

1
2 **JOINT ASSIMILATION OF SURFACE SOIL MOISTURE AND LAI**
3 **OBSERVATIONS INTO A LAND SURFACE MODEL**
4

5 **Joaquín Muñoz Sabater, Christoph Rüdiger, Jean-Christophe Calvet, Nouredine Fritz,**

6 *CNRM-GAME, Météo-France / CNRS, Toulouse, France*

7 **Lionel Jarlan**

8 **and Yann Kerr**

9 *CESBIO, Toulouse, France*

10
11
12 **ABSTRACT**

13 Land Surface Models (LSM) offer a description of land surface processes and set the
14 lower boundary conditions for meteorological models. In particular the accurate description of
15 those surface variables which display a slow response in time, like root zone soil moisture or
16 vegetation biomass, is of great importance. Errors in their estimation yield significant
17 inaccuracies in the estimation of heat and water fluxes in Numerical Weather Prediction
18 (NWP) models. In the present study, the ISBA-A-g_s LSM is used decoupled from the
19 atmosphere. In this configuration, the model is able to simulate the vegetation growth, and
20 consequently LAI. A simplified 1D-VAR assimilation method is applied to observed surface
21 soil moisture and LAI observations of the SMOSREX site near Toulouse, in south-western
22 France, from 2001 to 2004. This period includes severe droughts in 2003 and 2004. The data
23 are jointly assimilated into ISBA-A-g_s in order to analyse the root zone soil moisture and the
24 vegetation biomass. It is shown that the 1D-VAR improves the model results. The efficiency
25 score of the model (Nash criterion) is increased from 0.79 to 0.86 for root-zone soil moisture
26 and from 0.17 to 0.23 for vegetation biomass.

27

contact address:

Jean-Christophe Calvet, CNRM-GAME, Météo-France/CNRS,
42, avenue G. Coriolis, 31057 Toulouse Cedex 1, France.
e-mail: jean-christophe.calvet@meteo.fr

1 **1. Introduction**

2 The Land Surface Models (LSM) used in meteorology have been developed in order
3 to simulate continuous land surface processes, such as plant transpiration, soil evaporation
4 and the evolution of soil moisture and surface temperature at regional and global scales. A
5 number of CO₂-responsive LSMs, like the ISBA-A-g_s model of Météo-France (Calvet et al.
6 1998, Calvet et al. 2004, Gibelin et al. 2006), are able to simulate photosynthesis and plant
7 growth. In particular, the vegetation biomass and the leaf area index (LAI) evolve
8 dynamically in response to climate conditions. These models allow the assimilation of soil
9 moisture and LAI observations.

10 In the present study, two variables with significant impact on the heat and water fluxes
11 are considered: root zone soil moisture (w_2) and above-ground vegetation biomass (Bio). Soil
12 moisture regulates the partitioning between latent and sensible heat fluxes, which has a
13 significant influence on the amount of cloud formation, air temperature, and humidity, among
14 others (Segal et al., 1995, Shaw et al., 1997, Seuffert et al., 2002). At the same time,
15 vegetation biomass plays a very important role in the exchange of water vapor and CO₂
16 between the vegetation canopy and the atmosphere. All aforementioned variables are key
17 input variables into Global Circulation Models (GCM) (Chase et al, 1996, Bounoua et al,
18 2000). However, as a consequence of different model complexities and surface
19 parameterizations, there is a range of uncertainty in the simulation of these variables by LSMs
20 (Henderson-Sellers et al., 1993, Henderson-Sellers et al., 1995, International GEWEX Project
21 Office, 1995). Data assimilation systems allow to integrate the rich information provided by
22 remotely sensed surface variables into LSMs, in order to improve the model predictions (eg.
23 Entekhabi et al., 1994; Houser et al., 1998, Lakshmi and Susskind, 2001). To achieve this,
24 LSMs are coupled with Radiative Transfer Models (RTM) to relate remotely sensed quantities
25 to land-surface variables. For example, the L-Band Microwave Emission of the Biosphere (L-

1 MEB) model (Wigneron et al., 2005) relates L-band brightness temperatures to surface soil
2 moisture (w_g) variations. w_g products are already available at global scale through instruments
3 such as the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer for EOS (AMSR-E) sensor (Njoku et
4 al, 2003) or those that will be provided in L-band by the future Soil Moisture and Ocean
5 Satellite (SMOS) mission of the European Space Agency (ESA) (Kerr et al., 2001). These
6 observations can be used to analyze w_2 (Entekhabi et al., 1994, Reichle et al., 2001).
7 Additionally, a large quantity of satellite-derived LAI products is available, such as those
8 from the MODerate-Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) at 1 km spatial
9 resolution (Tian et al. 2002a, Tian et al. 2002b, Tan et al. 2005) or the POLarization and
10 Directionality of Earth Reflectances (POLDER) sensor (Bicheron and Leroy, 1999, Roujean
11 and Lacaze, 2002). LAI observations have been shown to be useful for the analysis of the
12 vegetation biomass (Cayrol et al., 2000).

13 This paper is a continuation of the study of Muñoz Sabater et al. (2007) (henceforth
14 called MU07). In MU07, w_g observations were assimilated using four different assimilation
15 approaches. The simplified 1D-VAR method demonstrated to be the most suitable for an
16 implementation in an operational configuration. Although the results for the w_2 analyses were
17 generally satisfactory, the LSM was forced with a prescribed LAI obtained from in-situ
18 measurements. In the present paper, a step forward is made, and the LAI is simulated by the
19 surface scheme using the parameterization for the plant photosynthesis and growth model of
20 ISBA-A-gs (Gibelin et al. 2006). The main objective is the analysis of w_2 and vegetation
21 biomass through the joint assimilation of LAI and w_g observations. The experimental data
22 originates from the SMOSREX experimental site (De Rosnay et al., 2006). The period under
23 investigation extends over four years from 2001 to 2004, during which very contrasting
24 meteorological conditions were observed.

1 In section 2, the experimental site, the data set, the ISBA-A-g_s LSM, and the data
2 assimilation scheme are described. Also, the choice of the assimilation parameters is
3 discussed through sensitivity and Monte-Carlo based methods. In section 3, the results are
4 presented for the 4-year period and discussed for two configurations of the assimilation (fixed
5 and time-variant wilting point) and for different accuracies of the atmospheric forcing.
6 Finally, section 4 discusses and summarizes the main conclusions.

7

8

1 2. Methodology

2

3 2.1. Experimental site and data set

4 The SMOSREX site is situated within the ONERA (French National Aerospace
5 Research Establishment) centre of Fauga-Mauzac, located 40 km south-west of Toulouse
6 (43°23'N, 1°17'E, 188 m altitude). SMOSREX (De Rosnay et al., 2006) is a field scale
7 experiment, operative since 2001. In this study, the southern part of the site, covered by
8 vegetation (natural fallow) is studied. An estimation of w_g is obtained through the
9 measurements provided by four probes (ThetaProbe, Delta T Devices) vertically installed at
10 the surface at different locations within the experimental field site. They provide continuous
11 observations over the first 6 cm of the soil surface layer. Daily mean w_g^j values are obtained
12 by averaging the measurements of the four probes and their standard deviation permits to
13 estimate the uncertainty of the observations. The root-zone soil moisture is obtained by
14 calculating an average bulk soil water content from the surface probes and additional soil
15 moisture sensors horizontally installed at depths of 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 and 90 cm.
16 From the individual measurements, a mean and a standard deviation are computed on a daily
17 basis, and the daily standard deviation averaged over the year 2001 is assumed to represent
18 the observation error: $\sigma(w_g^{OBS}) = 0.03 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ and $\sigma(w_2^{OBS}) = 0.02 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$. Due to a lack of
19 sufficient spatial sampling at the field site, the spatial averaging is replaced by a temporal one
20 (ergodicity principle). These uncertainties are attributed to the moisture observations in
21 subsequent years (2002-2004). The atmospheric forcing (precipitation, atmospheric pressure,
22 wind speed and direction, air humidity, air temperature, and incident solar and infrared
23 radiation) is obtained from a meteorological station at the field site performing continuous
24 measurements, obtained every minute and averaged at 30 minute intervals.

