydrogeological datasets of Brazilian Geological Survey (CPRM) and PhD
806 Martina Pacifici for her crucial help in designing and developing the graphical abstract of this paper.

807

808 **Supplementary materials.** Additional information related to the article is given in the following
809 supplement file 20211123_STOTEN_Supplement_Rama_LATAM.docx (link to be added by the journal).

810

811 **Data availability.** The high-resolution version of the DRASTIC map of South America, along with the maps
812 of the indexes and the sensitivity analysis, have been archived in a ZENODO repository and can be accessed
813 using the following link: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5572252> (Rama et al., 2021). All outcomes have been
814 stored in a .tif format (raster) with different pixel dimensions. Details and specs of graphical outcomes are
815 described in a dedicated file in the same repository (README.txt).

816

817 **Author contributions.** The idea of the work was conceived by FR and GB, the data processing was made
818 by FR, GB and LM. The original draft was produced by GB and FR, while the quality data control and internal
819 first review was made by JLA, RH, EEK. Final review, visualization and writing were completed by MM, NC,
820 NK, PS.

821 **Competing interests.** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

822

823 **References**

- 824 Aeschbach-Hertig, W., Gleeson, T., 2012. Regional strategies for the accelerating global problem of
825 groundwater depletion. *Nature Geosci.* 5, 853–861. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1617>.
- 826 Agudelo Moreno, L. J., Zuleta Lemus, D. D. S., Lasso Rosero, J., Agudelo Morales, D. M., Sepúlveda Castaño,
827 L. M., Paredes Cuervo, D., 2020. Evaluation of aquifer contamination risk in urban expansion areas as
828 a tool for the integrated management of groundwater resources. case: Coffee growing region, Colombia.
829 *Groundw. Sustain. Dev.* 10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsd.2019.100298>.
- 830 Aller, L., Bennet, T., Lehr, J. H., Petty, R. J., Hachet, G., 1987. DRASTIC: a standardised system for evaluating
831 groundwater pollution potential using hydrogeologic settings (EPA 600/2-87). Environmental Research
832 Laboratory. Office of Research and Development. US Environmental Protection Agency Report.
833 Tucson. 622.
- 834 Alley, W. M., Reilly, T. E., Franke, O. L., 1999. Sustainability of Ground-Water Resources. U.S. Geol. Surv.
835 *Circul.* 1186. ISBN 0-607-93040-3.
- 836 Aragão, F., Velásquez, L. N. M., Galvão, P., de Castro Tayer, T., Lucon, T. N., de Azevedo, Ú. R., 2020.
837 Natural background levels and validation of the assessment of intrinsic vulnerability to the
838 contamination in the carste lagoa santa protection unit, minas gerais, brazil. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 79(1).
839 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-019-8771-5>.

