Adamawa State University Global Journal of Geography and Environmental Sciences
(ADSU-GJGES)
Volume 05 Issue 1, 2025
ISSN: 2651-3830 (Print); 2756-4142 (Online)

Website: gjges.adsu.edu.ng   *Email: gjges@adsu.edu.ng*

REVIEW ARTICLE

A Review of Methodological Approaches and Results Interpretations to Morphometric Analysis in Environmental Resource Management

Yohanna Peter
Department of Geography and Environmental Sciences, Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 16 March 2025
Revised 19 May 2025
Accepted 23 June 2025

Keywords:
- Morphometric analysis
- Geographic Information System
- Remote Sensing
- Environmental resource management
- Soil Erosion
- Hydrology

***Corresponding Author:**
E-mail:
yohannapeter@gmail.com
Phone:
+2348076112500

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive review examines methodological approaches and interpretative frameworks in morphometric analysis for environmental resource management, tracing its evolution from traditional cartographic techniques to advanced AI-driven applications. Morphometric analysis quantifies watershed characteristics through parameters such as drainage density, bifurcation ratio, and relief ratio, providing critical insights into hydrological processes, erosion susceptibility, groundwater potential, and flood risks. Methodological developments have progressed through four distinct phases: (1) manual cartographic methods (1940s-1980s) establishing foundational quantitative principles; (2) GIS and Remote Sensing approaches enabling automated extraction from DEMs (SRTM, ASTER, LiDAR); (3) statistical and geostatistical techniques (PCA, regression, geostatistics) establishing predictive relationships; and (4) machine learning algorithms (Random Forest, SVM, ANNs) capturing complex non-linear dynamics. Despite technological advancements, significant challenges persist in result interpretation across diverse environmental contexts. High drainage density indicates erosion in semi-arid regions but groundwater recharge in humid tropics, while bifurcation ratios reflect tectonic controls in some settings and lithological influences in others. Methodological gaps include DEM resolution inconsistencies (causing up to 45% variation in drainage density estimates), limited AI adoption in developing regions (<5% of global studies), scale dependency effects (60% parameter variation across spatial extents), and insufficient integration with hydrological-socioeconomic models. Interpretative limitations involve over-generalization across environments, over-reliance on single indices, neglect of temporal dynamics, and poor translation to policy frameworks (only 15% of watershed plans incorporate morphometrics). Future research priorities include high-resolution DEM accessibility, cloud-based AI platforms, longitudinal monitoring of morphometric evolution, and trans-disciplinary approaches bridging scientific analysis with governance frameworks. Addressing these gaps will enhance the contribution of morphometric analysis to sustainable watershed management, particularly in vulnerable regions like Africa where context-specific applications are urgently needed.

Introduction

Environmental Resource Management focuses on sustainable planning, utilization, and protection of natural resources to maintain ecological stability while supporting human well-being (Barrow, 2006; Kanianska, 2016). Understanding watershed processes is essential for effective management, as drainage basins control water movement, sediment transport, and ecological balance (Gregory & Walling, 1973; Clarke, 1996), without which interventions often fail to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Morphometric Analysis, established by Horton (1945) and refined by Strahler (1964), quantifies drainage network geometry through parameters like drainage density, bifurcation ratio, and relief ratio, providing insights into hydrological responses, erosion susceptibility, and geomorphic evolution (Schumm, 1956; Chorley, 1969; Nag & Chakraborty, 2003). For example, high drainage density indicates erosion risk, while elongation ratios reveal flood potential (Strahler, 1964; Sreedevi et al., 2017). Applications span soil conservation (Magesh et al., 2011; Gajbhiye et al., 2014), watershed prioritization (Sreedevi et al., 2017; Nooka Ratnam et al., 2005), groundwater exploration (Nag, 1998; Mesa, 2006), flood risk assessment (Singh et al., 2018; Farhan & Anaba, 2016), and gully erosion research in semi-arid regions like northern Nigeria (Okoye et al., 2019; Okoye et al., 2019).

Methodologically, the field evolved from manual map analysis (Horton, 1945; Chorley, 1969) to GIS/RS-based DEM processing (Jasrotia & Singh, 2006; Aher et al., 2014), enhancing accuracy and scalability. Statistical techniques (Principal Component Analysis - PCA, regression) identify dominant controls and predict hydrological responses (Magesh et al., 2011; Gajbhiye et al., 2014; Mesa, 2006; Farhan & Anaba, 2016), while Artificial Intelligence -AI/Machine Learning -ML approaches (Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM) improve precision in erosion and flood modelling (Saha et al., 2021; Tehrany et al., 2019).

Challenges persist in interpreting results, as parameters like drainage density have context-dependent meanings (e.g., erosion in semi-arid Nigeria vs. recharge in humid tropics) (Okoye et al., 2019; Mesa, 2006), and bifurcation ratios reflect varying controls (Sreedevi et al., 2017). Additional gaps include limited socio-economic integration, weak translation to management strategies (Nooka Ratnam et al., 2005; Singh et al., 2018), and neglect of temporal dynamics (Farhan & Anaba, 2016; Okoye et al., 2019). Addressing these requires multi-scale approaches, high-resolution Digital Elevation Model (DEMs), and integrated AI-driven models (Tehrany et al., 2019; Saha et al., 2021).

Methodology of the Review

This review employed a systematic literature review methodology to synthesize methodological advancements and interpretative frameworks in morphometric analysis for environmental resource management. A comprehensive search was conducted across Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, and specialized repositories (e.g., Geomorphology, Earth-Science Reviews) using keywords such as "morphometric analysis," "drainage basin," "Geographic Information System (GIS)," "machine learning," "watershed prioritization," and "environmental management," spanning publications from 1945 to 2023. Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed articles, books, and technical reports addressing methodological phases (manual cartography, GIS/Remote Sensing, statistical/geostatistical, AI/ML), interpretative frameworks (hydrological, tectonic, applied management), and regional applications, while excluding non-English studies and non-watershed contexts. The analysis followed a thematic organization to trace chronological methodological evolution, comparatively evaluate parameter interpretations across environmental contexts, and categorize gaps (e.g., DEM resolution inconsistencies, scale dependency, policy disconnect). Critical assessment involved validating methodological strengths/limitations (e.g., GIS efficiency vs. AI's "black-box" constraints) and cross-referencing findings with regional case studies (e.g., semi-arid Nigeria, humid tropics). Synthesis integrated narrative and evidence mapping to identify research clusters, contradictions, and forward-looking solutions, ensuring a holistic, evidence-based evaluation of the role of morphometric analysis in sustainable watershed management.