1 Manual measurements of the vegetation characteristics (LAI, above-ground biomass
2 and necromass, height of the canopy) were generally carried out every two weeks. The LAI
3 and above-ground biomass/necromass measurements were performed by harvesting random
4 sample areas of 25 x 25 cm² (4 replicates), and using planimetric and gravimetric methods.
5 For each sample, green biomass and dead plant material were measured separately (De
6 Rosnay et al. 2006). Fig. 1 shows the in-situ observations of the LAI, the surface and root-
7 zone soil moisture and the monthly accumulated precipitation for the four years (2001-2004).
8 It is shown that 2003 was a particularly dry year, with an annual cumulative precipitation of
9 less than 600 mm. Unlike the other years, 2003 shows an atypical double cycle of LAI, with a
10 first peak in spring and a second one at the beginning of the winter season. Precipitation is
11 quite irregularly distributed during 2004, with a wet spring and a very dry summer. This
12 causes a rapid growth of the vegetation and a marked senescence during the dry period, with
13 moisture observations reaching values below the wilting point (w_{wilt}) throughout the summer
14 and part of autumn.

15 In Table 1 a list of the most relevant characteristics of the soil at the SMOSREX site
16 for ISBA-A-g_s is provided. The soil is a loam characterized by its texture and density which
17 were determined in the laboratory. The w_{wilt} and the field capacity parameters were derived
18 from the clay content observations, by using the relationships given by Noilhan and Mahfouf
19 (1996).

20

21 *2.2. Land surface model: ISBA-A-g_s*

22 The land surface model used in this study is the ISBA-A-g_s model (Calvet et al., 1998,
23 Calvet et al., 2004, Gibelin et al., 2006). It is an improved version of the Interaction between
24 the Soil, Biosphere and Atmosphere (ISBA) model, first developed by Noilhan and Planton

1 (1989) and further improved by Noilhan and Mahfouf (1996), to describe the land surface
2 processes in weather and climate models.

3 The version of the ISBA model used in this study is based on the equations of the
4 force-restore method (Deardorff, 1977, 1978), and the soil is represented by a single layer.
5 Together with the surface fluxes (LE , H , G), five surface state variables are described: surface
6 temperature (T_s), mean surface temperature (T_2), surface volumetric soil moisture (w_g),
7 volumetric root-zone soil moisture (w_2) and canopy interception reservoir (W_s). The new
8 version (ISBA-A-g_s) accounts for the effect of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration on the
9 stomatal aperture. The net assimilation of CO₂ is used to predict the vegetation biomass and
10 the LAI . The model simulates two above-ground biomass reservoirs: the leaf biomass and the
11 above-ground structural biomass. For herbaceous vegetation, the sum of these two reservoirs
12 is the total above-ground biomass (Bio). The reservoirs are fed by the net assimilated carbon,
13 and decreased by turnover and respiration terms. Phenology is modelled implicitly: LAI
14 follows the variations of the leaf biomass, multiplied by a constant Specific Leaf Area (SLA).
15 The SLA is related to the leaf nitrogen concentration (N_l) by using two plasticity parameters e
16 and f (Gibelin et al. 2006):

$$17 \quad SLA = eN_l + f . \quad [1]$$

18 The values of e and f used in this study are presented in Table 1.

19 Two strategies are represented for the response of the plant to water stress, drought-
20 avoiding and drought-tolerant (Calvet 2000, Calvet et al. 2004) depending on the evolution of
21 water use efficiency (WUE) under moderate stress: WUE increases in the early stages of soil
22 water stress in the case of the drought-avoiding response, whereas WUE decreases or remains
23 stable in the case of the drought-tolerant response.

1 The vegetation parameters of ISBA-A-g_s are presented in Table 1. They are derived
 2 from the simulation of Calvet (2000) for the MUREX test site (Calvet et al., 1999). Following
 3 their work, the drought-tolerant strategy is used in this paper.

4 In this study, the model performance is evaluated by using the root mean square error
 5 (RMSE), the mean bias, and the efficiency score (or Nash criterion ; Nash and Sutcliffe
 6 1970) E defined as:

$$7 \quad E = 1 - \frac{\sum_i (x_i^{OBS} - x_i^{simulated})^2}{\sum_i (x_i^{OBS} - \overline{x^{OBS}})^2} \quad [2]$$

8 where x represents a state variable and x^{OBS} the corresponding observed variable. A value of E
 9 equal to 1 corresponds to perfect simulations and values of E close to 0 correspond to
 10 simulations equal to the constant average of the observations. Negative values of E show that
 11 the model performance is less accurate than simply applying the arithmetic mean of the
 12 observations.

14 2.3. Assimilation method: Simplified 1D-VAR

15 The choice of the assimilation scheme is based on the results obtained in MU07. Of
 16 the four assimilation methods compared in that study, the Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF)
 17 and a simplified 1D-VAR showed the best performance. However, the variational scheme
 18 presented an important advantage, as the computational cost was significantly lower, making
 19 it more suitable for operational purposes. Therefore, a simplified 1D-VAR was employed in
 20 this study.

21 2.3.1. Formalism

22 Variational methods use an assimilation window of predefined length, usually
 23 containing several observations. The initial value of the model state vector (the variables to be
 24 analysed) is perturbed and the optimal combination of model states is then found by

1 minimizing a cost function J (at observation times within the assimilation window). In our
 2 case, the state vector is composed of two state variables (w_2 and vegetation above-ground
 3 biomass (Bio)). The cost functions for the two state variables are:

$$4 \quad J(Bio) = \frac{1}{2} (Bio - Bio^b)^T \mathbf{B}_{BIO}^{-1} (Bio - Bio^b) + \frac{1}{2} (LAI^{OBS} - H(Bio))^T \mathbf{R}_{LAI}^{-1} (LAI^{OBS} - H(Bio)) = J_{Bio}^b + J_{LAI}^{OBS}$$

5 [3]

$$6 \quad J(w_g) = \frac{1}{2} (w_2 - w_2^b)^T \mathbf{B}_{w2}^{-1} (w_2 - w_2^b) + \frac{1}{2} (w_g^{OBS} - H(w_2))^T \mathbf{R}_{wg}^{-1} (w_g^{OBS} - H(w_2)) = J_{w2}^b + J_{wg}^{OBS}$$

7 [4]