- 840 Arumi, J. L., L. Jara., 2009. Cartas de Vulnerabilidad Regiones de O'Higgins y Maule. Essbio S. A.
841 Concepción. 28. Chile.
- 842 Ascott, M.J., Gooddy, D.C., Wang, L., Stuart, M.E., Lewis, M.A., Ward, R.S., Binley, A.M., 2017. Global
843 patterns of nitrate storage in the vadose zone. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 1–6. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01321-w)
844 [017-01321-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01321-w).
- 845 Babiker, I. S., Mohamed, M. A. A., Hiyama, T., Kato, K., 2005. A GIS-based DRASTIC model for assessing
846 aquifer vulnerability in Kakamigahara heights, Gifu prefecture, central Japan. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 345(1-
847 3), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.11.005>.
- 848 Batjes, N. H., Ribeiro, E., van Oostrum, A., 2020. Standardised soil profile data to support global mapping and
849 modelling (WoSIS snapshot 2019). *Earth Syst. Sci. Data.* 12, 299–320. [https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-299-2020)
850 [299-2020](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-299-2020).
- 851 Beck, H. E., Zimmermann, N. E., McVicar, T. R., Vergopolan, N., Berg, A., Wood, E. F., 2018. Present and
852 future köppen-geiger climate classification maps at 1-km resolution. *Sci. Data.* 5.
853 <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.214>.
- 854 Betancur, T., Palacio, C., Gaviria, J. I., Rueda, M., 2013. Methodological proposal to assess groundwater
855 contamination danger: study case of Bajo Cauca aquifer (Colombia). *Environ. Earth Sci.* 70, 315–328.
856 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-012-2129-6>.
- 857 Bocanegra, E., da Silva Jr., G. C., Custodio, E., Manzano, M., Montenegro, S., 2010. State of knowledge of
858 coastal aquifer management in South America. *Hydrogeol. J.* 18(1), 261–267.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-009-0520-5>.
- 860 Boujon, P., Sanci, R., 2014. Vulnerability assessment of the aquifer in the basin of the el cura stream,
861 gualaguaychú, entre ríos. *Rev. Asoc. Geol. Argent.* 71(2), 275–291. ISSN 00044822.
- 862 Busico, G., Cuoco, E., Kazakis, N., Colombani, N., Mastrocicco, M., Tedesco, D., Voudouris, K., 2018.
863 Multivariate statistical analysis to characterize/discriminate between anthropogenic and geogenic trace
864 elements occurrence in the Campania Plain, Southern Italy. *Environ. Pollut.* 234, 260–269.
865 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.11.053>.
- 866 Busico, G., Giuditta, E., Kazakis, N., Colombani, N., 2019. A hybrid GIS and AHP approach for modelling
867 actual and future forest fire risk under climate change accounting water resources attenuation role.
868 *Sustainability (Switzerland).* 11(24). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11247166>.
- 869 Busico, G., Kazakis, N., Colombani, N., Mastrocicco, M., Voudouris, K., Tedesco, D., 2017. A modified
870 SINTACS method for groundwater vulnerability and pollution risk assessment in highly anthropized
871 regions based on NO₃ – and SO₄ ²⁻ concentrations. *Sci. Total Environ.* 609, 1512–1523.
872 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.257>.
- 873 Busico, G., Kazakis, N., Cuoco, E., Colombani, N., Tedesco, D., Voudouris, K., Mastrocicco, M., 2020. A
874 novel hybrid method of specific vulnerability to anthropogenic pollution using multivariate statistical
875 and regression analyses. *Water Res.* 171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.115386>.
- 876 Capitanio, F. A., Faccenna, C., Zlotnik, S., Stegman, D. R., 2011. Subduction dynamics and the origin of
877 Andean orogeny and the Bolivian orocline. *Nature.* 480, 83–86. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10596>.
- 878 Caprario, J., Rech, A. S., Finotti, A. R., 2019. Vulnerability assessment and potential contamination of
879 unconfined aquifers. *Water Supply.* 19(4), 1008–1016. <https://doi.org/10.2166/ws.2018.147>.
- 880 Céleri, R., Feyen, J., 2009. The Hydrology of Tropical Andean Ecosystems: Importance, Knowledge Status,
881 and Perspectives. *Mt. Res. Dev.* 29(4), 350–355. <https://doi.org/10.1659/mrd.00007>.
- 882 CETESB., 2020. Qualidade das águas subterrâneas no Estado de São Paulo Boletim 2020. São Paulo. 31.
883 [https://cetesb.sp.gov.br/aguas-subterraneas/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2021/07/Boletim-de-](https://cetesb.sp.gov.br/aguas-subterraneas/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2021/07/Boletim-de-Qualidade-da-Aguas-Subterraneas-no-Estado-de-Sao-Paulo-2020.pdf)
884 [Qualidade-da-Aguas-Subterraneas-no-Estado-de-Sao-Paulo-2020.pdf](https://cetesb.sp.gov.br/aguas-subterraneas/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2021/07/Boletim-de-Qualidade-da-Aguas-Subterraneas-no-Estado-de-Sao-Paulo-2020.pdf).
- 885 Civita, M., De Maio, M., 2004. Assessing and mapping groundwater vulnerability to contamination: the Italian
886 “combined” approach. *Geofis. Int.* 43(4), 513–532. ISSN 0016-7169.