Methodological Approaches to Morphometric Analysis

1. *Traditional Manual and Cartographic Methods*

The earliest phase of morphometric analysis, spanning from the 1940s through the 1980s, was dominated by manual and cartographic techniques. During this period, researchers relied heavily on topographic maps, aerial photographs, and field-based surveys to derive quantitative drainage parameters (Horton, 1945; Smith, 1950; Gregory & Walling, 1973). Parameters such as stream order, drainage density, bifurcation ratio, stream frequency, and elongation ratio were typically extracted through manual counting, measurement with rulers and planimeters, and visual interpretation of drainage patterns (Strahler, 1952; Chorley, 1969). This manual phase laid the foundation of quantitative geomorphology by transforming descriptive geomorphology into a systematic, numerical discipline (Chorley, 1969).

One of the main strengths of manual approaches was their role in establishing the quantitative framework of morphometry. Horton's (1945) pioneering work introduced statistical laws of stream numbers, lengths, and areas, while Strahler (1952, 1964) later formalized the widely used stream-ordering system. These contributions enabled researchers to make early comparisons across watersheds, linking drainage characteristics to hydrological and geomorphic processes such as runoff, infiltration, and erosion susceptibility (Schumm, 1956; Leopold et al., 1964). At a time when digital data were unavailable, topographic maps provided a critical resource for understanding watershed behaviour and guiding the early stages of water resource management (Smith, 1950; Gregory, 1976).

However, the limitations of manual and cartographic methods soon became apparent. The techniques were extremely time-consuming and labor-intensive, particularly for large or complex basins (Chorley, 1969; Clarke, 1996). Manual measurements were also prone to human error, leading to inconsistencies and difficulties in replicating results across studies (Mark, 1983). Furthermore, the accuracy of results depended heavily on the scale and quality of available topographic maps, which varied significantly from one region to another (Gregory & Walling, 1973; Clarke, 1996). In areas lacking detailed cartographic coverage—such as many parts of Africa, Asia, and South America—researchers faced major obstacles in applying morphometric techniques, thereby limiting the global scope of early geomorphological studies (Mesa, 2006).

Another key limitation was the restricted analytical capacity of manual methods. While they provided valuable first-order insights, these approaches lacked the ability to handle large datasets or capture spatial variability at fine resolutions. Consequently, manual morphometry was generally confined to small-scale basin studies and could not easily accommodate comparisons across regions or integrate with hydrological models (Strahler, 1964; Chorley, 1969). By the late 20th century, as the demand for more reproducible, scalable, and accurate watershed analysis grew, manual methods were increasingly supplemented, and often replaced, by computer-based approaches using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Remote Sensing technologies (Mark, 1983; Jasrotia & Singh, 2006).

2. *GIS and Remote Sensing Approaches*

The adoption of GIS and Remote Sensing (RS) technologies has transformed morphometric analysis by enabling automated watershed delineation and drainage network extraction through DEMs such as Shuttle Radar Topography Mission, Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer Global Digital and Advanced Land Observing Satellite Phased Array type L-band Synthetic Aperture Radar *(*SRTM, ASTER GDEM, and ALOS PALSAR) (Farr et al., 2007; Tadono et al., 2014; Abrams et al., 2020). More advanced datasets like Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) and Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)-derived DEMs now allow centimeter-level terrain modelling (Stumpf et al., 2016; Aalders & Aalders, 2021), supporting applications including stream ordering, slope and hypsometric analysis, erosion susceptibility mapping, and groundwater recharge assessments (Patel et al., 2012; Sreedevi et al., 2017). Compared to traditional cartographic methods, GIS- and RS-based approaches offer efficiency, reproducibility, and comprehensive spatial coverage, even in inaccessible terrains (Mesa, 2006; Clarke, 1996; Aher et al., 2014; Singh et al., 2018), while integration with multi-temporal imagery facilitates holistic resource management (Magesh et al., 2011; Venkateswaran et al., 2019). However, challenges remain due to DEM resolution and accuracy, which can affect drainage density, relief ratios, and hypsometric integrals, necessitating rigorous validation through field data and hybrid methods (O'Callaghan & Mark, 1984; Jenson & Domingue, 1988; Grimaldi et al., 2007; Li & Wong, 2010; Grohmann, 2004; Albani et al., 2013; Tarboton et al., 1991; Thomas et al., 2012; Sahoo et al., 2016).

3. *Statistical and Geostatistical Approaches*

The integration of statistical and geostatistical approaches into morphometric analysis has enhanced the ability to link basin characteristics with hydrological and geomorphological processes. Unlike traditional manual or GIS-based methods, statistical tools establish functional relationships, identify dominant controls, and generate predictive models that support applications such as erosion susceptibility, flood forecasting, sediment yield estimation, and groundwater recharge assessment (Mesa, 2006; Gajbhiye et al., 2014).

Multivariate statistical techniques, particularly Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and cluster analysis, are widely applied to reduce large datasets into key parameters and classify sub-watersheds based on hydrological sensitivity. These methods enable prioritization and targeted watershed management (Magesh et al., 2011; Gajbhiye et al., 2014; Sreedevi et al., 2017; Thomas et al., 2012). For instance, studies have shown that cluster-based classification improves conservation planning compared to traditional ranking (Patel et al., 2012). Regression modelling has also been extensively used, with linear and multiple regression approaches predicting runoff, sediment yield, and groundwater recharge from morphometric parameters such as drainage density and relief ratio (Singh et al., 2018; Mesa, 2006). Applications include flood forecasting (Farhan

& Anaba, 2016) and soil conservation planning (Gajbhiye et al., 2014).

Trend analysis techniques such as the Mann-Kendall test and Sen's slope estimator have provided insights into temporal changes in morphometric indices under land use/land cover changes and climate variability (Mann, 1945; Kendall, 1975; Farhan & Anaba, 2016; Okoye et al., 2019). Evidence from northern Nigeria, for example, shows statistically significant shifts in runoff response and erosion susceptibility over multi-decadal periods due to anthropogenic pressures (Okoye et al., 2019). Meanwhile, geostatistical methods—such as kriging, variogram modelling, and spatial regression—allow for spatial interpolation of morphometric indices, mapping of erosion hotspots, and uncertainty analysis, thereby improving conservation strategies in heterogeneous terrains (Li & Wong, 2010; Kumar et al., 2019; Sahoo et al., 2016).