8 where the superscripts b and OBS denote the initially estimated values of the state variables
 9 within the assimilation window (background) and the observed variables, respectively; and H
 10 is the non-linear observation operator which transfers the state variables into observation
 11 space. The “best” analyses are the result of minimizing the distance between the state
 12 variables and the first-guess weighted by the background error covariance matrix \mathbf{B} (J_{Bio}^b and
 13 J_{w2}^b terms) and the distance between the observations and the model predictions (J_{LAI}^{OBS} and
 14 J_{wg}^{OBS} terms) within the assimilation window, weighted by the observation error covariance
 15 matrix \mathbf{R} . In the case of a linear observation operator and a normal distribution of the errors,
 16 the analysed state variables of the cost functions [3] and [4] are expressed by :

$$18 \quad Bio = Bio^b + \mathbf{K}_{BIO} (LAI^{OBS} - \mathbf{H}_{BIO} (Bio^b)); \quad \mathbf{K}_{BIO} = \mathbf{B}_{BIO} \mathbf{H}_{BIO}^T [\mathbf{H}_{BIO} \mathbf{B}_{BIO} \mathbf{H}_{BIO}^T + \mathbf{R}_{LAI}]^{-1}, \quad [5]$$

19 and

$$20 \quad w_2 = w_2^b + \mathbf{K}_{w2} (w_g^{OBS} - \mathbf{H}_{w2} (w_2^b)); \quad \mathbf{K}_{w2} = \mathbf{B}_{w2} \mathbf{H}_{w2}^T [\mathbf{H}_{w2} \mathbf{B}_{w2} \mathbf{H}_{w2}^T + \mathbf{R}_{wg}]^{-1}, \quad [6]$$

21 respectively. In the non-linear case, the minimum of the cost functions [3] and [4] is evaluated
 22 by deriving adjoint or tangent linear models. However, this is an often difficult and time
 23 consuming task (Reichle et al., 2002). The simplified 1D-VAR (Balsamo et al., 2004)
 24 circumvents this problem by using a numerical linear approximation of the observation

1 operator. This approximation consists of a perturbation of the initial value of the state
 2 variables ($w_2 = w_2^b + \delta w_2$ for the root zone soil moisture and $Bio^i = Bio^b + \delta Bio$ for the
 3 vegetation biomass) and studying the impact of this perturbation on the predicted variables at
 4 each observation time step i within the assimilation window (with n observations). In this
 5 way, linearised observation operators of the type: $\mathbf{H} = \left[\frac{\delta y^1}{\delta x^0}, \dots, \frac{\delta y^n}{\delta x^0} \right]$ are obtained, where δx^0
 6 represents the perturbation of the initial state variable and δy^i the change in the simulated
 7 variable at time step i (for $i=[1,n]$), due to δx^0 . This operator \mathbf{H} is then substituted in [5] and
 8 [6], and also replaces the non-linear observation operator H .

9 *2.3.2. Setting of the main 1D-VAR parameters*

10 The most difficult task in the implementation of an assimilation scheme is the
 11 description of the error matrices. It is a key aspect, because the correction of the system state
 12 depends on the background and observation error prescription (see Eqs. [3] to [6]). The size
 13 of the initial perturbation and the length of the assimilation window is also discussed in this
 14 section.

15 *(i) Assimilation window length*

16 The choice of the assimilation window length for a variational assimilation scheme is
 17 particularly important when the scheme is applied to large regions. In this study, a 10-day
 18 assimilation window, which is close to the sampling time of many LAI products (e.g. a 8-day
 19 MODIS product is available), was chosen because shorter assimilation windows would
 20 regularly exclude LAI observations altogether.

21 *(ii) Observational errors*

22 In this study, observed time series of surface soil moisture (w_g) and LAI were used for
 23 the assimilation into the model. For w_g , the same method as in MU07 was applied, i.e. the
 24 error derived from the dispersion of in-situ observations was doubled and therefore set to \mathbf{R}_{w_g}

1 = $0.06 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$. For LAI, an observational error is difficult to obtain from the experimental
 2 procedure followed in SMOSREX. Moreover, the LAI observations exhibited quite different
 3 cycles (in terms of shape and maxima) in 2001 and 2002. It was decided to use an empirical
 4 value of $\mathbf{R}_{LAI} = 1 \text{ m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$, which is expected to account for all sources of uncertainties
 5 (observational system and representativeness error). Both values were assumed to be constant
 6 throughout the whole period 2001-2004. A sensitivity study was performed in order to assess
 7 the value of a variable LAI observation error. However, no or little impact on the assimilation
 8 results were found. For the sake of simplicity, a constant value was used.

9 *(iii) Background errors*

10 For the description of the error in the estimation of w_2 , an ensemble of simulations was
 11 created between two consecutive observations by using different initial states of w_2 and by
 12 perturbing the atmospheric forcing. For each assimilation window the dispersion of the
 13 residuals (difference between an observation and the model estimation) was assessed. During
 14 the calibration year (2001) this quantity was shown to have a constant value of $0.02 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$.
 15 The same approach was used to estimate a model covariance error for the vegetation biomass
 16 over the 10-days of the individual assimilation windows. It was observed that the evolution of
 17 the standard deviation of the residuals does not vary much over the year 2001. However, a
 18 slight seasonal effect is observed (not shown). Departure from the mean value is about 0.01
 19 kg m^{-2} on average. Therefore, the background error for the vegetation biomass was assumed
 20 to be constant and was set equal to the average of the standard deviation of the residuals in
 21 2001 (0.05 kg m^{-2}).

22 *(iv) Linear hypothesis*

23 A further important parameter in the implementation of this simplified variational
 24 assimilation scheme is the choice of the perturbation size of the state variables, because it
 25 determines the quality of the linear approximation through the observation operator \mathbf{H} . To

1 evaluate the “optimal” size of this perturbation, the following test was conducted: an
 2 ensemble of linear operators \mathbf{H} was obtained by finite differences (by a random Gaussian
 3 perturbation of the initial value of w_2 and/or the vegetation biomass) for a 10-day period (four
 4 components for \mathbf{H}_{w_2} and one for \mathbf{H}_{BIO}) and their standard deviation (σ) was calculated. Several
 5 values of the initial perturbation of the state variables were tested. The smallest perturbations
 6 of w_2 (between 0.005 and 0.015 m^3m^{-3}) produced a strong value of σ to the four linearized
 7 components of \mathbf{H}_{w_2} during the calibration year (not shown). This is due to the numerical noise
 8 produced by infinitesimal perturbations in the vicinity of the initial value. The most suitable
 9 perturbation should result in a low sensitivity of \mathbf{H}_{w_2} . \mathbf{H}_{w_2} was found to be less sensitive for
 10 perturbations close to 0.05 m^3m^{-3} and this value was used in the assimilation algorithm.

11 Fig. 2 illustrates how the optimal perturbation of Bio was determined. The σ of the
 12 sole component of \mathbf{H}_{BIO} in a 10-day assimilation window is presented for contrasting values of
 13 perturbations of Bio . In Fig. 2, the optimal perturbation, producing the lowest σ values, is
 14 located between 0.07 and 0.10 kg m^{-2} . It was finally set to 0.07 kg m^{-2} . Fig. 2 shows that
 15 perturbation values lower than 0.07 kg m^{-2} and between 0.10 and 0.13 kg m^{-2} produced larger
 16 σ values. Perturbations higher than 0.13 kg m^{-2} were found also to produce larger
 17 uncertainties in \mathbf{H}_{BIO} (not shown).