- 887 Cooper, M., Mendes, L. M. S., Silva, W. L. C., Sparovek, G., 2005. A National Soil Profile Database for Brazil
888 Available to International Scientists. *Soil Sci. Soc. of Am. J.* 69(3), 649.
889 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2004.0140>.
- 890 CPRM website. <http://geosgb.cprm.gov.br/geosgb/downloads.html> (accessed 12 October 2020).
- 891 Cuthbert, M. O., Gleeson, T., Moosdorf, N., Befus K. M., Schneider, A., Hartmann, J., Lehner B., 2019. Global
892 patterns and dynamics of climate–groundwater interactions. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 9, 137–141.
893 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0386-4>.
- 894 Dai, Y., Xin, Q., Wei, N., Zhang, Y., Shangguan, W., Yuan, H., Zhang, S., Liu, S., Lu X., 2019. A global high-
895 resolution data set of soil hydraulic and thermal properties for land surface modelling. *J. Adv. Model.*
896 *Earth Syst.* 11, 2996–3023. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001784>.
- 897 Davis, G. B., Barber, C., Power, T. R., Thierrin, J., Patterson, B. M., Rayner, J. L., Wu, Q., 1999. The
898 variability and intrinsic remediation of a BTEX plume in anaerobic sulphate-rich groundwater. *J.*
899 *Contam. Hydrol.* 36, 265–290. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7722\(98\)00148-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7722(98)00148-X).
- 900 de Graaf, I. E. M., Sutanudjaja, E. H., van Beek, L. P. H., Bierkens, M. F. P., 2015. A high-resolution global-
901 scale groundwater model. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 19, 823–837. [https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-823-](https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-823-2015)
902 2015.
- 903 de Graaf, I. E. M., Gleeson, T., (Rens) van Beek, L. P. H., Sutanudjaja, E. H., Bierkens M. F. P., 2019.
904 Environmental flow limits to global groundwater pumping, *Nature.* 574, 90–94.
905 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1594-4>.
- 906 De Sy, V., Herold, M., Achard, F., Beuchle, R., Clevers, J. G. P. W., Lindquist, E., Verchot, L., 2015. Land
907 use patterns and related carbon losses following deforestation in south America. *Environ. Res. Lett.*
908 10(12). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/124004>.
- 909 DGA., 2019. Mapa hidroquímico de Chile. Ministerio de Obras Públicas. Dirección General de Aguas.
910 División de Conservación de Recursos Hídricos. Santiago, Chile, 111.
911 <https://snia.mop.gob.cl/sad/CQA5868.pdf>.
- 912 Dobson, R., Schroth, M. H., Zeyer, J., 2007. Effect of water-table fluctuation on dissolution and biodegradation
913 of a multi-component, light nonaqueous-phase liquid. *J. Contam. Hydrol.* 94, 235–248.
914 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2007.07.007>.
- 915 Duhalde, D. J., Arumí, J. L., Oyarzún, R. A., Rivera, D. A., 2018. Fuzzy-based assessment of groundwater
916 intrinsic vulnerability of a volcanic aquifer in the chilean andean valley. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 190(7).
917 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-018-6758-4>.
- 918 European Union, Copernicus Land Monitoring Service 2018, European Environment Agency (EEA).
- 919 Fan, Y., Li, H., Miguez-Macho, G., 2013. Global Patterns of Groundwater Table Depth. *Science.* 339(6122),
920 940–943. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1229881>.
- 921 Fan, Y., Miguez-Macho, G., 2010. Potential groundwater contribution to Amazon evapotranspiration. *Hydrol.*
922 *Earth Syst. Sci.* 14, 2039–2056. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-14-2039-2010>.
- 923 FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC., 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2). Rome, Italy and
924 IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria.
- 925 Fick, S. E., R. J. Hijmans., 2017. WorldClim 2: new 1km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land
926 areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* 37(12), 4302–4315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>.
- 927 Foster, S., 1987. Fundamental concepts in aquifer vulnerability, pollution risk and protection strategy.
928 International Conference, Noordwijk Aan Zee. TNO Proc. Inf. 38, 69–86.
- 929 Foster, S., Hirata, R., 1988. Groundwater pollution risk assessment: a methodology using available data.
930 WHO-PAHO-CEPIS. Lima.
- 931 Foster, S., Hirata, R., Andreo, B., 2013. Le concept de vulnérabilité des aquifères à la pollution: Une aide ou
932 un obstacle au renforcement de leur protection? *Hydrogeol. J.* 21, 1389–1392.
933 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-013-1019-7>.