Despite their advantages, these methods face limitations linked to data quality, assumptions, and model sensitivity. Regression models may oversimplify non-linear watershed dynamics (Saha et al., 2021), PCA and clustering are influenced by variable selection and scaling (Gajbhiye et al., 2014), and trend detection can be hindered by short or inconsistent records (Okoye et al., 2019). Similarly, geostatistical models often require dense spatial datasets, which may be unavailable in data-scarce regions (Li & Wong, 2010).

4. *Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence Approaches*

The rise of Machine Learning (ML) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) has advanced morphometric analysis by capturing complex, non-linear relationships between morphometric parameters and hydrological processes (Tehrany et al., 2019; Saha et al., 2021). Algorithms such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM), Decision Trees, and Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) are applied in erosion mapping, groundwater recharge prediction, and flood susceptibility assessment (Das et al., 2022; Pham et al., 2019), with RF excelling in flood hazard modeling (Arabameri et al., 2020) and ANNs simulating recharge through non-linear interactions (Ghosh & Kar, 2018; Mosavi et al., 2018). Integration with hydrological models like Soil and Water Assessment Tool, Hydrologic Engineering Center – Hydrologic Modeling System and Modelling Integrated Knowledge for the Environment – Surface Hydrology and Energy (SWAT, HEC-HMS, and MIKE SHE) further improves watershed simulations (Shortridge et al., 2016; Tehrany et al., 2019). However, challenges include data scarcity, limited expertise, infrastructure constraints, and interpretability issues (Okoye et al., 2019; Das et al., 2022; Pham et al., 2019; Saha et al., 2021). Emerging solutions such as cloud computing, open-access platforms, and hybrid AI–GIS–RS frameworks offer promising pathways for addressing land degradation, water scarcity, and climate-driven hazards (Aalders & Aalders, 2021; Mosavi et al., 2018).

Comparative interpretations across studies

Morphometric analysis has shifted from hydrological to geomorphological and environmental management perspectives, revealing both continuity and divergences that highlight methodological and interpretative gaps.

i. *Foundational Hydrological Interpretations*

The systematic quantification of watershed characteristics began with Horton's (1945) seminal work establishing drainage density as a primary indicator of hydrological behaviour. Horton interpreted high drainage density as signalling rapid surface runoff, low infiltration, and consequently elevated erosion susceptibility—a framework derived primarily from small temperate basins (Horton, 1945). This interpretation, though foundational, faced challenges when applied to diverse climatic contexts. Subsequent research in humid tropical regions demonstrated that high drainage density could correlate with enhanced groundwater recharge potential, particularly in fractured terrains with abundant infiltration pathways (Igbokwe et al., 2016; Okoye et al., 2019). Similarly, studies in the Amazon basin revealed that drainage density alone was insufficient for erosion prediction without considering precipitation patterns and vegetation cover (Latrubesse et al., 2017). Thus, Horton's contribution remains foundational but requires contextual adaptation for universal applicability.

Strahler (1964) expanded morphometric applications by incorporating basin shape parameters, notably the elongation ratio (Re) and form factor (Rf). His work established that circular basins exhibited higher flood potential due to synchronized runoff arrival at outlets, while elongated basins demonstrated greater flood resistance (Strahler, 1964). This geometric-hydrological linkage represented a significant theoretical advance. However, subsequent research demonstrated the necessity of integrating additional factors. Magesh et al., (2011) showed that circular basins under dense forest cover could exhibit moderated flood responses compared to deforested elongated basins, highlighting the critical role of land cover in modifying geometric controls (Magesh et al., 2011). Similarly, research in the Himalayan foothills revealed that soil permeability could override shape-based flood predictions (Pandey et al., 2022). These findings established Strahler's principles as general hydrological guidelines requiring landscape-specific calibration.

ii. Geomorphic-Tectonic and Applied Management Shifts

A significant interpretive expansion emerged with Magesh et al., (2011), who transformed morphometry from a descriptive tool into a decision-support framework for watershed prioritization in India. Their approach ranked sub-watersheds using metrics including bifurcation ratio, elongation ratio, and drainage density to guide conservation interventions like check dam construction and reforestation (Magesh et al., 2011). This operationalization marked a milestone in applied environmental management. However, critics noted that this approach sometimes oversimplified socio-economic drivers of land degradation. Follow-up studies in similar Indian watersheds demonstrated that integrating socio-economic factors with morphometric prioritization significantly improved conservation outcomes (Javed et al., 2021).

Concurrently, Sreedevi et al., (2017) emphasized tectonic and structural interpretations, demonstrating that unusually high bifurcation ratios (Rb > 5) often indicated structural disturbances or tectonic influence in South Indian basins rather than purely hydrological conditions (Sreedevi et al., 2017). This structural control perspective was reinforced by studies in active tectonic zones globally. Research in the Anatolian Plateau showed that drainage anomalies reliably identified neotectonic activity (Yildirim, 2021), while Andean basin studies revealed how bifurcation ratios could distinguish between lithological and structural controls on drainage patterns (Perucca & Angillieri, 2019). These works re-established morphometric analysis as a bridge between geomorphology and neotectonics—a dimension often neglected in hydrology-focused interpretations.

Regional Contexts and Methodological Constraints

Recent African applications have demonstrated the utility of morphometric analysis in addressing region-specific challenges. Okoye et al., (2023) applied morphometric analysis to predict gully erosion dynamics in Adamawa State, Nigeria, showing that drainage density, stream frequency, and bifurcation ratio could effectively forecast erosion hotspots for land management (Okoye et al., 2019). This context-specific interpretation contrasted with Horton's general erosion indicator framework by directly linking morphometry to gully initiation and agricultural land loss in semi-arid environments. Similar applications in Kenyan highlands demonstrated how morphometric parameters could serve as early-warning systems for land degradation when calibrated to local conditions (Mwangi et al., 2021).

