

Estimating Evapotranspiration with Land Data Assimilation Systems

C. D. Peters-Lidard^{*1}, S. V. Kumar^{2,1}, D. M. Mocko^{2,1}, and Y. Tian^{3,1}

^{1*}*NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Hydrological Sciences Branch, Code 614.3, Greenbelt, MD*

²*Science Applications International Corporation, Beltsville, MD*

³*Earth System Science Interdisciplinary Center, College Park, MD.*

Submitted to SPECIAL ANNUAL REVIEW ISSUE OF HYDROLOGICAL PROCESSES
July 2011, Revised October 2011

* Corresponding Author: Dr. Christa D. Peters-Lidard, NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, Hydrological Sciences Branch, Code 614.3, Greenbelt, MD 20771 Phone: 301-614-5811; Fax: 301-614-5808; E-mail: christa.peters@nasa.gov; URL: <http://lis.gsfc.nasa.gov>.

Abstract

Advancements in both land surface models (LSM) and land surface data assimilation, especially over the last decade, have substantially advanced the ability of land data assimilation systems (LDAS) to estimate evapotranspiration (ET). This article provides a historical perspective on international LSM intercomparison efforts and the development of LDAS systems, both of which have improved LSM ET skill. In addition, an assessment of ET estimates for current LDAS systems is provided along with current research that demonstrates improvement in LSM ET estimates due to assimilating satellite-based soil moisture products. Using the Ensemble Kalman Filter in the Land Information System, we assimilate both NASA and Land Parameter Retrieval Model (LPRM) soil moisture products into the Noah LSM Version 3.2 with the North American LDAS phase 2 (NLDAS-2) forcing to mimic the NLDAS-2 configuration. Through comparisons with two global reference ET products, one based on interpolated flux tower data and one from a new satellite ET algorithm, over the NLDAS2 domain, we demonstrate improvement in ET estimates only when assimilating the LPRM soil moisture product.

Keywords

Land surface modeling, land data assimilation systems, evapotranspiration, soil moisture assimilation

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Land surface models predict terrestrial water, energy, momentum, and in some cases,
3 biogeochemical exchange processes by solving the governing equations of the soil-vegetation-
4 snowpack medium based on atmospheric boundary conditions including precipitation, radiation,
5 wind, temperature, humidity and pressure. By constraining land surface models with observed
6 atmospheric boundary conditions and land surface states, land surface data assimilation improves
7 our ability to understand and predict terrestrial water and energy fluxes and states, including
8 evapotranspiration. The ability to predict evapotranspiration is critical for applications in weather
9 and climate prediction, agricultural forecasting, water resources management, and hazard
10 mitigation (e.g., NRC, 2010; 2011). Until recently, global or continental land surface modeling at
11 horizontal scales of 1 km or finer was infeasible due to limits in computational and observational
12 resources.

13
14 Land Data Assimilation Systems (LDAS, Figure 1), are typically run “uncoupled” (or
15 “offline”) to estimate water and energy fluxes and states using observationally-based
16 precipitation, radiation and meteorological inputs. However, they may also be run “coupled” to
17 an atmospheric model for weather forecasts.

18
19 This paper reviews current and developing capabilities for estimating evapotranspiration
20 (ET) using land surface models (LSMs) as part of an LDAS. First, we present a survey of land
21 surface modeling for ET estimation, including recent intercomparison studies and LDAS efforts.
22 Next, we compare LSM ET estimates from current LDAS systems to global gridded tower-based
23 and remote sensing-based flux estimates. Finally, we present the results from simulations that

24 employ data assimilation (DA) of remotely sensed soil moisture measurements to improve LSM
25 ET estimates.

26

27 **BACKGROUND**

28 The ability of LSMs or soil-vegetation-atmosphere transfer schemes (SVATS) to predict
29 evapotranspiration has advanced significantly since the original bucket (Manabe, 1969), Simple
30 Biosphere (SiB; Sellers et al., 1986) and Biosphere-Atmosphere Transfer Scheme (BATS;
31 Dickinson et al., 1986) models pioneered at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric
32 Administration's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (NOAA/GFDL), National
33 Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Space Flight Center (NASA/GSFC) and the
34 National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), respectively. Numerous advancements in
35 second-generation LSMs have brought additional focus to snow physics and hydrology, such as
36 the community Noah (Ek et al., 2003; Barlage et al., 2010; Livneh et al., 2010) and the Variable
37 Infiltration Capacity (VIC; Liang et al., 1996; Bowling and Lettenmaier, 2010). So-called "third
38 generation" LSMs include dynamic phenology and carbon stores, such as the Community Land
39 Model (CLM; Bonan et al., 2002; Lawrence et al., 2011). To a large extent, this advancement has
40 come as the result of three key community activities: first, the Global Land Atmosphere System
41 Study (GLASS) intercomparison studies, second, the North American and Global LDAS
42 projects, and third, the recent LandFlux initiatives. Below, we provide background on these
43 efforts, including their major findings related to evapotranspiration estimation from LSMs.