- 934 Fritch, T. G., McKnight, C. L., Yelderman Jr., J. C., Arnold, J. G., 2000. An aquifer vulnerability assessment
935 of the paluxy aquifer, central texas, USA, using GIS and a modified DRASTIC approach. *Environ.*
936 *Manage.* 25(3), 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002679910026>.
- 937 Garreaud, R. D., 2009. The Andes climate and weather. *Adv. Geosci.* 22, 3–11. [https://doi.org/10.5194/adgeo-](https://doi.org/10.5194/adgeo-22-3-2009)
938 22-3-2009.
- 939 Garreaud, R. D., Vuille, M., Compagnucci, R., Marengo, J., 2009. Present-day South American climate.
940 *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* 281(3-4), 180–195.
941 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2007.10.032>.
- 942 Giacomazzo, A. P., de Almeida, W. S., 2020. Study of the contamination potential of the jockey club landfill,
943 distrito federal, brazil. *Eng. Sanit. e Ambient.* 25(6), 909–920. [https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-](https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-4152202020180223)
944 4152202020180223.
- 945 Gimsing, A.L., Agert, J., Baran, N., Boivin A., Ferrari, F., Gibson, R., Hammond, L., Hegler, F., Jones, R. L.,
946 Konig, W., Kreuger, J., van der Linden, T., Liss, D., Loiseau, L., Massey, A., Miles, B., Monrozies L.,
947 Newcombe, A., Poot, A., Reeves, G. L., Reichenberger, S., Rosenbom, A. E., Staudenmaier, H., Sur,
948 R., Shwen, A., Stemmer, M., Tuting, W., Ulrich, U., 2019. Conducting groundwater monitoring studies
949 in Europe for pesticide active substances and their metabolites in the context of Regulation (EC)
950 1107/2009. *J. Consum. Prot. Food. Saf.* 14, 1–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00003-019-01211-x>.
- 951 Giri C. and Long, J., 2014. Land Cover Characterization and Mapping of South America for the Year 2010
952 Using Landsat 30 m Satellite Data. *Remote Sens.* 6(10), 9494–9510. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs6109494>.
- 953 Gleeson, T. N., Moosdorf, J., Hartmann, L. P. H. van Beek., 2014. A glimpse beneath earth’s surface: Global
954 HYdrogeology MaPS (GLHYMPS) of permeability and porosity. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 41, 3891–3898.
955 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059856>.
- 956 Gleeson, T., VanderSteen, J., Sophocleous, M. A., Tanigauchi, M., Alley W. M., Allen, D. M., Zhou, Y., 2010.
957 Groundwater sustainability strategies. *Nature Geosci.* 3, 378–379. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo881>.
- 958 Gogu, R. C., Dassargues, A., 2000. Current trends and future challenges in groundwater vulnerability
959 assessment using overlay and index methods. *Environ. Geol.* 39(6), 549–559. [https://doi-](https://doi-org/10.1007/s002540050466)
960 [org/10.1007/s002540050466](https://doi-org/10.1007/s002540050466).
- 961 Gomes, M. C. R., Mendonça, L. A. R., Cavalcante, I. N., 2018. Mapping of vulnerability and risk of
962 groundwater pollution in the eastern portion of the araripe sedimentary basin, ceará, Brasil. *Anu. do*
963 *Inst. De Geocienc.* 41(3), 252–259. https://doi.org/10.11137/2018_3_252_259.
- 964 Gómez, J., Schobbenhaus, C., Montes, N. E., compilers., 2019. Geological Map of South America 2019, Scale
965 1:5 000 000, Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CGMW). Colombian Geol. Surv. and
966 Geol. Surv. of Brazil. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.32685/10.143.2019.929>.
- 967 Goode, D. J., Konikow, L. F., 1990. Apparent dispersion in transient groundwater flow. *Water Resour. Res.*
968 26, 2339–2351. <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR026i010p02339>.
- 969 Goyal, D., Haritash, A. K., Singh, S. K. (2021). A comprehensive review of groundwater vulnerability
970 assessment using index-based, modelling, and coupling methods. *J. Environ. Manag.* 296
971 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113161>.
- 972 Hendrickx, J. M., Flury, M., 2001. Uniform and preferential flow mechanisms in the vadose zone, in:
973 Conceptual models of flow and transport in the fractured vadose zone. National Research Council. 149–
974 187. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/10102>.
- 975 Herlinger, R., Viero, A. P., 2007. Groundwater vulnerability assessment in coastal plain of Rio Grande do Sul
976 State, Brazil, using drastic and adsorption capacity of soils. *Environ. Geol.* 52, 819–829.
977 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00254-006-0518-4>.
- 978 Hirata, R. C. A., Bastos, C. R. A., Rocha, G. A., Gomes, D. C., Iritani, M. A., 1991. Groundwater pollution
979 risk and vulnerability map of the state of sao paulo, Brazil. *Water Sci. Technol.* 24(11), 159–169.
980 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.1991.0348>.