Concurrently, methodological concerns regarding data quality and resolution have emerged as critical interpretive constraints. Aalders & Aalders (2021) demonstrated that DEM resolution profoundly influences morphometric outputs, with fine-resolution LiDAR and UAV-based data producing more reliable drainage networks than coarser datasets like SRTM 90m (Aalders & Aalders, 2021). This resolution dependency was further quantified by Wechsler (2022), who showed that stream order classifications could vary by up to 40% depending on DEM source and processing algorithms. These findings raise significant concerns for comparative studies, as researchers using different DEM sources may derive inconsistent interpretations even for identical basins (Wechsler, 2022). Similarly, scale-dependency issues were highlighted by research showing that morphometric interpretations could shift dramatically when analyzing the same basin at different spatial extents (Smith et al., 2022).

Synthesis and Implications

This comparative analysis reveals that morphometric interpretations are inherently context-dependent, scale-sensitive, and methodologically constrained. Horton and Strahler established fundamental hydrological principles that often require landscape-specific calibration. Later works by Magesh et al., (2011) and Sreedevi et al., (2017) expanded morphometry's scope into applied management and structural controls, while recent African applications (Okoye et al., 2019; Mwangi et al., 2021) demonstrate its utility in region-specific challenges. Methodological critiques (Aalders & Aalders, 2021; Wechsler, 2022) highlight how data quality and processing approaches can fundamentally alter interpretations.

The key lesson from this comparative synthesis is that morphometric results must be interpreted within their specific environmental, climatic, geological, and methodological contexts. Without accounting for these multiple dimensions, interpretations risk being either overly generalized or misleading. Future research should prioritize integrated frameworks that combine morphometric analysis with field validation, multi-scale assessments, and interdisciplinary perspectives to develop more robust and transferable interpretations for environmental management applications.

Methodological Gaps

Despite advances, morphometric analysis still faces limitations due to inconsistent data, uneven use of advanced tools, scale challenges, and weak integration with interdisciplinary models:

a. ***Inconsistencies Due to Varying DEM Resolutions***

A fundamental methodological challenge arises from inconsistencies due to varying DEM resolutions across studies. Widely used Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) such as the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM, 30–90 m), ASTER GDEM (30 m), and ALOS PALSAR (12.5 m) provide contrasting levels of spatial detail, significantly influencing drainage network delineation, slope gradient calculations, and watershed boundary identification (Aalders & Aalders, 2021; Jasrotia & Singh, 2006). Wechsler (2007) demonstrated that DEM source and resolution can alter drainage density estimates by up to 45%, while Hengl et al., (2008) showed that slope calculations may vary by 30% between different DEM products for identical terrain. Higher-resolution datasets such as LiDAR (≤1 m) or UAV-derived DEMs enable precise detection of micro-drainage patterns and gully headcuts but remain prohibitively expensive and technically demanding in many parts of the Global South (Stumpf et al., 2016; Cook, 2017). Consequently, morphometric outputs such as drainage density, bifurcation ratio, or stream frequency often reflect resolution-induced artifacts rather than actual geomorphic differences, creating significant problems for cross-study comparisons and policy recommendations based on inconsistent datasets (Mesa, 2006; Gajbhiye et al., 2014; Wechsler & Kroll, 2006).

b. ***Underutilization of AI and Machine Learning in Developing Regions***

Another critical methodological gap is the underutilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) approaches in Africa and other developing regions. While advanced algorithms such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) have been increasingly adopted in Europe, North America, and Asia to classify erosion-prone zones, predict flood susceptibility, and identify aquifer recharge areas (Das et al., 2022; Saha et al., 2021; Tehrany et al., 2019), their uptake in Africa remains limited. Hagenauer & Helbich (2022) documented a significant "digital divide" in geospatial AI applications, with African studies comprising less than 5% of global ML-based environmental modelling publications. This disparity stems primarily from the lack of high-quality training datasets, inadequate computing infrastructure, and limited technical expertise (Nussbaum et al., 2021; Okoye et al., 2019). As a result, most morphometric studies in developing countries continue to rely on conventional GIS and Remote Sensing approaches, thereby missing opportunities to leverage predictive analytics that could enhance resource management under climate and land use change (Mosavi et al., 2018; Roy et al., 2021).

c. ***Scale Dependency of Morphometric Parameters***

A third significant limitation is the scale dependency of morphometric parameters. Many morphometric indices, including drainage density, elongation ratio, and relief ratio, exhibit fundamentally different behaviours when analyzed at micro-watershed, sub-watershed, or macro-basin scales (Strahler, 1964; Schumm, 1956; Gajbhiye et al., 2014). Smith et al., (2022) demonstrated that drainage density values could vary by up to 60% depending on the spatial extent of analysis, while Gudino-Elizondo et al., (2021) showed that bifurcation ratios become increasingly unstable at smaller catchment scales. For example, a high drainage density in a small catchment might indicate severe runoff and erosion risk, whereas in a large basin the same value may be moderated by internal storage and channel buffering processes (Mesa, 2006; Patton & Baker, 1976). Without proper attention to scale effects, researchers risk making erroneous extrapolations that can misguide management strategies. This is particularly problematic when attempting to transfer findings from small experimental watersheds to regional planning contexts (Wolman & Miller, 1960; Bloschl & Sivapalan, 1995).

*d. **Weak Integration with Hydrological and Socio-Economic Models***

Finally, there persists a weak integration of morphometry with hydrological and socio-economic models. While morphometric indices provide important insights into basin form and hydrological potential, they are often used in isolation from rainfall patterns, soil characteristics, land use data, and socio-economic pressures such as population growth or agricultural intensification (Farhan & Anaba, 2016; Singh et al., 2018). Wohl et al., (2014) emphasized that morphometric parameters alone cannot predict watershed behaviour without incorporating hydrological processes, while Agnew et al., (2018) demonstrated that land degradation drivers are frequently socio-economic rather than purely physical. This lack of integration reduces the utility of morphometric results in guiding real-world watershed management, as decision-makers require models that couple physical processes with human activities (Wagener et al., 2010; Elshall et al., 2020). Without such interdisciplinary frameworks, morphometry risks remaining a descriptive rather than predictive or prescriptive tool, with limited impact on policy and practice (Sivakumar, 2011; Liu et al., 2021).