44

45 *GLASS Intercomparison Studies: PILPS, Rhone-AGG, and GSWP*

46 The international GLASS panel, as part of the Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment
47 (GEWEX), has spearheaded three major intercomparison projects designed to evaluate the skill

48 of land surface models for predicting water and energy fluxes and states. The first was the
49 Project to Intercompare Land-Surface Parameterization Schemes (PILPS; Henderson-Sellers et
50 al., 1995; Pitman and Henderson-Sellers 1998). This project focused on a series of evaluations
51 conducted in phases using specified atmospheric boundary conditions and parameters at points or
52 regions. One of the key findings in this project is the documentation of the systematic
53 improvements in LSMs from first-generation (bucket) to second-generation (e.g., SiB, BATS,
54 Noah, VIC) through third generation (e.g., CLM). Another major finding from PILPS is the
55 synthesis work by Koster and Milly (1997), in which it was shown that the interplay between the
56 evaporation and runoff formulations in any LSM, could be expressed via two model-independent
57 quantities: 1) the soil-depth-integrated evaporation sink efficiency and 2) the runoff-generation
58 fraction over this integrated evaporation sink. A third major finding was that hydrologically-
59 oriented models such as VIC were shown to be more skillful for continental scale water budgets.

60

61 The second major GLASS intercomparison projects, which represented a global-scale
62 follow-on to PILPS, were the Global Soil Wetness Projects (GSWPs, Dirmeyer, 2011). GSWP-
63 1 (Dirmeyer et. al, 1999) focused on the International Satellite Land-Surface Climatology Project
64 (ISLSCP) Initiative I forcing data for the period 1987-88, and produced the first ever global,
65 offline, multimodel land analysis based on “best possible” meteorological forcings. In addition,
66 GSWP-1 served as a pathfinder for the NLDAS and GLDAS efforts described below. GSWP-2
67 (Dirmeyer et al., 2006) built on the foundation of GSWP-1, and produced 1 degree global multi-
68 model fluxes and states for the ISLSCP II period from 1986-95 and showed that, in the absence
69 of robust in-situ and/or remotely sensed soil moisture to provide constraints, the best estimate of
70 soil wetness from multiple model products is a simple average. In addition to this finding,

71 GSWP-2 also derived multi-model soil wetness values normalized to the LSM dynamic range
72 controlling the ET-runoff interplay, as described above in the PILPS analyses by Koster and
73 Milly (1997). With respect to ET, GSWP-2 showed that ET has the smallest interannual
74 variability of any water budget variable, and that global average transpiration is about one-third
75 larger than direct evaporation from the soil. For the GSWP-2 period, latent heat flux exceeded
76 sensible heat flux by about 20%, although that may reflect an absence of soil moisture limitations
77 in later periods as observed by Jung et al. (2010) and discussed further below.

78 The third major intercomparison project, which occurred between GSWP-1 and GSWP-2, is
79 known as Rhone-AGG (Boone et al., 2004). Rhone-AGG significantly advanced the
80 community's ability to observationally diagnose deficiencies in LSM hydrological cycles by
81 looking at spatial scaling of water and energy balance processes finer than GSWP (8km vs. 1°),
82 particularly the interplay of high-elevation snow accumulation/melt and lower-elevation
83 streamflow. Techniques for evaluating and diagnosing physical processes with simulated
84 hydrographs helped advance LSM's ability to simulate the daily hydrological cycles at multiple
85 scales, most notably by implementing subgrid runoff formulations and elevation-based tiling for
86 snow pack modeling. Rhone-AGG and GSWP-2 occurred in parallel with and greatly benefitted
87 the development of NLDAS and GLDAS, as described in the following sections.

88

89 *The North American Land Data Assimilation System*

90 The primary goal of the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS; Mitchell
91 et al., 2004; <http://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/nldas/>; <http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/mmb/nldas/>) is to
92 construct quality-controlled, and spatially- and temporally-consistent, land-surface model (LSM)
93 datasets from the best available observations and model outputs. NLDAS is a collaboration
94 project among several groups: NOAA/NCEP's Environmental Modeling Center (EMC), NASA's

95 Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Princeton University, the University of Washington, the
96 NOAA/NWS Office of Hydrological Development (OHD), and the NOAA/NCEP Climate
97 Prediction Center (CPC). The NLDAS project produces a LSM forcing dataset from a daily
98 gauge-based precipitation analysis (temporally disaggregated using hourly radar data, satellite
99 estimates, or other sources), bias-corrected shortwave radiation, and surface meteorology
100 reanalyses. This forcing is used to drive four separate LSMs to generate hourly model outputs of
101 surface fluxes, soil moisture, snow cover, and runoff. The current operational version of
102 NLDAS uses the following LSMs: Noah – from NOAA/NCEP, Mosaic – from GSFC, VIC –
103 from Princeton University, and SAC – from NOAA/OHD. Datasets and simulations from
104 NLDAS Phase 2 (NLDAS-2) extend back to January 1979 and continue to be produced in near
105 real-time on a 1/8th-degree grid over central North America (from 25 to 53N and 125 to 67W).
106 NLDAS individual and ensemble-mean LSMs are also used for drought monitoring and as part
107 of an experimental drought forecast system. The ensemble-mean on the drought monitor is a
108 simple type of a multi-model analysis of LSMs, which have been shown to improve the depiction
109 of simulated states in many ways (e.g., Guo et al., 2007, for GSWP-2 datasets). NLDAS data
110 products are distributed at EMC as well as at the NASA Goddard Earth Sciences Data and
111 Information Services Center (GES DISC; <http://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/hydrology/>).