- 981 Hu, X., Ma, C., Qi, H., Guo, X., 2018. Groundwater vulnerability assessment using the GALDIT model and
 982 the improved DRASTIC model: a case in Weibei Plain, China. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 25(32), 32524–
 983 32539. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-018-3196-3>.
- 984 Huan, H., Jinsheng, W., Yanguo, T., 2012. Assessment and validation of groundwater vulnerability to nitrate
 985 based on a modified DRASTIC model: a case study in Jilin City of northeast China. *Sci. Total Environ.*
 986 440, 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.08.037>.
- 987 Huscroft, J., Gleeson, T., Hartmann, J., Börker, J., 2018. Compiling and mapping global permeability of the
 988 unconsolidated and consolidated Earth: GLobal HYdrogeology MaPS 2.0 (GLHYMPS 2.0). *Geophys.*
 989 *Res. Lett.* 45, 1897–1904. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075860>.
- 990 IGRAC (International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre) and UNESCO-IHP (UNESCO
 991 International Hydrological Programme), 2015. *Transboundary Aquifers of Latin America, Based on:
 992 Transboundary Aquifers of the World, Map*, Delft, Netherlands.
- 993 Jahromi, M. N., Gomeh, Z., Busico, G., Barzegar, R., Samany, N. N., Aalami, M. T., Tedesco, D., Mastrocicco,
 994 M., Kazakis, N., 2021. Developing a SINTACS-based method to map groundwater multi-pollutant
 995 vulnerability using evolutionary algorithms. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 28(7), 7854–7869.
 996 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11089-0>.
- 997 Jarvis, N. J., 2007. A review of non-equilibrium water flow and solute transport in soil macropores: principles,
 998 controlling factors and consequences for water quality. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 58. 3.
 999 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2007.00915.x>.
- 1000 Jasechko, S., Perrone, D., Befus, K., Cardenas, M. B., Ferguson, G., Gleeson, T., Luijendijk, E., McDonnell,
 1001 J. J., Taylor, R. G., Wada, Y., Kirchner, J. W., 2017. Global aquifers dominated by fossil groundwaters
 1002 but wells vulnerable to modern contamination. *Nature Geosci.* 10, 425–429.
 1003 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2943>.
- 1004 Jasechko, S., S. J. Birks, T. Gleeson, Y. Wada, P. J. Fawcett, Z. D. Sharp, J. J. McDonnell, J. M. Welker.,
 1005 2014. The pronounced seasonality of global groundwater recharge. *Water Resour. Res.* 50, 8845–8867.
 1006 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015809>.
- 1007 Javadi, S., Hashemy Shahdany, S. M., Neshat, A., Chambel, A. (2020). Multi-parameter risk mapping of
 1008 qazvin aquifer by classic and fuzzy clustering techniques. *Geocarto Int.*
 1009 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2020.1778099>.
- 1010 Jia, Z., Bian, J., Wang, Y., Wan, H., Sun, X., Li, Q., 2019. Assessment and validation of groundwater
 1011 vulnerability to nitrate in porous aquifers based on a DRASTIC method modified by projection pursuit
 1012 dynamic clustering model. *J. C. Hydrol.* 226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2019.103522>.
- 1013 Kazakis, N., Busico, G., Colombani, N., Mastrocicco, M., Pavlou, A., Voudouris, K., 2019. GALDIT-SUSI a
 1014 modified method to account for surface water bodies in the assessment of aquifer vulnerability to
 1015 seawater intrusion. *J. Environ. Manage.* 235, 257–265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.01.069>.
- 1016 Kazakis, N., Voudouris, K. S., 2015. Groundwater vulnerability and pollution risk assessment of porous
 1017 aquifers to nitrate: Modifying the DRASTIC method using quantitative parameters. *J. Hydrol.* 525, 13–
 1018 25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.03.035>.
- 1019 Keuskamp, J. A., Van Drecht, G., Bouwman, A. F., 2012. European-scale modelling of groundwater
 1020 denitrification and associated N₂O production. *Environ. Pollut.* 165, 67–76.
 1021 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2012.02.008>.
- 1022 Konikow, L. F., Kendy, E., 2005. Groundwater depletion: A global problem. *Hydrogeol. J.* 13, 317–320.
 1023 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-004-0411-8>.
- 1024 Kumar, R., Heße, F., Rao, P. S. C., Musolff, A., Jawitz, J. W., Sarrazin, F., Samaniego, L., Fleckenstein, J. H.,
 1025 Rakovec, O., Thober, S., Attinger, S., 2020. Strong hydroclimatic controls on vulnerability to subsurface
 1026 nitrate contamination across Europe. *Nat. Commun.* 11(1). [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19955-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19955-8)
 1027 8.