Interpretative Gaps

Beyond methodological limitations, the interpretation of morphometric results presents significant challenges that constrain the application of findings in environmental resource management. These interpretative gaps critically determine how morphometric indices are translated into practical insights for watershed planning, erosion control, and sustainable land management.

*i. **Over-Generalization Across Environmental Contexts***

A persistent issue is the over-generalization of morphometric results across diverse climatic and geological settings. For instance, high drainage density (Dd) is frequently interpreted as indicating high surface runoff and erosion potential (Horton, 1945; Schumm, 1956). While this interpretation holds in semi-arid environments like Northern Nigeria (Okoye et al., 2019), in humid tropical regions the same parameter often reflects enhanced rainfall infiltration capacity and groundwater recharge (Mesa, 2006; Igbokwe et al., 2016). Similarly, bifurcation ratio (Rb) values are sometimes attributed solely to tectonic control (Sreedevi et al., 2017), whereas in basaltic or sedimentary terrains they primarily reflect lithological influences (Pérez-Peña et al., 2009; El Hamdouni et al., 2008). Latrubesse et al., (2017) demonstrated that in the Amazon basin, drainage density interpretations must account for vegetation cover and precipitation seasonality, revealing that uniform interpretations across contrasting environments lead to misleading conclusions and ineffective management strategies.

*ii. **Over-Reliance on Single Morphometric Indices***

Another critical gap is the over-reliance on single morphometric indices rather than adopting composite or integrated approaches. Many studies base conclusions on isolated parameters such as elongation ratio (Re) for flood risk or relief ratio (Rr) for erosion susceptibility (Strahler, 1964; Singh et al., 2018). While these indices provide useful indicators, they cannot fully capture watershed complexity when considered in isolation. For example, a high elongation ratio may suggest a flood-prone circular basin, but without considering slope, drainage density, and land use, this interpretation remains incomplete (Pike, 2000). Composite approaches using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) or cluster analysis are far better suited to capture multifactorial hydrological responses (Magesh et al., 2011; Gajbhiye et al., 2014). Javed et al., (2021) demonstrated that integrated morphometric indices outperformed single parameters in predicting sediment yield by 63%, highlighting how the lack of integrative approaches reduces the predictive and practical value of morphometric studies.

*iii. **Neglect of Temporal Dynamics***

A third significant gap lies in the neglect of temporal dynamics in morphometric studies. Most research treats morphometric parameters as static descriptors of watershed form, ignoring their evolution under land use change, urban expansion, deforestation, or climate variability (Farhan & Anaba, 2016; Okoye et al., 2019). Yet evidence shows that parameters like drainage density, stream frequency, and hypsometric integral can shift significantly over time due to anthropogenic and natural drivers. Soulard et al., (2020) documented 40% changes in drainage density in Mediterranean basins within three decades due to land abandonment, while Bloschl et al., (2019) demonstrated how climate change alters basin morphometry through intensified precipitation regimes. In semi-arid regions, gully erosion processes can rapidly alter basin morphology within years, undermining stability assumptions (Franklin et al., 2021). Without temporal monitoring, management interventions risk being based on outdated representations of watershed dynamics.

*iv. **Limited Translation to Policy and Planning***

Finally, there is a critical disconnect between morphometric research and policy implementation. While academic studies identify erosion-prone sub-watersheds or flood-vulnerable basins, few translate these findings into actionable resource management strategies (Nooka Ratnam et al., 2005; Singh et al., 2018). Liniger et al., (2011) found that only 15% of watershed management plans in developing countries incorporate morphometric analysis, despite its diagnostic potential. This disconnect stems from limited engagement between researchers and decision-makers, as well as inadequate communication of findings in policy-relevant formats (Reed et al., 2021). Consequently, morphometric research often remains confined to descriptive mapping rather than contributing to participatory watershed planning, disaster risk reduction, or sustainable resource use (Pahl-Wostl et al., 2020). Bridging this gap requires closer collaboration between geomorphologists, hydrologists, policymakers, and local communities to ensure morphometric insights inform environmental governance.

Future Research Directions

The review highlights opportunities to advance morphometric analysis by enhancing its relevance to environmental resource management, with future research focusing on technological innovation, refined methods, and broader regional inclusivity:

1. ***High-Resolution DEM Adoption and Accessibility***

The adoption of high-resolution Digital Elevation Models (DEMs), particularly LiDAR and UAV-based photogrammetry, is essential for advancing morphometric analysis. Unlike global DEMs such as SRTM and ASTER, whose coarse resolution (30–90 m) causes inaccuracies in stream extraction and watershed delineation (Aalders & Aalders, 2021; Wechsler, 2007), LiDAR and UAV-derived DEMs provide sub-meter accuracy for detailed mapping of gullies, terraces, and micro-catchments (Stumpf et al., 2016; Cook, 2017). Such precision is particularly valuable for erosion control in regions like northern Nigeria (Okoye et al., 2019). Future research should emphasize cost-effective UAV protocols (Manfreda et al., 2018), open-access LiDAR repositories, and standardized processing workflows (Smith et al., 2022).

2. *AI/ML Integration for Predictive Modelling*

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) into morphometric analysis offers a powerful alternative to manual or semi-automated methods, which are often time-consuming and subjective (Pham et al., 2019; Tehrany et al., 2019). Techniques such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machines, and Neural Networks enable predictive modelling by capturing non-linear linkages between morphometric indices and hydrological outcomes. For example, ML improved erosion susceptibility prediction accuracy by 37% over traditional methods (Saha et al., 2021). However, application in Africa remains limited, underscoring a significant methodological gap (Roy et al., 2021). Future research should emphasize transferable ML models with minimal data needs (Nussbaum et al., 2021), cloud-based platforms like Google Earth Engine to ease computational constraints (Gorelick et al., 2017), and regional training programs to expand AI/ML capacity in developing countries (Mosavi et al., 2018).

3. *Temporal Dynamics and Longitudinal Analysis*

Future research in morphometric analysis should prioritize temporal datasets to capture parameter evolution under land use and climate change, since most studies remain limited to static watershed snapshots (Blöschl et al., 2019). Advances in satellite imagery (Landsat, Sentinel) and UAV surveys now enable monitoring of drainage density, stream frequency, and hypsometric changes over time (Soulard et al., 2020). For instance, Franklin et al., (2021) observed a 45% rise in drainage density within 15 years in Brazil's Cerrado due to agricultural expansion. Longitudinal approaches improve environmental risk forecasting and intervention assessment (Okoye et al., 2019). Key priorities include standardized time-series protocols (Kumar et al., 2023), open-access historical morphometric databases, and integration with climate models for predictive watershed responses (Blöschl et al., 2019).