112

113 The first incarnation of the project, Phase 1 (NLDAS-1), comprised data since October 1996
114 and consisted of a somewhat-similar yet different LSM forcing dataset (Cosgrove et al., 2003).
115 Earlier versions of the same four LSMs (Noah, SAC, VIC, and Mosaic) were used in NLDAS-1
116 as well. NLDAS-1 datasets were extensively evaluated and validated against available
117 observations in numerous studies, including examinations of the forcing (Luo et al., 2003) and of

118 the LSM output (Robock et al., 2003). Robock et al. evaluated the LSM-simulated soil
119 moistures and temperatures against observations from the Oklahoma Mesonet, and also
120 evaluated surface latent, sensible, and ground fluxes using ARM/CART stations. They found
121 that the Noah LSM was closest to the observations of the latent heat flux in this region over a
122 two-year period. Lohmann et al. (2003) intercompared water balance and streamflow between
123 the LSMs and found regional differences up to a factor of 4 in the simulated mean annual runoff
124 and up to a factor of 2 in the mean annual evapotranspiration, with monthly differences even
125 greater. Other land parameters evaluated from NLDAS-1 included soil moisture (Schaake et al.,
126 2004), snow cover extent (Sheffield et al., 2003), and snow water equivalent (Pan et al., 2003).
127 Many of these studies from NLDAS-1 also tested the effects of LSM physics and parameter
128 changes on the evaluation results.

129
130 The NLDAS-2 forcing dataset corrects the daily gauge precipitation analysis using a PRISM
131 (Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes; Daly et al., 1994) method which
132 considers the topographic effect on precipitation. The precipitation is temporally disaggregated
133 to hourly, primarily using Stage II radar data. In locations/times when the radar data is not
134 available, satellite retrievals, a coarser-scale hourly gauge analysis, or reanalysis data is used.
135 The non-precipitation land-surface forcing fields for NLDAS-2 are derived from the analysis
136 fields of the NCEP North American Regional Reanalysis (NARR, Mesinger et al., 2006).
137 Surface pressure, surface downward longwave radiation, and near-surface temperature and
138 humidity fields are vertically adjusted to the terrain on the NLDAS grid. The surface downward
139 shortwave radiation is bias-corrected using GOES satellite observations. NLDAS-2 also
140 contains numerous improvements to the equations of the LSMs as well as their calibration. The

141 snow physics in the Noah LSM was upgraded (Livneh et al., 2010), VIC model parameters were
142 calibrated using streamflow observations (Troy et al., 2008), SAC used an updated potential
143 evaporation dataset (Xia et al., 2011b), and Mosaic used updated model parameters (for details,
144 see Robock et al., 2003). Xia et al. (2011a) analyzed water and energy fluxes in the upgraded
145 NLDAS-2 LSMs, including their ensemble-mean and model spread. In a separate study, Xia et
146 al. (2011c) examined the spatial distribution of the correlation between monthly-mean
147 precipitation and evapotranspiration (ET) the four LSMs; they found that the two soil vegetation
148 atmosphere transfer (SVAT) LSMs (Noah and Mosaic) had a stronger correlation, while the two
149 hydrological LSMs (VIC and SAC) had a stronger correlation between the precipitation and
150 runoff. Wei et al. (2011) evaluated improvements of the Noah LSM related to warm season
151 simulation in NLDAS by adding a seasonally- and spatially-varying LAI as well as
152 modifications to Noah's treatment of the vertical profile of root density, the minimum stomatal
153 resistance parameters, the diurnal variation of surface albedo, the roughness length for heat, and
154 the vapor-pressure and soil moisture deficit terms. This study compared the NLDAS-2 version
155 of Noah to ARM/CART latent heat flux observations and found reduced biases, which also
156 helped improve the simulation of the mean annual water balance. Mo et al. (2011) compared ET
157 from three NLDAS-2 LSMs against Ameriflux observations and found that Noah and VIC
158 tended to exhibit low ET biases in the winter, with slight high ET biases in the summer, despite
159 no apparent biases in NLDAS-2 net radiation. Mosaic generally had higher ET than the
160 observations as well as from Noah and VIC, with a three-member ensemble-mean performing
161 the best., consistent with the findings of GSWP discussed in the previous section. Kovalskyy et
162 al. (2011) estimated evapotranspiration using a scheme that combines a water balance model
163 with an event-driven phenology model, driven with NLDAS-2 forcing; they compared these

164 estimates against ET from the MODerate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS)
165 instrument (Mu et al., 2007) as well as from the NLDAS-2 Mosaic LSM, and showed better
166 agreement to the MODIS-derived ET at the 5-km scale of the study.