- 1028 Lasagna, M., De Luca, D. A., Franchino, E., 2016. The role of physical and biological processes in aquifers
1029 and their importance on groundwater vulnerability to nitrate pollution. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 75, 961.
1030 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-016-5768-1>.
- 1031 Li, R., Merchant, J. W., 2013. Modeling vulnerability of groundwater to pollution under future scenarios of
1032 climate change and biofuels-related land use change: A case study in north dakota, USA. *Sci. Total*
1033 *Environ.* 447, 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.01.011>.
- 1034 Lima, M. L., Zelaya, K., Massone, H., 2011. Groundwater vulnerability assessment combining the drastic and
1035 dyna-CLUE model in the argentine pampas. *Environ. Manage.* 47(5), 828–839.
1036 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-011-9652-1>.
- 1037 Lodwick, W. A., Monson, W., Svoboda, L., 1990. Attribute error and sensitivity analysis of map operations in
1038 geographical in-formation systems: Suitability analysis. *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst.* 4(4), 413–428.
1039 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02693799008941556>.
- 1040 Machiwal, D., Cloutier, V., Güler, C. Kazakis, N., 2018. A review of GIS-integrated statistical techniques for
1041 groundwater quality evaluation and protection. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 77, 681.
1042 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-018-7872-x>.
- 1043 Machiwal, D., Jha, M. K., Singh, V. P., Mohan, C., 2018. Assessment and mapping of groundwater
1044 vulnerability to pollution: Current status and challenges. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 185, 901–927.
1045 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2018.08.009>.
- 1046 Massone, H. E. Barilari, A., 2020. Groundwater pollution: A discussion about vulnerability, hazard and risk
1047 assessment. *Hydrogeol. J.* 28(2), 463–466. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-019-02090-0>.
- 1048 Massone, H., Londoño, M. Q., Martínez, D., 2010. Enhanced groundwater vulnerability assessment in
1049 geological homogeneous areas: A case study from the argentine pampas. *Hydrogeol. J.* 18(2), 371–379.
1050 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-009-0506-3>.
- 1051 Miguez-Macho, G. Fan, Y., 2012. The role of groundwater in the Amazon water cycle: 1. Influence on seasonal
1052 streamflow, flooding and wetlands. *J. Geophys. Res.* 117, D15113.
1053 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD017539>.
- 1054 Miguez-Macho, G. Fan, Y., 2012. The role of groundwater in the Amazon water cycle: 2. Influence on seasonal
1055 soil moisture and evapotranspiration. *J. Geophys. Res.* 117, D15114.
1056 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD017540>.
- 1057 Mohan, C., Western, A. W., Wei, Y., Saft, M., 2018. Predicting groundwater recharge for varying land cover
1058 and climate conditions – a global meta-study. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 22, 2689–2703.
1059 <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-2689-2018>.
- 1060 Montoya, J. C., Porfiri, C., Roberto, Z. E., Viglizzo, E. F., 2019. Assessing the vulnerability of groundwater
1061 resources in semiarid lands of central argentina. *Sustain. Water Resour. Manag.* 5(4), 1419–1434.
1062 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40899-018-0246-4>.
- 1063 Muñoz Sabater, J., 2019. ERA5-Land hourly data from 1981 to present. Copernicus Climate Change Service
1064 (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS). <https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.e2161bac>.
- 1065 Nadiri, A. A., Sedghi, Z., Khatibi, R., Sadeghfam, S. (2018). Mapping specific vulnerability of multiple
1066 confined and unconfined aquifers by using artificial intelligence to learn from multiple DRASTIC
1067 frameworks. *J. Environ. Manag.* 227, 415-428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.08.019>.
- 1068 Napolitano, P., Fabbri, A., 1996. Single-Parameter Sensitivity Analysis for Aquifer Vulnerability Assessment
1069 Using DRASTIC and SINTACS, in: *Proceedings of Vienna Conference, HydroGIS 96: Application of*
1070 *Geographical Information Systems in Hydrology and Water Resources Management.* IAHS Pub.,
1071 Vienna, 235, 559–566.
- 1072 National Research Council (NRC)., 1993. *Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment: Predicting Relative*
1073 *Contamination Potential Under Conditions of Uncertainty.* The National Academies Press, 224.
1074 Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, <https://doi.org/10.17226/2050>.