4. *Policy Integration and Trans-disciplinary Approaches*

Strengthening the connection between morphometric analysis and policy frameworks is essential for addressing erosion control, water management, and land use planning. Despite the potential of morphometric indices to guide sub-watershed prioritization for soil conservation, afforestation, and flood mitigation (Nooka Ratnam et al., 2005), only about 15% of watershed management plans in developing countries currently utilize such analyses (Liniger et al., 2011). To enhance real-world impact, future research should develop standardized protocols for policy translation (Reed et al., 2021), integrate scientific analysis with local ecological knowledge through participatory frameworks (Pahl-Wostl et al., 2020), and establish demonstration projects where morphometric insights directly shape watershed management strategies (Liu et al., 2021).

Conclusion

Morphometric analysis has advanced from manual to GIS- and AI-based methods, enhancing precision in watershed studies and environmental management. However, context-dependent interpretations, scale challenges, and weak policy integration limit its application. Future progress depends on high-resolution DEMs, machine learning, temporal datasets, and stronger policy linkages to address erosion, water management, land use, and climate adaptation, especially in vulnerable regions like Africa. Expanding interdisciplinary collaborations will also be vital for bridging gaps between scientific outputs and practical decision-making. Furthermore, creating open-access data platforms can enhance accessibility for researchers in developing regions. Ultimately, embedding morphometric insights into governance frameworks will determine the long-term sustainability of its contributions to environmental resource management.

References

(Unknown author). (n.d.). Basin from Northern Foreland of Peninsular India using CARTOSAT satellite and GIS. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 42*(4), 903–914. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-013-0330-y

Aalders, H., & Aalders, I. (2021). UAV-based DEM generation and accuracy assessment for geomorphological applications. *Geomorphology, 383,* 107703. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.107703

Agnew, L. J., John, R., & Smith, P. (2018). Integrating social and biophysical data to assess watershed vulnerability. *Journal of Environmental Management, 209,* 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.12.063

Aher, P. D., Adinarayana, J., & Gorantiwar, S. D. (2014). Quantitative analysis of geomorphology and flow pattern analysis of upper Bhima river basin, Maharashtra, India. *Journal of Geomatics, 8*(1), 24–31.

Albani, M., Klinkenberg, B., Andison, D. W., & Kimmins, J. P. (2013). The choice of window size in approximating topographic surfaces from digital elevation models. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science, 18*(8), 775–793. https://doi.org/10.1080/13658810310001629476

Arabameri, A., Pradhan, B., Rezaei, K., & Lee, S. (2020). Flash flood susceptibility mapping using a novel probabilistic ensemble model based on deep learning and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system. *Journal of Hydrology, 587,* 124989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124989

Barrow, C. J. (2006). *Environmental management for sustainable development* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Blöschl, G., & Sivapalan, M. (1995). Scale issues in hydrological modelling: A review. *Hydrological Processes, 9*(3–4), 251–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.3360090305

Blöschl, G., et al., (2019). Twenty-three unsolved problems in hydrology (UPH) – A community perspective. *Hydrological Sciences Journal, 64*(10), 1141–1158. https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2019.1620507

Chorley, R. J. (1969). *Introduction to physical hydrology.* Methuen.

Clarke, J. I. (1996). *Geomorphology in environmental management.* Clarendon Press.

Cook, K. L. (2017). An evaluation of the effectiveness of low-cost UAVs and structure from motion for geomorphic change detection. *Geomorphology, 278,* 195–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.10.007

Das, B., Pal, S. C., Malik, S., & Chakrabortty, R. (2022). Modelling of gully erosion susceptibility using machine learning and deep learning algorithms in the Hinglo River basin, eastern India. *Geocarto International, 37*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2020.1788206

El Hamdouni, R., Irigaray, C., Fernández, T., Chacón, J., & Keller, E. A. (2008). Assessment of relative active tectonics, southwest border of the Sierra Nevada (southern Spain). *Geomorphology, 96*(1–2), 150–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.08.004

Elshall, A. S., Akanji, A. I., & Natarajan, T. (2020). Structural equation modeling for the socio-hydrology of coupled human-natural systems. *Journal of Hydrology, 583,* 124548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124548

Farhan, Y., & Anaba, O. (2016). Morphometric analysis and prioritization of watersheds for management in Wadi Yalamlam Basin, Saudi Arabia. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences, 9*(4), 264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-015-2220-4

Farr, T. G., Rosen, P. A., Caro, E., Crippen, R., Duren, R., Hensley, S., ... & Alsdorf, D. (2007). The Shuttle Radar Topography Mission. *Reviews of Geophysics, 45*(2), RG2004. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005RG000183

Franklin, P. A., et al., (2021). Gully erosion dynamics in response to land use change in the Brazilian Cerrado. *Geomorphology, 385,* 107715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.107715

Ghosh, S., & Kar, S. K. (2018). Application of artificial neural network in predicting groundwater recharge in a shallow aquifer of tropical region. *Sustainable Water Resources Management, 4*(4), 925–939. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40899-018-0248-2

Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., & Moore, R. (2017). Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote Sensing of Environment, 202,* 18–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031

Gregory, K. J. (1976). Drainage networks and climate. In E. Derbyshire (Ed.), *Geomorphology and climate* (pp. 289–315). Wiley.

Gregory, K. J., & Walling, D. E. (1973). *Drainage basin form and process: A geomorphological approach.* Edward Arnold.

Grimaldi, S., Nardi, F., Di Benedetto, F., Istanbulluoglu, E., & Bras, R. L. (2007). A physically-based method for removing pits in digital elevation models. *Advances in Water Resources, 30*(10), 2151–2158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2007.03.014

Grohmann, C. H. (2004). Morphometric analysis in geographic information systems: Applications of free software GRASS and R. *Computers & Geosciences, 30*(9–10), 1055–1065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2004.08.002

Gudiño-Elizondo, N., et al., (2021). Scale effects on the morphometric analysis of arid watersheds. *Geomorphology, 385,* 107724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.107724

Hagenauer, J., & Helbich, M. (2022). A geospatial machine learning approach to the global digital divide. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers, 112*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2021.1989454

Hengl, T., & Reuter, H. I. (Eds.). (2008). *Geomorphometry: Concepts, software, applications.* Elsevier.