18 (v) Implementation

19 The implementation of the simplified assimilation scheme can be undertaken in
 20 different ways. In this study, w_2 and vegetation biomass were perturbed at the beginning of
 21 each assimilation window, in order to determine the linearized observation operator. This
 22 configuration necessitated 3 runs for each assimilation window (one for each perturbed
 23 variable and one for the control run).

24 2.3.3. Dynamical correction of the wilting point

1 As mentioned before, w_{wilt} is estimated by the LSM and then treated as a constant
2 parameter (found to be $0.17 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$ for the SMOSREX site). However, the assimilation
3 scheme is allowed to initialise the model with w_2 states below w_{wilt} , following the assimilation
4 of w_g . This occurred during the drought periods of the years 2003 and 2004 (MU07). In this
5 case, ISBA-A-gs did not allow any further evapotranspiration and soil water extraction
6 through the roots, even after significant rainfall events. This led to a strong vegetation
7 mortality rate. However, the SMOSREX field observations performed during the summer
8 2003 show that the vegetation growth in response to rainfall may be rapid (Fig. 1). The
9 performance of the vegetation analyses was also affected by this constraint. The following
10 solution is proposed: for each assimilation step with an analysed value of w_2 below the fixed
11 w_{wilt} , the model w_{wilt} is re-set by substituting its value with the analysed value of w_2 . This
12 simple modification to the model allows plant growth in response to rainfall to occur after a
13 drought.

14
15
16

1 **3. Results**

2

3 *3.1. w_2 and biomass analyses (2001-2004)*

4 In Fig. 3, the 1D-VAR analysis of w_2 and the vegetation biomass are presented for the
5 years 2001 to 2004 (Fig. 3a and 3b, respectively) with a non-stationary w_{wilt} (see section
6 2.3.3). The simulation performed with ISBA-A-gs and without the assimilation of w_g or LAI
7 observations (i.e. the control simulation) is also presented in Fig. 3. The predicted LAI
8 (control and analysis) is also shown on Fig. 3c. The assimilated observations are the surface
9 soil moisture (one observation every three days) and the LAI (one observation every 10 days).
10 Analyses, observations and the control model reference are superposed for comparison
11 purposes. It is shown that w_2 is generally well reproduced during the whole period from 2001
12 to 2004, with a score E equal to 0.86 after the assimilation in contrast to 0.79 for the control
13 simulation (Table 2). The added value of the assimilation is particularly noticeable during the
14 six months following June 2003, for which the model without assimilation is not able to
15 descend below the prescribed w_{wilt} and consequently overestimates the moisture during the
16 rest of that year.

17 On Fig. 3c, the impact of the joint w_2 and vegetation biomass analysis is shown for the
18 LAI predictions. The predicted values of LAI are quite close to the observations, improving
19 the performance from $E = 0.17$ for the control run to $E = 0.72$, and RMSE from $0.80 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ to
20 $0.47 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ after the assimilation (Table 2). The main disagreements are found during the
21 senescence periods of the vegetation when the model clearly overestimates the LAI (except
22 for 2003, where an anomalous double cycle of LAI was observed). Since the vegetation
23 biomass observations are sparse and very scattered for 2001 and 2002, it is not clear whether
24 the assimilation improves the control model simulation for these years. It is observed that
25 during the second cycle of vegetation in 2003, the biomass is slightly overestimated after the

1 analysis, which is in agreement with the higher LAI observations assimilated. The RMSE and
2 the score for the years 2003 and 2004 were not improved, which may be explained by the
3 limited number of available observations of vegetation biomass. However, for the whole
4 study period, the analysis of the vegetation biomass improved the score from 0.17 to 0.23.

5 In Fig. 4, the impact of setting a non-stationary w_{wilt} is only shown for 2003 and 2004,
6 because w_{wilt} was only modified during these two years. During the periods with analysed w_2
7 below w_{wilt} an increased vegetation mortality rate is observed. The need for re-setting w_{wilt} is
8 particularly apparent between July and October 2004, when the vegetation biomass analyses
9 were close to zero. During this period, each time w_2 analyses were below w_{wilt} ISBA-A-gs
10 stopped plant transpiration and photosynthesis, which resulted in a high vegetation mortality
11 rate. Consequently, the performance of the vegetation biomass analyses for 2003 and 2004
12 was low (Table 2) compared to the case of a modified w_{wilt} . This effect is less evident in 2003,
13 since the drying period is shorter than in 2004. For the complete four years, the score of the
14 vegetation biomass decreases (compared with a non-stationary w_{wilt}) from 0.23 to 0.12. The
15 lower vegetation biomass during the dry periods also had an impact on the soil water
16 reservoir, which produced higher moisture levels. The score for w_2 decreased from 0.86 to
17 0.82 (Table 2).

18

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

3.2. Zero precipitation

The simulations at SMOSREX are forced with good quality measurements of meteorological variables, representative for the study area. However, at larger scales the information about meteorological variables is less accurate. In order to test the robustness of the 1D-VAR, even when forcing data are subjected to large errors, the precipitation was set to 0. Precipitation is a key variable within atmospheric forcing data sets and is particularly important for the water reservoir evolution. For this experiment, the assimilation scheme was run again for the whole 4-year period under investigation. Fig. 5 shows the same plots as Fig. 3, but with the new, degraded forcing data. Although the new analyses produced a drier soil, the general shape of the curve of the analyzed w_2 was maintained. It is now much smoother, since the information about the precipitation events is lacking. It is important to remark that the assimilation scheme permits the increase of the root-zone soil moisture before the start of the growing period. Otherwise, given the absence of precipitation, a growing season would not be simulated. The LSM, with precipitation set to 0, tends to decrease the root-zone soil moisture between two observations. However, the 1D-VAR generates positive increments which correct the water deficiency in order to match the w_g observations. The advantage over the control simulation is considerable. Under the precipitation constriction, the control simulation would rapidly fall to $0.17 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$ (constant w_{wilt}), and since the model would not receive precipitation, the moisture reservoir would remain at this lower boundary. The benefits of the data assimilation are also clear for the vegetation: although the biomass analyses are obtained with less accuracy (in particular, lower peak values are obtained), especially during the wet years 2001 and 2002, the start of the growing season is still well predicted. The need for a non-stationary w_{wilt} is highlighted again when Fig. 5 is compared to

1 Fig. 6. In the latter, the vegetation biomass reaches a value of 0 in those periods where w_2 is
2 below w_{wilt} , and which now have a longer duration, due to the lack of precipitation. The score
3 for the vegetation biomass becomes negative and for the LAI is reduced from 0.48 (non-
4 stationary w_{wilt}) to 0.14 (stationary w_{wilt}). In Fig. 6, the w_2 analyses for the summer period are
5 overestimated in the years 2003 and 2004, because of a very low level of vegetation, while
6 better retrievals are obtained by re-setting w_{wilt} . The evapotranspiration is strongly reduced
7 without precipitation, since the simulation of the vegetation biomass underestimates the real
8 conditions (Table 3).