- 1075 Neshat, A., Pradhan, B., Pirasteh, S., & Shafri, H. Z. M., 2014. Estimating groundwater vulnerability to
 1076 pollution using a modified DRASTIC model in the Kerman agricultural area, Iran. *Environ. Earth Sci.*
 1077 71(7), 3119–3131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-013-2690-7>.
- 1078 Nistor, M., 2020. Groundwater vulnerability in Europe under climate change. *Quat. Int.* 547, 185–196.
 1079 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2019.04.012>.
- 1080 Nobre, R. C. M., Rotunno Filho, O. C., Mansur, W. J., Nobre, M. M. M., Cosenza, C. A. N., 2007. Groundwater
 1081 vulnerability and risk mapping using GIS, modeling and a fuzzy logic tool. *J. Contam. Hydrol.* 94(3-4),
 1082 277–292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2007.07.008>.
- 1083 Núñez, C., Verbist, K., 2018. Atlas de Sequía de América Latina y el Caribe, UNESCO and CAZALAC. 204.
 1084 ISBN: 978-92-3-300097-1.
- 1085 Oki, T., Kanae, S., 2006. Global hydrological cycles and world water resources. *Science.* 313, 1068–1072.
 1086 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3847070>.
- 1087 Ottoni, M. V., Ottoni Filho, T. B., Schaap, M. G., Lopes-Assad, M. L. R. C., Rotunno Filho, O. C., 2018.
 1088 Hydrophysical Database for Brazilian Soils (HYBRAS) and Pedotransfer Functions for Water
 1089 Retention. *Vadose Zone J.* 17(1), 0. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2017.05.0095>.
- 1090 Ouedraogo, I., Defourny, P., Vanclooster, M., 2016. Mapping the groundwater vulnerability for pollution at
 1091 the pan african scale. *Sci. Total Environ.* 544, 939–953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.135>.
- 1092 Pacheco, F. A. L., Pires, L. M. G. R., Santos, R. M. B., Sanches Fernandes, L. F., 2015. Factor weighting in
 1093 DRASTIC modeling. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 505, 474–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.09.092>.
- 1094 Peixoto da Silva, F., Cavalcante, I. N., 2019. Aquifer vulnerability and contamination risk of groundwater in
 1095 urban environment. *Geologia USP - Serie Cientifica.* 19(2), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2316-9095.v19-142384>.
- 1097 Rahmani, B., Javadi, S., Shahdany, S. M. H. (2021). Evaluation of aquifer vulnerability using PCA technique
 1098 and various clustering methods. *Geocarto Int.* 36(18), 2117–2140.
 1099 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2019.1690057>.
- 1100 Rama F., Busico G., Arumi J. L., Kazakis N., Colombani N., Marfella L., Hirata R., Kruse E. E., Sweeney P.,
 1101 and Mastrocicco, M., 2021. DATASETS and OUTCOMES - Assessment of intrinsic aquifer
 1102 vulnerability at continental scale through a critical application of the DRASTIC method: the case of
 1103 South America (version 1.0) [Data set]. Zenodo.
- 1104 Rama, F., Ramos, D. T., Müller, J. B., Corseuil, H. X., Miotliński K., 2019. Flow field dynamics and high
 1105 ethanol content in gasohol blends enhance BTEX migration and biodegradation in groundwater. *J.*
 1106 *Contam. Hydrol.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2019.01.003>.
- 1107 Richts A., Struckmeier W. F., Zaepke M., 2011. WHYMAP and the Groundwater Resources Map of the World
 1108 1:25,000,000. In: Jones J. (eds) *Sustaining Groundwater Resources. International Year of Planet Earth.*
 1109 Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3426-7_10
- 1110 Roy-Roura, M., Nolan, B.T., Menció, A., Mas-Pla, J., 2013. Regression model for aquifer vulnerability
 1111 assessment of nitrate pollution in the Osona region (NE Spain). *J. Hydrol.* 505, 150–162.
 1112 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.09.048>.
- 1113 Sadeghfam, S., Khatibi, R., Nadiri, A. A., Ghodsi, K (2021). Next Stages in Aquifer Vulnerability Studies by
 1114 Integrating Risk Indexing with Understanding Uncertainties by using Generalised Likelihood
 1115 Uncertainty Estimation. *Expo. Health.* 13, 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12403-021-00389-6>.
- 1116 Seabra, V. S., Da Silva Jr., G. C., Cruz, C. B. M., 2009. The use of geoprocessing to assess vulnerability on
 1117 the east coast aquifers of rio de janeiro state. Brazil. *Environ. Geol.* 57(3), 665–674.
 1118 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00254-008-1345-6>.
- 1119 Shanguan, W., T. Hengl, J. Mendes de Jesus, H. Yuan, Y. Dai., 2017. Mapping the global depth to bedrock
 1120 for land surface modeling. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 9, 65–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016MS000686>.