167

168 *The Global Land Data Assimilation System*

169 The Global Land Data Assimilation System (GLDAS) led at NASA/GSFC (Rodell et al.,
170 2004a) also uses satellite- and ground-based observations to construct a forcing dataset to drive
171 four LSMs. The four LSMs in GLDAS are Noah, Mosaic, VIC, and CLM, and GLDAS data
172 extends globally from January 1979 at both 1.0-degrees (all LSMs) and 0.25-degrees (Noah
173 only). In addition to extending an NLDAS-style framework to the global scale, GLDAS was one
174 of the first LDASs to routinely assimilate satellite-based surface states to improve simulated
175 water and energy fluxes and states. GLDAS has included data assimilation of MODIS snow
176 cover to constrain the modeled SWE (after Rodell and Houser, 2004), and has also studied the
177 effects of assimilating remotely-sensed skin temperatures and soil moistures. While considering
178 ET produced by GLDAS, Rodell et al. (2004b) compared basin-scale estimates of
179 evapotranspiration produced by GLDAS/Noah and other models against a water balance
180 approach using the Gravity Recovery And Climate Experiment (GRACE) satellites, and found
181 that the GRACE estimates were generally within the range of the model results, and the biases
182 were consistent and the uncertainty on the same order as GRACE.. Kato et al. (2007) examined
183 the choice of LSM, land cover, soils, elevation, and forcings using GLDAS on the simulated
184 latent and sensible heat fluxes and soil moisture compared to CEOP in situ observations. They
185 found that the LSM choice had the biggest effect on the simulated output (including ET), and
186 that ET was most sensitive first to precipitation, then land cover, and then radiation. Syed et al.
187 (2008) compared variations in terrestrial water storage from GRACE compared to GLDAS

188 simulations and found that ET was most effective in dissipating terrestrial water storage in the
189 mid-latitudes. Despite all these detailed studies, however, none have directly evaluated both
190 GLDAS and NLDAS using observations over CONUS. One study that did compare early
191 versions of both systems (Jambor et al.,2002) demonstrated the benefit of satellite-based
192 precipitation used in conjunction with model precipitation in GLDAS while using the gauge-
193 based precipitation in NLDAS as the evaluation dataset. Overall, GLDAS's advancements in
194 land data assimilation and GRACE-based ET estimation significantly advanced the ability of
195 LSMs to estimate ET, subject to observational constraints.

196

197 *The LandFlux Initiative and Reference ET Products*

198 The LandFlux initiative has been coordinated by the GEWEX Radiation Panel to develop
199 and evaluate consistent and high-quality global ET datasets for climate studies. Recently
200 developed capabilities for global ET estimation using LSMs (as discussed above) as well as
201 techniques for synthesizing satellite data, flux tower data, and atmospheric reanalyses provide
202 the opportunity to produce global ET products using different approaches. The LandFlux-EVAL
203 project (Mueller et al., 2011; Jiménez et al., 2011) is currently evaluating multiple global ET
204 products produced using four different categories of techniques: 1) Observations-based
205 diagnostic datasets; 2) observationally-driven “offline” LSM products (e.g., GSWP, GLDAS); 3)
206 atmospheric reanalyses; and 4) IPCC AR4 simulations from 11 GCMs. In Mueller et al., 41
207 global land ET datasets were evaluated along with IPCC AR4 GCM simulations for the 1989–
208 1995 time period. An interesting finding of a cluster analysis conducted as part of this study is
209 that the GLDAS-Noah and CLM products were closely related to two different reference ET
210 products, including the Jung et al., 2009 product described further below.

211

212 Jimémez et al. (2011) evaluated 12 monthly mean land surface ET and other flux products for
213 the period 1993–1995 and found that the 12-product global annual mean latent heat flux (Q_{le})
214 was approximately 45 Wm^{-2} with a spread of approximately 20 Wm^{-2} . Similar spreads were
215 found for sensible (Q_h) and net radiative (R_n) fluxes, with larger spreads for tropical rainforest
216 year-round and grassland or crop in the dry season. Analysis for large river basins indicated
217 large spreads for the Danube, Congo, Volga, and Nile basins, with smaller spreads for other
218 basins, including the Mississippi.

219

220 One of the key reference datasets for the LandFlux-EVAL effort, also used as one of the
221 reference datasets in our LDAS analysis described in subsequent sections, is the Max Planck
222 Institute (MPI) flux dataset from Jung et al., (2009), which was created by synthesizing
223 FLUXNET (Baldocchi et al., 2001) tower data with meteorological forcings and vegetation
224 information from interpolated station and satellite data to produce a global, monthly, $1/2$ degree
225 resolution estimate of land ET from 1982 to 2008. Jung et al. (2010) found that global annual
226 ET has been increasing by approximately 7 mm per year per decade during the period 1982-
227 1997, with moisture limitation eliminating this trend during the period 1998-2008. Another ET
228 product used as a reference dataset in this study is the global 1km ET estimates based on MODIS
229 satellite data (Mu et al., 2011). In this dataset, ET estimates are derived using Mu et al. (2011)'s
230 algorithm, which is improved relative to the previous Mu et al. (2007) work. The ET algorithm is
231 primarily based on the Penman-Monteith equation and considers the surface energy partitioning
232 and environmental constraints to derive ET. In this study, we employ the monthly averaged
233 MOD16 ET datasets.

234

235 Although the LandFlux-EVAL effort has compared model-based GLDAS and GSWP flux
236 estimates to observationally-based MOD16 and MPI reference flux estimates, a key question not
237 previously addressed by LandFlux-EVAL is the extent to which assimilating observed soil
238 moisture can reduce the differences between the model-based and observationally-based flux
239 estimates. Addressing this question is one of the primary motivations of the current work.