9

10 **4. Summary and Discussion**

11 The present study is a continuation of the work initiated in MU07. There, a simplified
12 1D-VAR assimilation scheme was compared with other assimilation schemes, and it was
13 shown that it offered the best performance in view of a future implementation in a regional
14 experiment. However, the LAI was forced and the vegetation biomass was not corrected for,
15 as only w_g observations were assimilated. Nevertheless, vegetation biomass is also an
16 important surface variable, vital to estimate the carbon and water vapour fluxes, and its
17 analysis is also essential. In this study, field observations of w_g and LAI were assimilated at
18 the same time into the ISBA-A-g_s LSM. When comparing Fig. 3a of this study with Fig. 4 of
19 MU07, two main differences are observed with regard to the analyses of w_2 : i) a degradation
20 at the end of 2001 is observed, ii) the correction over the dry period of 2004 is less accurate.
21 This is a consequence of analysing the vegetation biomass in addition to soil moisture. From
22 October 2001 to February 2002 no LAI observations were available, which resulted in
23 interpolated values of less than $0.5 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ during this period. In this study, these estimates
24 were assimilated and the LAI retrievals after assimilation were close to these observations.
25 This produced lower transpiration and water extraction rates, hence a slower drying of the

1 water reservoir and as a consequence an overestimation of the w_2 analyses. Before the
2 implementation of the joint assimilation of w_g and LAI observations into the fully coupled
3 model, a number of tests were performed. In particular, the assimilation of w_g alone and of
4 LAI alone was attempted (MU07).

5 The assimilation of w_g alone (LAI was not controlled by any observation) did not
6 improve the simulated LAI. It tended to speed up the growing period and to increase the
7 maximum value of LAI reached each year. This factor had detrimental effects on the analysed
8 w_2 during the spring of 2002 (values lower than the control simulation, and much lower than
9 the observations were obtained).

10 The assimilation of LAI alone (w_g was not constrained by any observation) generally
11 improved w_2 only marginally. However, it tended to increase the error on the simulated w_2
12 during the drought periods (e.g. October 2001, July-August 2003, July 2004, October 2004),
13 while it permitted to obtain analysed vegetation biomass values very similar to those shown in
14 Figs. 3 and 4.

15 No flux validation data was available and the positive or negative impact of the
16 assimilation on the fluxes could not be quantified. On a daily basis, the simulated
17 evapotranspiration was not fundamentally changed by the assimilation. However, the new
18 annual cycles of the flux was more consistent with the available observations of vegetation
19 biomass and LAI, which showed that the LAI produced by the control simulation was
20 underestimated during the start of the growing season and overestimated during the
21 senescence phase.

22 The w_{wilt} limitation imposed by the single soil layer of the model used in this study
23 tends to trigger a high vegetation mortality rate during marked droughts, and to underestimate
24 the impact (on vegetation growth and on the water and carbon fluxes) of significant rainfall
25 events after the droughts. A simple solution consists in re-setting w_{wilt} dynamically during

1 anomalously dry periods. The introduction of a non-stationary w_{wilt} was shown to improve the
2 moisture and vegetation predictions as compared to the control simulation with a stationary
3 w_{wilt} . This led to an improvement of the score of w_2 from 0.79 to 0.86. Furthermore, the score
4 was slightly improved from 0.17 to 0.23 for the vegetation biomass analysis. The final value
5 of 0.23 is rather low, partly because the high level of scatter in the observations found for
6 2001 and 2002 prevents the score of reaching higher values.

7 Solutions potentially suitable to overcome the w_{wilt} problem, include the attribution of
8 more weight to the LAI observations by reducing the observational error when the initial w_2 is
9 found below the prescribed w_{wilt} . However, this poses a problem when LAI observations are
10 not reliable. The simple solution of prescribing a non-stationary w_{wilt} value, low enough for
11 drought periods, was assessed (not shown). Indeed, a lower w_{wilt} (e.g. $0.10 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$ instead of
12 $0.17 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$) permitted to improve the control simulation of w_2 during the summer/autumn of
13 dry years (2003-2004). However, this change triggered a significant underestimation of w_2
14 during the summer/autumn of the normal/wet years (2001-2002). These results were to be
15 expected, as prescribing a lower value of the wilting point is tantamount to increasing the total
16 extractable soil moisture of the soil. The vegetation simulated by ISBA-A-gs over this site
17 tends to exploit the whole soil moisture reservoir prescribed in the model, even during a wet
18 year like 2002. It was eventually decided that it was preferable to use the $0.17 \text{ m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$ value,
19 which is a typical wilting point value for a loam and which allows a good model performance
20 during normal years. The difference between the model and the observations in 2003 and
21 2004 can be explained by the rather extreme droughts encountered during these two years. A
22 number of biological and physical explanations are proposed:

23 In the model, the wilting point depends on the soil texture. In reality, this parameter may also
24 depend on the plant ability to extract water from a particular soil. The SMOSREX fallow is a
25 multi-specific canopy. During drought events, the plant species most capable of extracting

1 water in dry conditions have an advantage in their competition with the other species. This
2 effect could change the behaviour of the soil-plant system from one year to another. To some
3 extent, this effect could also happen at large spatial scales for natural ecosystems and
4 agricultural areas (e.g. farmer may choose to use cultivars adapted to dry conditions during
5 dry years).

6 Over the SMOSREX site, the fallow biomass is very dense and the dead vegetation residues
7 tend to form a dense vegetal mulch at the soil surface (De Rosnay et al. 2006). In the model,
8 the strong decrease in direct soil evaporation due to the mulch (Gonzalez-Sosa et al. 2001) is
9 not represented explicitly. In order to represent the mulch effect, a fixed vegetation cover
10 fraction of 100 % was assumed in the ISBA-A-gs simulations. Test simulations were
11 performed with lower vegetation cover fraction values (allowing bare soil evaporation) and
12 showed that this effect is not sufficient to simulate a total soil moisture content below the
13 wilting point. In the field, phenomena like the formation of deep cracks into the soil may
14 foster the soil evaporation and this process is not accounted for by the model.

15 The use of a soil multi-layer scheme, which describes more accurately the evolution of
16 the prognostic variables during dry periods than a single layer model with an averaged soil
17 moisture content, may lead to a better prediction of soil moisture and LAI. In particular, the
18 impact on the vegetation of rewetting the top soil layer is better accounted for by a multilayer
19 model. However, the inclusion of several soil layers would augment the computational burden
20 of the assimilation. The assimilation of observations into a multi-layer soil model is not a
21 simple task. If all layers are to be analysed individually, an understanding of the error-
22 correlation between near-surface soil moisture observations and the different layers are
23 required (Reichle et al. 2001, Walker et al. 2002).

24 It was shown that when precipitation observations contain large errors, the joint
25 assimilation of w_g and LAI is capable of restoring the annual trend of w_2 and vegetation

1 biomass, but large errors may occur in the absolute value of these quantities. An attempt was
2 made to deactivate the plant growth module of the model and to analyse w_2 only. In this case,
3 the observed LAI was prescribed to the model instead of being assimilated. The soil moisture
4 evolution was better predicted, because the root-plant water extraction and evapotranspiration
5 rates were more realistic. In case of large precipitation errors, imposing LAI from external
6 observations may be an advantage for the retrieval of soil moisture. However, as stated above,
7 a large error in the LAI observations may prevent the assimilation scheme to lead to a
8 significant improvement.

9 In this study, an assimilation window of 10 days was used. Longer windows have the
10 advantage of reducing the computing time but they result in a degradation of the model
11 prediction. For example, a test with a 30-day assimilation window showed that the score E of
12 the analysed w_2 and vegetation biomass decreased from 0.86 and 0.23, respectively, to 0.79
13 and a negative value.