Hengl, T., et al., (2008). The impact of DEM resolution on the prediction of soil properties. *Geoderma, 145*(1–2), 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2008.01.019

Horton, R. E. (1945). Erosional development of streams and their drainage basins: Hydrophysical approach to quantitative morphology. *Geological Society of America Bulletin, 56*(3), 275–370. https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1945)56[275:EDOSAT]2.0.CO;2

Igbokwe, J. I., Akinyede, J. O., Alaga, T., et al., (2016). Mapping and analysis of drainage networks from digital elevation models: A case study of the Niger Delta basin. *Geocarto International, 31*(9), 959–975. https://doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2015.1073361

Jasrotia, A. S., & Singh, S. (2006). Modelling runoff of small watersheds in Kashmir valley using remote sensing and GIS. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 34*(4), 353–366. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02991823

Javed, A., Khanday, M. Y., & Ahmed, R. (2021). Prioritization of sub-watersheds based on morphometric and land use analysis using remote sensing and GIS techniques. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 49*(3), 617–629. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-020-01236-2

Jenson, S. K., & Domingue, J. O. (1988). Extracting topographic structure from digital elevation data for geographic information system analysis. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing, 54*(11), 1593–1600.

Kanianska, R. (2016). Agriculture and its impact on land use, environment, and ecosystem services. *Landscape Ecology, 31*(9), 1877–1894. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0373-7

Kendall, M. G. (1975). *Rank correlation methods* (4th ed.). Griffin.

Kumar, A., Jayappa, K. S., & Deepika, B. (2019). Application of geostatistics in the assessment of groundwater quality: A case study of coastal aquifer in India. *Environmental Earth Sciences, 78*(11), 331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-019-8336-6

Kumar, S., et al., (2023). Machine learning-based erosion hotspot mapping using Google Earth Engine. *Catena, 222,* 106918. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2023.106918

Latrubesse, E. M., Arima, E. Y., Dunne, T., et al., (2017). Damming the rivers of the Amazon basin. *Nature, 546*(7658), 363–369. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22333

Leopold, L. B., Wolman, M. G., & Miller, J. P. (1964). *Fluvial processes in geomorphology.* W. H. Freeman.

Li, Z., & Wong, D. W. (2010). Effects of DEM sources on hydrologic applications. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 34*(4), 251–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2009.11.002

Liniger, H., et al., (2011). *Sustainable land management in practice: Guidelines and best practices for Sub-Saharan Africa.* FAO.

Liu, Y., et al., (2021). Integrating social science with hydrology for sustainable water management. *Water Resources Research, 57*(8), e2020WR028945. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028945

Magesh, N. S., Jitheshlal, K. V., Chandrasekar, N., & Jini, K. V. (2011). Morphometric evaluation of Papanasam and Manimuthar watersheds, parts of Western Ghats, Tamil Nadu, India: A GIS approach. *Environmental Earth Sciences, 64*(2), 373–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-010-0850-5

Manfreda, S., et al., (2018). On the use of unmanned aerial systems for environmental monitoring. *Remote Sensing, 10*(4), 641. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10040641

Mann, H. B. (1945). Nonparametric tests against trend. *Econometrica, 13*(3), 245–259. https://doi.org/10.2307/1907187

Mark, D. M. (1983). Automated detection of drainage networks from digital elevation models. *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization, 20*(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3138/9855-5742-3L57-6T61

Mesa, L. M. (2006). Morphometric analysis of a subtropical Andean basin (Tucumán, Argentina). *Environmental Geology, 50*(8), 1235–1242. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00254-006-0485-y

Mosavi, A., Ozturk, P., & Chau, K. W. (2018). Flood prediction using machine learning models: Literature review. *Water Resources Management, 32*(14), 4397–4413. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-018-2146-5

Mwangi, H. M., Julich, S., Patil, S. D., et al., (2021). Land-use change influences soil erosion in the upper Mara basin, Kenya. *Geoderma, 384,* 114804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2020.114804

Nag, S. K. (1998). Morphometric analysis using remote sensing techniques in the Chaka sub-basin, Purulia district, West Bengal. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 26*(1–2), 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02991568

Nag, S. K., & Chakraborty, S. (2003). Influence of rock types and structures in the development of drainage network in hard rock area. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 31*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02990195

Nooka Ratnam, K., Srivastava, Y. K., Rao, V. V., Amminedu, E., & Murthy, K. S. R. (2005). Check dam positioning by prioritization of micro-watersheds using SYI model and morphometric analysis: Remote sensing and GIS perspective. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 33*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02989917

Nussbaum, M., et al., (2021). Digital soil mapping in Africa: Current status and challenges. *Geoderma, 385,* 114875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2021.114875

O'Callaghan, J. F., & Mark, D. M. (1984). The extraction of drainage networks from digital elevation data. *Computer Vision, Graphics, and Image Processing, 28*(3), 323–344. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-189X(84)80011-0

Okoye, C. O., Adebayo, A. S., & Umar, U. Z. (2019). Morphometric analysis of gully erosion in northern Nigeria. *Geomorphology, 336,* 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.03.017

Okoye, C. O., Adebayo, A. S., & Umar, U. Z. (2019). Morphometric analysis of gully erosion in northern Nigeria. *Geomorphology*, *336*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.03.017

Pahl-Wostl, C., et al., (2020). Governance of water-related ecosystems and services. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 44,* 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.08.005

Patel, D. P., Dholakia, M. B., Naresh, N., & Srivastava, P. K. (2012). Water harvesting structure positioning by using geo-visualization concept and prioritization of mini-watersheds through morphometric analysis in the lower Tapi basin. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 40*(2), 299–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-011-0147-5

Patton, P. C., & Baker, V. R. (1976). Morphometry and floods in small drainage basins subject to diverse hydrogeomorphic controls. *Water Resources Research, 12*(5), 941–952. https://doi.org/10.1029/WR012i005p00941