240

241 **EXPERIMENTAL SETUP**

242 To illustrate the current capability of the current LDAS systems to simulate
243 evapotranspiration at continental scales, we compare estimates from GLDAS, and two NLDAS-
244 equivalent simulations over the NLDAS-domain with two reference datasets: (1) the gridded
245 FLUXNET dataset from Jung et al. (2009) and (2) the MOD16 dataset developed by Mu et al.
246 (2011). Further, we also present estimates from the NLDAS-equivalent simulations that employ
247 the assimilation of satellite surface soil moisture retrievals. Because the NLDAS uses only a
248 single version of the Noah LSM, we chose to produce our NLDAS-equivalent products using the
249 Land Information System (LIS; Kumar et al., 2006, Peters-Lidard et al., 2007) with Noah
250 versions 2.7.1 and 3.2 so that we can examine the impacts of recent physics changes in Noah on
251 ET estimation. The experiments employ the same domain configuration used in the NLDAS
252 project (from 25-53°N and 125-67°W at 1/8th-degree resolution) and are designed in a manner as
253 similar as possible to the NLDAS-2 Noah model simulations. While the forcings and NLDAS-
254 equivalent simulations are at a 1/8 degree horizontal resolution, we average the outputs to 1/2
255 degree resolution prior to comparisons with the FLUXNET and MOD16 datasets. The GLDAS
256 Noah datasets are similarly averaged from 1/4-degree to the 1/2 degree resolution. The forcing for
257 the NLDAS-equivalent runs is the NLDAS-2 described above. The simulations are run with a 15

258 minute timestep, and the models are spun up by running from 1979 to 1985 and then
259 reinitializing the model from 1979 to generate outputs from 1979-2010.

260

261 In the data assimilation integrations, we employ surface soil moisture data derived from the
262 Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer for the Earth Observing System (AMSR-E) sensor
263 aboard the Aqua satellite. Two different AMSR-E retrieval products are employed in the data
264 assimilation simulations; (1) the NASA Level-3, “AE_Land3” product (version 6, Njoku et al.,
265 2003) and (2) AMSR-E Land Parameter Retrieval Model (LPRM) product developed at NASA
266 GSFC and VU Amsterdam (Owe et al., 2008). The NASA product is primarily based on X-band
267 brightness temperatures, whereas both X-band and C-band brightness temperature-based
268 retrievals are used in the LPRM product. Measurements from both ascending and descending
269 overpasses are used in these products. A number of quality control measures are applied to the
270 soil moisture retrievals prior to data assimilation, similar to the approaches followed in Reichle
271 et al. (2007) and Liu et al. (2011). In the soil moisture products, retrievals flagged for dense
272 vegetation, precipitation, snow cover, frozen ground, and Radio Frequency Interference (RFI)
273 are excluded in the assimilation system. Further, additional quality control is applied based on
274 the information from the land surface model, where the retrievals are excluded when the land
275 surface model indicated active precipitation, non-zero snow cover, frozen soil or dense
276 vegetation (when green vegetation fraction > 0.7).

277

278 The assimilation integrations employ a one-dimensional Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF)
279 algorithm, which is a widely used technique for soil moisture data assimilation (Reichle et al.,
280 2002, Crow and Wood, 2003, Reichle et al., 2007, Kumar et al., 2008, Kumar et al., 2009). An

281 ensemble size of 12 is used in these simulations (Kumar et al., 2008), with perturbations applied
282 to both the meteorological fields and model prognostic fields to simulate uncertainty in the soil
283 moisture fields. The parameters used for these perturbations are listed in Table 1, which are
284 based on earlier data assimilation studies (Kumar et al., 2009). As algorithms such as EnKF are
285 designed to correct random, zero-mean errors and assume the use of unbiased observations
286 relative to the model generated background, it is often a common practice to scale the
287 observations prior to data assimilation to match the model's climatology (Reichle and Koster,
288 2004, Drusch et al., 2005, Reichle et al., 2007, Kumar et al., 2009). Here we employ the
289 Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF)-scaling approach of Reichle and Koster (2004), where
290 the observations (roughly corresponding to a maximum depth of 2cm) are rescaled to the
291 model's 10cm surface soil moisture climatology by matching the CDF of the observations to the
292 CDF of the model soil moisture. The model CDF and observation CDF are computed using 7
293 years of data (2002-2008), separately for each grid point.

294

295 As the soil moisture retrievals are available only from 2002 onwards, the NLDAS-equivalent
296 simulations with data assimilation are conducted during the period of 2002-2008. During this
297 period, we update not only the surface (10cm) soil moisture in Noah, but also the layer 2 through
298 layer 4 soil moisture, following the parameters in Table 1. The comparisons presented in next
299 section are limited to the data assimilation period (2002-2008).

300

301 **CURRENT RESEARCH FINDINGS AND FUTURE WORK**

302 The results presented in this section focus first on the evaluation of the LDAS ET estimates
303 that do not employ data assimilation. This is followed by the description of the impact of soil
304 moisture data assimilation on ET estimation.