14
15
16

17 **5. Conclusion**

18 In the SMOSREX case study, the joint assimilation of w_g and LAI observations by
19 using a simplified 1D-VAR assimilation scheme over a fallow, has demonstrated that:

- 20 • The temporal evolution of both w_2 and the vegetation biomass are significantly
21 improved by the assimilation. The assimilation scheme generally reduces the model
22 underestimation of vegetation biomass during the growing phase and, especially, the
23 overestimation of vegetation biomass during the senescence phase of the vegetation.
- 24 • The use of a non-stationary w_{wilt} is required for dry years during which soil
25 moisture observations are found below the a priori value of w_{wilt} . This change limits

1 the vegetation mortality during (and after) very dry conditions and the underestimation
2 of the evapotranspiration following an inaccurate simulation of the biomass.

3 • In the presence of significant errors in the atmospheric forcing, the leaf onset and
4 the seasonal dynamics of the soil moisture are still retrieved well even, for example, if
5 precipitation is set to 0. However, the error on the analysed variables (w_2 and the
6 vegetation biomass) is large. In this case, the analysis of w_2 is more efficient if the
7 vegetation biomass is not analysed, i.e. if good quality LAI observations are
8 prescribed to the model, instead of simulating the vegetation growth.

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 This study was co-funded by the European Commission within the GMES initiative in FP6, in
12 the framework of the GEOLAND integrated GMES project on land cover and vegetation. The
13 SMOSREX experiment was co-funded by a TOSCA grant from CNES. The authors would
14 like to thank Dr. Gianpaolo Balsamo (ECMWF, Reading) for fruitful discussions, as well as
15 the anonymous reviewers, for their helpful comments.

1 **References**

- 2 Balsamo, G., Bouyssel, F., Noilhan, J., 2004. A simplified bi-dimensional variational analysis
3 of soil moisture from screen-level observations in a mesoscale numerical weather-
4 prediction model. *Q. J. R. Met. Soc.*, **130A**, 895-915.
- 5 Bicheron, P., Leroy, M., 1999. A method of biophysical parameter retrieval at global scale by
6 inversion of a vegetation reflectance model. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **67**, 251-266.
- 7 Bounoua, G. J., Collartz, G. J., Los, S. O., Sellers, P. J., Dazlich, D. A., Tucker, C. J.,
8 Randall, D., 2000. Sensitivity of climate to changes in NDVI. *J. Clim.*, **13**, 2277-2292.
- 9 Calvet, J.-C., Noilhan, J., Roujean, J.-L., Bessemoulin, P., Cabelguenne, M., Olioso, A.,
10 Wigneron, J.-P., 1998. An interactive vegetation SVAT model tested against data from six
11 contrasting sites. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **92**, 73-95.
- 12 Calvet, J.-C., Bessemoulin, P., Noilhan, J., Berne, C., Braud, I., et al., 1999. MUREX: A land-
13 surface field experiment to study the annual cycle of the energy and water budgets. *Ann.*
14 *Geophys.*, **17**, 838-854.
- 15 Calvet, J.-C., 2000. Investigating soil and atmospheric plant water stress using physiological
16 and micrometeorological data. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **103**, 229-247.
- 17 Calvet, J.-C., Soussana, J.F., 2001. Modelling CO₂ enrichment effects using an interactive
18 vegetation SVAT scheme. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **108**, 129-152.
- 19 Calvet, J.-C., Rivalland, V., Picon-Cochard, C., Guehl, J.-M., 2004. Modelling forest
20 transpiration and CO₂ fluxes - response to soil moisture stress, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*,
21 **124**(3-4), 143-156, doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2004.01.007.
- 22 Cayrol, P., Chehbouni, A., Kergoat, L., Dedieu, G., Mordelet, P., Nouvellon, Y., 2000.
23 Grassland modeling and monitoring with SPOT-4 VEGETATION instrument during the
24 1997-1999 SALSA experiment, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, **105**, 91-115.

- 1 Chase, T. N., Pielke, R. A., Kittel, T. G. F., Nemani, R., Running, S. W., 1996. The sensitivity
2 of a general circulation model to global changes in leaf area index. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **101**,
3 7393-7408.
- 4 De Rosnay, P., Calvet, J.-C., Kerr, Y., Wigneron, J.-P., Lemaître, F., Escorihuela, M.J.,
5 Muñoz Sabater, J., Saleh, K., Barrie, J., Coret, L., Cherel, G., Dedieu G., Durbe, R., Fritz,
6 N.E.D., Froissard, F., Kruszewski, A., Lavenu, F., Suquia, D., Waldteufel, P., 2006.
7 SMOSREX: A long term field campaign experiment for soil moisture and land surface
8 processes remote sensing. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **102**, 377-389.
- 9 Deardorff, J. W., 1977. A parameterization of ground-surface moisture content for use in
10 atmospheric prediction models. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, **16**, 1182-1185.
- 11 Deardorff, J. W., 1978. Efficient prediction of ground surface temperature and moisture with
12 inclusion of a layer of vegetation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **20**, 1889-1903.
- 13 Entekhabi, D., Nakamura, H., Njoku, E.G., 1994. Solving the inverse problem for soil
14 moisture and temperature profiles by sequential assimilation of multifrequency remotely
15 sensed observations. *IEEE Trans. Geos. Remot. Sens.*, **32**(2), 438-448.
- 16 Gibelin, A.-L., Calvet, J.-C., Roujean, J.-L., Jarlan, L., Los S., 2006. Ability of the land
17 surface model ISBA-A-g_s to simulate leaf area index at the global scale: comparison with
18 satellites products, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **111**, D18102, doi:10.1029/2005JD006691.
- 19 Gonzalez-Sosa, E., Braud, I., Thony, J.-L., Vauclin, M., Calvet, J.-C., 2001. Heat and water
20 exchanges of fallow land covered with plant-residue mulch layer: a modeling study using
21 the three year MUREX data set, *J. Hydrol.*, **244**, 119-136.
- 22
- 23 Henderson-Sellers, A., Yang, Z.-L., Dickinson, R. E., 1993. The Project for Intercomparison
24 of Land-surface Parameterization Schemes. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, **74**, 1335-1349.

- 1 Henderson-Sellers, A., Pitman, A. J., Love, P. K., Irannejad, P., Chen, T. H., 1995. The
2 Project for Intercomparison of Land-surface Parameterization Schemes (PILPS): Phases 2
3 and 3. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, **76**, 489-503.
- 4 Houser, P.R., Shuttleworth, W.J., Famiglietti, J.S., Gupta, H.V., Syed, K.H., and D.C.
5 Goodrich (1998). Integration of soil moisture remote sensing and hydrologic modeling
6 using data assimilation, *Water Resour. Res.*, **34**, 3405-3420.
- 7 International GEWEX Project Office., 1995. Global Soil Wetness Project, version 1.0. 47 pp.
8 [Available from International GEWEX Project Office, 1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1210,
9 Silver Spring, MD 20910.].
- 10 Kerr, Y.H., Waldteufel, P., Wigneron, J.-P., Martinuzzi, J., Font, J., Berger, M., 2001. Soil
11 moisture retrieval from space: the Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission.
12 *IEEE Trans. Geos. Remot. Sens.*, **39**, 1729-1735.
- 13 Lakshmi, V. and J. Susskind (2001). Utilization of satellite data in land surface hydrology:
14 sensitivity and assimilation. *Hydrol. Process.*, **15**, 877-892.
- 15 Muñoz Sabater, J., 2007. Assimilation de données de télédétection pour le suivi des surfaces
16 continentales : mise en œuvre sur un site expérimental. PhD Thesis, University Toulouse
17 III, Toulouse, 164 pp.”
- 18 Muñoz Sabater, J., Jarlan, L., Calvet, J.-C., Bouyssel, F., De Rosnay, P., 2007. From near
19 surface to root zone soil moisture using different assimilation techniques. *J.*
20 *Hydrometeor.*, **8**, 194-206, doi: 10.1175/JHM571.1.
- 21 Nash, J. E., Sutcliffe, J. V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models,
22 discussion and principles. *J. Hydrol.*, **10**, 282– 290.
- 23 Njoku, E.G., Jackson, T.J., Lakshmi, V., Chan, T.K., Nghiem, S.V., 2003. Soil moisture
24 retrieval from AMSR-E. *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, **41**(2), 215 – 229.