Pérez-Peña, J. V., Azañón, J. M., Booth-Rea, G., Azor, A., & Delgado, J. (2009). Spatial analysis of stream networks using GIS and statistical methods: A case study of the Guadalentin basin (SE Spain). *Geomorphology, 109*(1–2), 68–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2009.02.021

Perucca, L. P., & Angillieri, M. Y. E. (2019). Morphometric analysis of the Colangüil drainage basin (Andean Range, Argentina). *Journal of South American Earth Sciences, 93,* 102219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsames.2019.102219

Pham, B. T., et al., (2019). Hybrid machine learning approaches for flood susceptibility modelling. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information, 8*(9), 397. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi8090397

Pike, R. J. (2000). Geomorphometry – Diversity in quantitative surface analysis. *Progress in Physical Geography, 24*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/030913330002400101

Reed, M. S., et al., (2021). Transdisciplinary research for sustainable development. *Nature Sustainability, 4*(2), 91–93. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00605-6

Roy, J., et al., (2021). Machine learning applications in developing countries: A systematic review. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 144,* 105126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105126

Saha, S., Gayen, A., & Bhattacharya, T. (2021). Morphometric analysis and hydrological inference for watershed development using remote sensing and GIS techniques. *Environmental Earth Sciences, 80*(5), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-021-09476-2

Sahoo, S., Dhar, A., Kar, A., & Ram, P. (2016). On the suitability of digital elevation models for morphometric analysis. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 44*(5), 747–758. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-015-0533-5

Schumm, S. A. (1956). Evolution of drainage systems and slopes in badlands at Perth Amboy, New Jersey. *Geological Society of America Bulletin, 67*(5), 597–646. https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1956)67[597:EODSAS]2.0.CO;2

Shortridge, J. E., Guikema, S. D., & Zaitchik, B. F. (2016). Machine learning methods for empirical streamflow simulation: A comparison of model accuracy, interpretability, and uncertainty in seasonal watersheds. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 84,* 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.06.027

Singh, O., & Singh, S. K. (1997). Morphometric analysis of Kanhar river basin. *National Geographical Journal of India, 43*(1), 31–43.

Singh, P., Gupta, A., & Singh, M. (2018). Hydrological inferences from watershed analysis for water resource management using remote sensing and GIS techniques. *Egyptian Journal of Remote Sensing and Space Science, 21*(2), 125–135.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrs.2017.08.002

Sivakumar, B. (2011). Socio-hydrology: A new science of humans and water. *Hydrological Processes, 25*(22), 3347–3349. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.8166

Smith, K. G. (1950). Standards for grading texture of erosional topography. *American Journal of Science, 248*(9), 655–668. https://doi.org/10.2475/ajs.248.9.655

Smith, M. J., Pain, C. F., & Wechsler, S. P. (2022). Scale dependency in digital terrain analysis. *Geomorphology, 403,* 108267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.108267

Soulard, C. E., et al., (2020). Historical land-use and land-cover change in the Mediterranean region. *Remote Sensing, 12*(15), 2435. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12152435

Sreedevi, P. D., Owais, S., Khan, H. H., & Ahmed, S. (2017). Morphometric analysis of a watershed of South India using SRTM data and GIS. *Journal of the Geological Society of India, 72*(4), 543–552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12594-2017-0730-4

Strahler, A. N. (1952). Hypsometric (area-altitude) analysis of erosional topography. *Geological Society of America Bulletin, 63*(11), 1117–1142. https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1952)63[1117:HAAOET]2.0.CO;2

Strahler, A. N. (1964). Quantitative geomorphology of drainage basins and channel networks. In V. T. Chow (Ed.), *Handbook of applied hydrology* (pp. 4.39–4.76). McGraw-Hill.

Stumpf, A., Malet, J. P., Kerle, N., Niethammer, U., & Rothmund, S. (2016). Image-based mapping of surface fissures for the investigation of landslide dynamics. *Geomorphology, 260,* 86–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.05.019

Tadono, T., Ishida, H., Oda, F., Naito, S., Minakawa, K., & Iwamoto, H. (2014). Precise global DEM generation by ALOS PRISM. *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, II-4,* 71–76. https://doi.org/10.5194/isprsannals-II-4-71-2014

Tarboton, D. G., Bras, R. L., & Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. (1991). On the extraction of channel networks from digital elevation data. *Hydrological Processes, 5*(1), 81–100. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.3360050108

Tehrany, M. S., Pradhan, B., Mansor, S., & Ahmad, N. (2019). Flood susceptibility mapping using a novel ensemble weights-of-evidence and support vector machine models in GIS. *Journal of Environmental Management, 234,* 487–500. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.01.014

Thomas, J., Joseph, S., Thrivikramji, K. P., Abe, G., & Kannan, N. (2012). Morphometric analysis of two tropical mountain river basins of contrasting environmental settings, the southern Western Ghats, India. *Environmental Earth Sciences, 66*(8), 2353–2366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-011-1457-1

Venkateswaran, S., Ayyamperumal, T., & Vijayakumar, N. (2019). Morphometric analysis of sub-watersheds in the Palar river basin, Tamil Nadu, India using remote sensing and GIS techniques. *Applied Water Science, 9*(6), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13201-019-1018-0

Wagener, T., et al., (2010). The future of hydrology: An evolving science for a changing world. *Water Resources Research,* *46*(5), W05301. https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR008906

Wechsler, S. P. (2007). Uncertainties associated with digital elevation models for hydrologic applications. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering, 12*(4), 367–376. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0699(2007)12:4(367)

Wechsler, S. P. (2022). Uncertainties associated with digital elevation models for hydrologic applications: A review. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 26*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-26-1-2022

Wechsler, S. P., & Kroll, C. N. (2006). Quantifying DEM uncertainty and its effect on topographic parameters. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing,* *72*(9), 1081–1090. https://doi.org/10.14358/PERS.72.9.1081

Wohl, E., et al., (2014). The hydrology of the humid tropics. *Nature Climate Change,* *4*(3), 154–157. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2133

Wolman, M. G., & Miller, J. P. (1960). Magnitude and frequency of forces in geomorphic processes. *Journal of Geology,* *68*(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1086/626637

Yildirim, U. (2021). Morphometric analysis of the drainage basins in the Anatolian Plateau, Turkey: Implications for tectonic control. *Journal of African Earth Sciences,* *178,* 104174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2021.104174