305

306 *Evaluation of the ET estimates from LDAS simulations*

307 Table 2 presents the domain-averaged root mean square and bias errors and the associated 95%
308 confidence intervals, for latent (Q_{le}) and sensible (Q_h) heat flux estimates from the three LDAS
309 simulations compared against the gridded FLUXNET and MOD16 datasets. This table also
310 shows results from the data assimilation experiments to be discussed in the next section.
311 Overall, the NLDAS-like simulation using the Noah 2.7.1 model provides better estimates of Q_{le}
312 (RMSE of 19.3 Wm⁻² against FLUXNET and 21.5 Wm⁻² against MOD16) relative to other
313 products. Average seasonal cycles of these error metrics stratified monthly are presented in
314 Figure 2. In both sets of comparisons, the largest differences between the LDAS simulations are
315 observed during the spring and fall months, with NLDAS-like simulations with Noah 2.7.1
316 providing the better estimates. Q_{le} estimates from GLDAS show underestimation in the late
317 summer and fall months and an overestimation in the spring and early summer months, relative
318 to both reference datasets. Comparatively, NLDAS-like integration with Noah 2.7.1 indicates
319 lower biases most months, but the biases are consistently positive. Though Noah 3.2 is a newer
320 version of the Noah model, the flux estimates appear to be degraded overall relative to Noah
321 2.7.1, with the comparison against FLUXNET data indicating more severe degradations relative
322 to the MOD16. This may reflect uncertainty in the reference flux datasets during the springtime,
323 in particular. During the fall months, bias estimates in Noah 3.2 are improved relative to Noah
324 2.7.1 (in the comparisons against FLUXNET), but during spring and summer months, biases in
325 Noah 3.2 ET increase compared to that of Noah 2.7.1. It can be noted that these trends in RMSE
326 and bias errors are highly statistically significant, as indicated by the 95% confidence interval
327 values given for each error estimate. Note that any spatial auto-correlation of RMSE and Bias
328 values across the domain is ignored in computing these confidence intervals. The tight intervals

329 reported in Table 2 are likely to increase if allowances for spatial autocorrelation of errors are
330 included in the confidence interval computations. The trend of increased flux error estimates in
331 Noah 3.2 relative to Noah 2.7.1 is likely a result of the changes in model parameters (such as
332 LAI) along with other changes to Noah's warm season physics as described in Wei et al. (2011).
333 As discussed in the Background section, Wei et al. (2011) showed improvement of these physics
334 changes when compared to ARM/CART flux datasets, whereas our analysis uses gridded data
335 (FLUXNET and MOD16) over the entire NLDAS domain, including many different vegetation
336 types and climate regimes. Other studies (also presented in the Background section) showed
337 Noah 3.2's improved simulation of streamflow, snow, and other hydrologic variables relative to
338 Noah 2.7.1.

339
340 Figure 3 provides an intercomparison of the seasonally-averaged Q_{le} computed using
341 estimates from three consecutive months (DJF represents December-January-February, MAM
342 represents March-April-May, JJA represents June-July-August and SON represents September-
343 October-November) from the three LDAS integrations and the two reference datasets, the
344 gridded FLUXNET and MOD16 product. Relative to FLUXNET, all three LDAS datasets show
345 higher ET in the spring MAM months in the Southeast and Lower Mississippi River Basin.
346 During JJA, however, GLDAS compares much better than the NLDAS-like Noah simulations.
347 Interestingly, the Noah 2.7.1 and Noah 3.2 results for JJA are generally similar except over
348 highly vegetated crop regions in the upper Midwest and the irrigated growing areas along the
349 Mississippi River. Neither reference dataset seems to reflect irrigated areas (see, for example
350 Table 4 in Mu et al., 2011), and the differences in Noah2.7.1 and Noah3.2 do not include
351 irrigation effects, so these differences for crops are likely due to changes in the aerodynamic

352 conductance formulation in Noah, implemented primarily for improved snowmelt modeling.
353 Here, the Noah 3.2 JJA Qle is much higher, indicating that the parameter values used for the
354 vegetation type(s) in these regions may need refinement. A closer look during MAM also shows
355 this same pattern with higher Qle in Noah 3.2 relative to Noah 2.7.1. It can be noted that except
356 MOD16, all other datasets show an artifact of lower Qle in California and West Coast regions.
357 Interestingly, the higher Qle areas for MOD16 do not seem to correspond to known irrigated
358 areas. During the fall SON months, the Qle from GLDAS is low compared to FLUXNET,
359 particularly over the Upper Plains and Southeast; the Noah simulations show a pattern overall
360 much closer to FLUXNET, but with too high Qle magnitudes right along the Gulf Coast.
361 MOD16, on the other hand, indicates lower Qle over the High plains consistent with GLDAS,
362 and higher Qle over the Southeast, consistent with the NLDAS-based estimates.

363

364 *Impact of soil moisture data assimilation on ET estimates*

365 Figure 4 provides a comparison of the average seasonal cycles of RMSE and Bias in Qle
366 estimates (again, relative to the two reference datasets) from the NLDAS-like simulation without
367 any data assimilation (termed as the "open loop" (OL) simulation) and the two integrations that
368 employ the assimilation of surface soil moisture retrievals from NASA and LPRM products
369 (NASA-DA and LPRM-DA, respectively). In this comparison, all three model integrations
370 employ Noah 3.2. It can first be observed that the assimilation of soil moisture retrievals impact
371 the Qle estimates, primarily during the summer and fall months. The Qle estimates from the open
372 loop simulation are systematically improved by the assimilation of LPRM soil moisture
373 retrievals, whereas the assimilation of NASA retrievals shows degradation. Compared to
374 FLUXNET, the domain averaged RMSE of the open loop integration is 27.6 Wm^{-2} and it
375 increases to 29.4 Wm^{-2} in the NASA-DA integration (Table 2). The improvements shown in

376 Figure 4 from LPRM-DA translates to a domain averaged RMSE of 25.6 Wm^{-2} when compared
377 to FLUXNET. The trends in RMSE and Bias are similar in the comparisons against MOD16.
378 The RMSE of the open loop integration is 22.7 Wm^{-2} and it improves to 21.9 Wm^{-2} with the
379 assimilation of LPRM soil moisture retrievals. The assimilation of NASA soil moisture retrievals
380 degrades the ET estimates, with a domain averaged RMSE of 24.5 Wm^{-2} .