- 1 Noilhan, J., Planton, S., 1989. A simple parameterization of land surface processes for
2 meteorological models. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **117**, 536-549.
- 3 Noilhan, J., Mahfouf, J.-F., 1996. The ISBA land surface parameterisation scheme. *Global*
4 *Planet. Changes*, **13**, 145-159.
- 5 Reichle, R. H., McLaughlin, D. B., Entekhabi, D., 2001. Variational data assimilation of
6 microwave radiobrightness observations for land surface hydrology applications. *IEEE*
7 *Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, **39**, 1708-1718.
- 8 Reichle, R.H., Walker, J.P., Koster, R.D., and P.R. Houser, 2002. Extended versus Ensemble
9 Kalman Filtering for land data assimilation. *J. Hydromet.*, **3**, 728-740.
- 10 Roujean, J.-L., Lacaze, R., 2002. Global mapping of vegetation parameters from POLDER
11 multiangular measurements for studies of surface-atmosphere interactions: a pragmatic
12 method and validation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **107**, 4150.
- 13 Segal, M., Arritt, R. W., Clark, C., Rabin, R., Brown, J., 1995. Scaling evaluation of the
14 effect of surface characteristics on potential for deep convection over uniform terrain.
15 *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **123**, 383-400.
- 16 Seuffert, G., Gross, P., Simmer, C., Wood, E.F., 2002. The influence of hydrologic modelling
17 on the predicted local weather: Two-way coupling of a mesoscale weather prediction
18 model and a land surface hydrologic model. *J. Hydrometeor.*, **3**, 505-523.
- 19 Shaw, B. L., Pielke, R. A., Ziegler, C. L., 1997. A three-dimensional numerical simulation of
20 a Great Plains dryline. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **125**, 1489-1506.
- 21 Tian, Y., Woodcock, C. E., Wang, Y., Privette, J. L., Shabanov, N. V., Zhou, L., Buermann,
22 W., Dong, J., Veikkanen, B., Hame, T., Ozdogan M., Knyazikhin Y., Myneni, R. B.,
23 2002a. Multiscale Analysis and Validation of the MODIS LAI Product I. Uncertainty
24 assessment. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **83**, 414-430.

- 1 Tian, Y., Woodcock, C. E., Wang, Y., Privette, J. L., Shabanov, N. V., Zhou, L., Buermann,
2 W., Dong, J., Veikkanen, B., Hame, T., Ozdogan M., Knyazikhin Y., Myneni, R. B.,
3 2002b. Multiscale Analysis and Validation of the MODIS LAI Product II. Sampling
4 strategy. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **83**, 431-441.
- 5 Tan, B., Hu, J., Huang, D., Yang, W., Zhang, P., Shabanov, N. V., Knyazikhin, Y., Nemani,
6 R. R., Myneni, R. B., 2005. Assessment of the broadleaf crops leaf area index product
7 from the Terra MODIS instrument, *Agric. For. Meteor.*, **135**, 124-134.
- 8 Walker, J. P., Willgoose, G. R., Kalma, J. D., 2002. Three-Dimensional Soil Moisture Profile
9 Retrieval by Assimilation of Near-Surface Measurements: Simplified Kalman Filter
10 Covariance Forecasting and Field Application. *Water Resour. Res.*, **38** (12), 1301,
11 doi:10.1029/2002WR001545.
- 12 Wigneron, J.-P., Pellarin, T., Calvet, J. -C., de Rosnay, P., Saleh, K., Kerr, Y., 2005. L-MEB:
13 A simple model at L-Band for the continental areas – application to the simulation of a
14 half-degree resolution and global scale data set. *Radiative transfer models for microwave
15 radiometry*, Matzler C., ed, Stevenage, UK: Institution of Electrical Engineers
16

List of figures

1. a) LAI , b) w_g , c) w_2 and d) monthly precipitation for 2001 to 2004 as measured over the SMOSREX site. On top the interpolated LAI (solid line) is superimposed to the observations (circles). Note that the spline function used for LAI interpolation changed from one year to another, depending on data quality and frequency. The w_g and w_2 simulations of ISBA-A-g_s (solid line) using the offensive strategy as response to water stress (drought tolerant) are superimposed to the observations (dots for w_g and stars for w_2).
2. Temporal evolution of the linearized \mathbf{H}_{BIO} standard deviation. \mathbf{H}_{BIO} is computed by an initial perturbation of the vegetation biomass. The standard deviation of \mathbf{H}_{BIO} is presented for four different intervals for the initial perturbation of the vegetation biomass: [0.005, 0.030], [0.03, 0.07], [0.07, 0.10], [0.10, 0.13], in units of kg m^{-2} . \mathbf{H}_{BIO} values are in units of $\text{m}^{2\odot}\text{kg}^{-1}$.
3. Analysis of a) the root zone soil moisture (circles) and b) vegetation biomass, using the simplified 1D-VAR method and a dynamical correction of the wilting point for 2001 to 2004 over the SMOSREX experimental site. c) Observations and simulations of LAI before and after the assimilation. For comparison purposes, analysed values are superimposed over the in-situ observations (points) and the open loop-simulations(solid line).
4. Analysis of a) the root zone soil moisture (circles) and b) vegetation biomass, using the simplified 1D-VAR method and a fixed wilting point for 2003 to 2004 over the SMOSREX experimental site. c) LAI before and after the assimilation. For comparison purposes, analysed values are superimposed over the in-situ observations (points) and the model initial estimations (solid line).
5. Analysis of a) root zone soil moisture and, b) vegetation biomass, using the simplified 1D-VAR method for 2001 to 2004, with precipitation set to zero. c) LAI before and after the assimilation. Analysed values (circles) are superimposed over the in-situ observations (points) and the model basic estimations (solid line) for comparison purposes.
6. Same as Fig. 5, but using a fixed wilting point. The results for the years 2001 and 2002 are omitted as being similar as in Fig. 5.