- 1121 Siebert, S., Burke, J., Faures, J. M., Frenken, K., Hoogeveen, J., Döll, P., Portmann, F. T., 2010. Groundwater
1122 use for irrigation – a global inventory. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 14, 1863–1880.
1123 <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-14-1863-2010>.
- 1124 Stigter, T. Y., Ribeiro, L., Carvalho Dill, A. M. M., 2006. Evaluation of an intrinsic and a specific vulnerability
1125 assessment method in comparison with groundwater salinization and nitrate contamination levels in two
1126 agricultural regions in the South of Portugal. *Hydrogeol. J.* 14, 79–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10040-004-0396-3>.
- 1128 Sutanudjaja, E. H., van Beek, R., Wanders, N., Wada, Y., Bosmans, J. H. C., Drost, N., van der Ent, R. J., de
1129 Graaf, I. E. M., Hoch, J. M., de Jong, K., Karssenber, D., López López, P., Peßenteiner, S., Schmitz,
1130 O., Straatsma, M. W., Vannamete, E., Wissler, D., Bierkens, M. F. P., 2018. PCR-GLOBWB 2: a
1131 5 arcmin global hydrological and water resources model. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 11, 2429–2453.
1132 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2429-2018>.
- 1133 Tayer, T. D., Velásques, L. N. M., 2017. Assessment of intrinsic vulnerability to the contamination of karst
1134 aquifer using the COP method in the Carste Lagoa Santa Environmental Protection Unit, Brazil.
1135 *Environ. Earth Sci.* 76, 445, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-017-6760-0>.
- 1136 Tobler, W., 1987. “Measuring Spatial Resolution”, in: *Proceedings, Land Resources Information Systems*
1137 *Conference*. Beijing, China. 12–16.
- 1138 van der Heijden, G., Legout, A., Pollier, B., Bréchet, C., Ranger, J., Dambrine, E., 2013. Tracing and modeling
1139 preferential flow in a forest soil—Potential impact on nutrient leaching. *Geoderma*. 195, 12–22.
1140 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2012.11.004>.
- 1141 Van Stemproot, D., Ewert, L., Wassenaar, L., 1993. Aquifer vulnerability index: a GIS compatible method for
1142 groundwater vulnerability mapping. *Can. Water Resour. J.* 18(1), 25–37.
1143 <https://doi.org/10.4296/cwrj1801025>.
- 1144 Vanderborght J., Timmerman A., Feyen J., 2020. Solute Transport for Steady-State and Transient Flow in
1145 Soils with and without Macropores. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64, 4.
1146 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2000.6441305x>.
- 1147 Vías J., Andreo B., Perles M., Carrasco F., Vadillo I., Jiménez P., 2006. Proposed method for groundwater
1148 vulnerability mapping in carbonate (karstic) aquifers: the COP method. *Hydrogeol. J.* 14, 912–925.
1149 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-006-0023-6>.
- 1150 Villar, P.C., 2016. International cooperation on transboundary aquifers in South America and the Guarani
1151 Aquifer case. *Rev. Bras. de Política Int.* 59. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201600107>.
- 1152 Vu, T. D., Ni, C. F., Li, W. C., Truong M. H. J. W., 2019. Modified index-overlay method to assess spatial–
1153 temporal variations of groundwater vulnerability and groundwater contamination risk in areas with
1154 variable activities of agriculture developments. *Water*. 11 (12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/w11122492>.
- 1155 Wachniew, P., Zurek, A. J., Stumpp, C., Gemitzi, A., Gargini, A., Filippini, M., Rozanski, K., Meeks, J.,
1156 Kværner, J. Witczak, S., 2016. Toward operational methods for the assessment of intrinsic groundwater
1157 vulnerability: A review. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 46(9), 827–884.
1158 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2016.1160816>.
- 1159 Yamazaki, D., Ikeshima, D., Tawatari, R., Yamaguchi, T., O’Loughlin, F., Neal, J. C., Sampson, C.C., Kanae,
1160 S., Bates, P. D., 2017. A high-accuracy map of global terrain elevations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 44(11),
1161 5844–5853. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017gl072874>.
- 1162 Yin, L., Zhang, E., Wang, X., Wenninger, J., Dong, J., Guo, L., Huang, J., 2013. A GIS-based DRASTIC
1163 model for assessing groundwater vulnerability in the ordos plateau, China. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 69(1),
1164 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-012-1945-z>.
- 1165 Yoon, JH. Zeng, N., 2010. An Atlantic influence on Amazon rainfall. *Clim. Dyn.* 34, 249–264.
1166 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-009-0551-6>.