381
382 To quantify the spatial improvements due to assimilation, we define an "improvement
383 metric" as difference between the RMSE of the integration with data assimilation and the RMSE
384 of the open loop integration (RMSE (DA) – RMSE (OL)). If data assimilation improves the flux
385 estimates (i.e., reduces the RMSE), then the improvement metric will be negative. On the other
386 hand, the improvement metric will be positive if the assimilation simulation degrades the flux
387 estimates. Figures 5 and 6 present a comparison of the improvement metric stratified seasonally,
388 from both assimilation integrations, as compared to both reference ET datasets. Figure 5
389 represents the improvement metric when using the NASA AMSR-E product and Figure 6 shows
390 the corresponding comparisons when using the LPRM product. In both sets of comparisons, the
391 LPRM-based assimilation provides more systematic improvements in the flux estimates, whereas
392 the NASA-based integration indicates degradations over several regions. For example, during
393 MAM months, the flux estimates from NASA-DA show degradation over the Southern Great
394 Plains, with improvements observed over Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and areas along the Mississippi
395 river; these are the same areas discussed earlier in Figure 3 where Noah 3.2 had higher simulated
396 ET. The LPRM-integration on the other hand, shows improvements over large areas of
397 Midwest, and South-central U.S during MAM, with no significant degradations observed as a
398 result of soil moisture assimilation. During JJA, the NASA-DA shows degradations in most

399 regions interspersed with improvements over a few regions near North Dakota, Illinois, Eastern
400 Texas and the West coast, in the comparisons using the FLUXNET data. The MOD16-based
401 comparisons show similar results, with small regions of improvements over the Central and
402 Eastern US with degradations over most of the domain. In contrast, the JJA comparisons for
403 LPRM-DA show degradations in a few regions only, with improvements observed over large
404 areas of the Midwest U.S. During the SON months, similar trends are seen, with degradations
405 over Mexico and regions near Ohio and Illinois (when compared to FLUXNET) and Mississippi
406 river basin areas (when compared to MOD16). The LPRM-DA based simulations show
407 improvements over Midwest and Central US in the comparisons against MOD16 and no
408 significant degradations in the comparisons against FLUXNET.

409 Further analysis of the differences shown in Figures 5 and 6 reveals that the magnitudes of
410 the differences are strongly related to landcover type. Based on further analysis (not shown),
411 stratifying the Qle RMSE improvements due to DA with respect to landcover type, we found that
412 the most significant improvements occur in croplands for both soil moisture datasets and both
413 reference datasets. Grassland was also found to have significant changes in Qle RMSE with both
414 datasets, and more so with respect to the MOD16 reference data. In general, DA does not occur
415 over heavily vegetated regions, due to masking out high-vegetation water content areas which
416 make soil moisture retrievals difficult. Nonetheless, our results suggest modest changes over
417 evergreen needleleaf forests and woodlands, especially for the NASA product.

418

419 In order to relate the improvements and degradations in latent heat flux estimates to changes
420 in soil moisture resulting from data assimilation, we present a comparison of the surface soil
421 moisture difference maps in Figure 7. The difference maps represent the mean surface soil

422 moisture of the data assimilation integration subtracted by the mean surface soil moisture of the
423 open loop integration. In other words, the difference maps represent the changes in soil moisture
424 values introduced by data assimilation, averaged seasonally. A negative difference indicates that
425 the soil moisture is drier due to assimilation and a positive difference indicates that the soil
426 moisture is wetter from assimilation. By comparing Figures 5 and 6 against Figure 7, it can be
427 observed that the spatial patterns of the improvement metric correlates well with those of the soil
428 moisture difference maps. For example, during MAM, both the NASA-DA and the NASA-
429 LPRM (with a smaller magnitude) soil moisture difference maps indicate drier patterns over
430 Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and areas along the Mississippi river that leads to corresponding
431 improvements in latent flux estimates (Figure 5) over these same regions. During JJA, the soil
432 moisture changes due to assimilation of NASA and LPRM are generally of opposite sign, and
433 seem to show a mix of improvements and degradations in the fluxes, depending on landcover. .
434 During SON, assimilation of NASA retrievals dries the soil moisture over Lower Texas and
435 Mexico (relative to OL) and it leads to a corresponding degradation in the flux estimates over
436 these regions when compared to FLUXNET (Figure 5, panel for SON). Similar patterns of tight
437 correlation between the soil moisture difference patterns and the flux improvement patterns can
438 be observed in the LPRM-DA integration. During JJA, over the Midwest US, the LPRM-DA
439 causes the soil moisture simulations to be drier than the open loop simulation leading to
440 improvements in the latent heat flux estimates over the same areas.