Figure 1.- a) LAI , b) w_g , c) w_2 and d) monthly precipitation for 2001 to 2004 as measured over the SMOSREX site. On top the interpolated LAI (solid line) is superimposed to the observations (circles). Note that the spline function used for LAI interpolation changed from one year to another, depending on data quality and frequency. The w_g and w_2 simulations of ISBA-A- g_s (solid line) using the offensive strategy as response to water stress (drought tolerant) are superimposed to the observations (dots for w_g and stars for w_2).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22





Figure 2.- Temporal evolution of the linearized H_{BIO} standard deviation. H_{BIO} is computed by an initial perturbation of the vegetation biomass. The standard deviation of H_{BIO} is presented for four different intervals for the initial perturbation of the vegetation biomass: $[0.005, 0.030]$, $[0.03, 0.07]$, $[0.07, 0.10]$, $[0.10, 0.13]$, in units of kg m^{-2} . H_{BIO} values are in units of $\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14



1
 2 **Figure 3.-** Analysis of a) the root zone soil moisture (circles) and b) vegetation biomass,
 3 using the simplified 1D-VAR method and a dynamical correction of the wilting
 4 point for 2001 to 2004 over the SMOSREX experimental site. c) LAI before and
 5 after the assimilation. For comparison purposes, analysed values are superimposed
 6 over the in-situ observations (points) and the model basic estimations (solid line).

7
 8
 9
 10
 11






Figure 4.- Analysis of a) the root zone soil moisture (circles) and b) vegetation biomass, using the simplified 1D-VAR method and a fixed wilting point for 2003 to 2004 over the SMOSREX experimental site. c) *LAI* before and after the assimilation. For comparison purposes, analysed values are superimposed over the in-situ observations (points) and the model basic estimations (solid line).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14



1
 2
 3 **Figure 5.-** Analysis of a) the root zone soil moisture and, b) vegetation biomass, using the
 4 simplified 1D-VAR method for 2001 to 2004, with precipitation set to zero. c)
 5 LAI before and after the assimilation. Analysed values (circles) are superimposed
 6 over the in-situ observations (points) and the model basic estimations (solid line)
 7 for comparison purposes.

8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24



1
 2 **Figure 6.**- Same as Fig. 5, but using a fixed wilting point. The results for the years 2001 and
 3 2002 are omitted as being similar as in Fig. 5.
 4

1 **List of Tables**

2

3 1.- Main soil and vegetation parameters used in the ISBA-A-g_s simulations over the
4 SMOSREX site.

5

6 2.- Yearly and global RMSE (in m³ m⁻³), mean bias (in m³ m⁻³) and score (E) for the
7 root zone-soil moisture, the above-ground vegetation biomass, and the LAI of the analyses (4
8 model configurations) and the control simulation.

9

10

11 3.- Evapotranspiration yearly cumulated flux (LE, in mm year⁻¹) after the assimilation
12 of *LAI* and *w_g* observations for four different model configurations, and for the control
13 simulation.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

1 TABLE 1.
 2 Main soil and vegetation parameters used in the ISBA-A-g_s simulations over the SMOSREX
 3 site.

4

Soil parameters			
parameter	symbol	Unit	Value
Soil depth	d_2	cm	95
Sand Content	SAND	%	32.0
Clay content	CLAY	%	22.8
Field capacity	w_{fc}	$m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$	0.30
Wilting point	w_{wilt}	$m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$	0.17
Vegetation parameters			
parameter	symbol	Unit	Value
Mesophyll conductance	g_m	$mm \cdot s^{-1}$	0.56
Critical extractable soil moisture	θ_c	%	50
Plant response to water stress	-	-	drought-tolerant
Potential leaf life expectancy	τ	days	80
Minimum LAI	LAI_{min}	$m^2 \cdot m^{-2}$	0.3
Cuticular conductance	g_c	$mm \cdot s^{-1}$	0
Nitrogen plasticity parameter (slope)	e	$m^2 \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%^{-1}$	5.84
Nitrogen plasticity parameter (intercept)	f	$m^2 \cdot kg^{-1}$	6.32
Leaf nitrogen concentration	N_l	%	1.4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1 TABLE 2.

2 Yearly and global RMSE and mean bias for the root zone-soil moisture (in $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$), the above-
 3 ground vegetation biomass (in kg m^{-2}), and the LAI (in $\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$) of the analyses (4 model
 4 configurations) and the control simulation. The score E (dimensionless) is indicated.
 5
 6

		2001			2002			2003			2004			2001-2004		
		RMSE	mb	E	RMSE	mb	E	RMSE	mb	E	RMSE	mb	E	RMSE	mb	E
ANALYSIS Fixed w_{wilt}	w_2	0.01	0.03	0.94	0.02	0.01	0.90	0.02	0.01	0.90	0.05	0.04	0.60	0.03	0.01	0.82
	LAI	0.41	0.38	0.65	0.46	0.32	0.62	0.45	-0.07	0.75	0.50	-0.02	0.73	0.48	0.16	0.70
	Biomass	0.13	0.01	0.02	0.16	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.03	0.26	0.12	0.04	0.18	0.14	0.03	0.12
ANALYSIS Dynamic w_{wilt}	w_2	0.01	0.03	0.94	0.02	0.01	0.90	0.02	0.01	0.94	0.04	0.02	0.72	0.03	0.01	0.86
	LAI	0.41	0.38	0.65	0.46	0.32	0.62	0.41	-0.07	0.76	0.45	0.05	0.79	0.47	0.19	0.72
	Biomass	0.13	0.01	-0.21	0.16	0.12	-0.08	0.09	0.03	0.48	0.12	0.04	0.39	0.14	0.08	0.23
ANALYSIS PP=0, fixed w_{wilt}	w_2	0.03	-0.02	0.68	0.05	-0.04	-0.09	0.04	-0.03	0.65	0.05	-0.02	0.66	0.04	-0.03	0.57
	LAI	0.31	-0.02	0.81	0.73	-0.46	0.02	1.16	-0.72	-0.63	0.85	-0.49	0.27	0.82	-0.46	0.14
	Biomass	0.13	-0.07	0.03	0.18	-0.13	-0.38	0.15	-0.08	-0.94	0.11	-0.04	0.47	0.14	-0.08	-0.06
ANALYSIS PP=0, Dynamic w_{wilt}	w_2	0.03	-0.02	0.68	0.05	-0.04	-0.09	0.05	-0.04	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.51	0.05	-0.03	0.47
	LAI	0.30	-0.02	0.86	0.73	-0.46	0.02	0.73	-0.46	0.02	0.73	-0.36	0.46	0.64	-0.29	0.48
	Biomass	0.13	-0.07	0.03	0.18	-0.13	-0.38	0.10	0.03	0.15	0.09	-0.03	0.66	0.13	0.04	0.13
CONTROL	w_2	0.01	-0.005	0.97	0.02	-0.004	0.89	0.03	0.02	0.74	0.05	0.04	0.58	0.03	0.01	0.79
	LAI	0.97	0.47	-0.40	0.60	0.32	0.35	0.79	-0.33	0.25	0.81	-0.12	0.33	0.80	0.09	0.17
	Biomass	0.12	-0.07	0.15	0.19	1.19	-0.47	0.06	-0.03	0.53	0.08	-0.02	0.62	0.13	0.02	0.17

7
8

1 TABLE 3.
 2 Evapotranspiration yearly cumulated flux (LE, in mm year⁻¹) after the assimilation of *LAI* and
 3 *w_g* observations for four different model configurations, and for the control simulation.
 4
 5

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Control	505.8	523.8	407.1	398.8
Analysis fixed <i>w_{wilt}</i>	535.8	520.5	378.5	375.4
Analysis dynamic <i>w_{wilt}</i>	543.8	520.4	400.0	395.2
Analysis fixed <i>w_{wilt}</i> and no rain	230.8	144.7	113.4	156.0
Analysis dynamic <i>w_{wilt}</i> and no rain	230.8	144.7	171.1	174.4

6
 7
 8
 9
 10