441

442 It is important to note that the CDF-scaling approach for data assimilation used here (and
443 described previously) is intended to preserve the soil moisture climatology of the LSM, while
444 taking advantage of observed anomalies. Therefore, the results suggest that the

445 improvements/degradations in Q_{le} due to soil moisture assimilation are a direct result of
446 improved/degraded soil moisture stress responses in the stomatal resistance formulation of the
447 Noah 3.2 LSM. This sort of non-linear feedback is likely due to the ability of LPRM-DA to
448 redistribute water in a seasonal cycle that corresponds to Noah's biases in soil moisture and ET.
449 By design, and verified by us (not shown) the soil moisture increments from both NASA-DA and
450 LPRM-DA do not change the mean surface soil moisture relative to the open loop. However, as
451 most easily explained via the bias time series in Figure 4, significant seasonal changes in soil
452 moisture, translate into varying ET responses. In winter, the change in ET from the OL to the
453 DA is nominal (since R_{net} , and therefore Q_{le} is small). In spring, LPRM tends to reduce soil
454 moisture relative to the open loop and therefore Q_{le} bias while NASA-DA increases soil
455 moisture and Q_{le} bias. In the summer, the open loop skill is higher, and both products further
456 compensate for errors, with LPRM tending to overdry and NASA tending too wet. Overall, the
457 net effect is a domain-averaged increase of 2 Wm^{-2} in total Q_{le} for the LPRM-DA, and a 3 Wm^{-2}
458 reduction in Q_{le} for NASA-DA.

459

460 *Evaluation of the surface energy partition from LDAS simulations*

461 The surface energy partition consists of two key components, the latent heat and the sensible
462 heat fluxes. Though the primary focus of this article is to evaluate the latent heat estimates, we
463 also evaluated the sensible heat flux (Q_h) estimates from the LDAS simulations using
464 FLUXNET data to examine if the trends seen in the Q_{le} estimates are consistent for both energy
465 partition terms. Trends in error metrics similar to those seen with latent heat flux estimates are
466 found in the sensible heat estimates. As shown in Table 2, Q_h estimates from GLDAS has a
467 domain averaged RMSE of 23.4 Wm^{-2} whereas the NLDAS-like simulations with Noah 2.7.1
468 and Noah 3.2 have domain averaged RMSEs of 21.1 and 32.5 Wm^{-2} , respectively. The

469 assimilation with LPRM data improves the domain averaged RMSE to 30.4 Wm^{-2} (over that of
470 the open loop integration NLDAS-like simulation with Noah 3.2), whereas the assimilation of
471 NASA retrievals degrades the sensible heat flux estimates with a domain averaged RMSE of
472 34.5 Wm^{-2} . Spatial patterns of improvements and degradations similar to that seen in Figures 5
473 and 6 are observed for sensible heat fluxes as well (not shown; for FLUXNET only, as Q_h is not
474 available from MOD16). Again, these trends are statistically significant, as seen from the
475 confidence interval values presented in Table 2.

476

477 **SUMMARY**

478 This article provides a description of the capabilities of Land Data Assimilation Systems (LDAS)
479 for generating ET estimates and presents a quantitative evaluation of ET estimates, expressed as
480 latent heat flux (Q_{le}), from a number of LDAS simulations. The simulated ET values from
481 GLDAS and LSM simulations conducted over the NLDAS-domain using two different versions
482 of the Noah land surface model (Noah version 2.7.1 and version 3.2) are compared against two
483 reference ET datasets: the gridded tower-based estimates from the FLUXNET measurements and
484 ET estimates based on MODIS satellite data, known as the MOD16 product. The article also
485 presents an evaluation of the impact of soil moisture data assimilation in ET estimation. The data
486 assimilation integrations employ two different retrievals of the AMSR-E soil moisture
487 measurements; the NASA Level-3 product and the AMSR-E Land Parameter Retrieval Model
488 product from VU Amsterdam.

489

490 The evaluation of ET fields indicate that the simulation using NLDAS forcing with Noah
491 2.7.1 provides slightly better estimates among the LDAS simulations without data assimilation,
492 although all Noah simulations suffer from significant high biases relative to the two reference

493 dataset. This could be due to a combination of parameter and structural errors in addition to
494 errors in the reference data themselves. The three LDAS simulations differ most during the
495 spring and fall months. Comparison of the seasonally averaged ET fluxes show overestimations
496 during MAM in all three LDAS products over the Southeast and Lower Mississippi River basin.
497 During JJA, the differences between the two Noah model-based simulations are more prominent
498 over vegetated crop regions in the upper Midwest and irrigated areas along the Mississippi river.
499 GLDAS product shows underestimation in ET during the SON months, whereas the NLDAS-
500 forced Noah simulations show better agreement with both FLUXNET and MOD16 estimates
501 during this period.

502

503 The assimilation of surface soil moisture impacts the ET estimates, particularly during the spring
504 (MAM) and summer (JJA) months, which is when the expected impacts would be largest due to
505 increasing soil moisture stress, insolation, and vegetation fraction conditions. The assimilation of
506 LPRM retrievals demonstrates systematic, statistically significant but modest improvements in
507 ET estimates relative to the Noah model simulation without data assimilation. The assimilation
508 of NASA retrievals, on the other hand, provides mixed results, with improvements in a few
509 regions of the NLDAS-domain. Overall, the integration using the NASA soil moisture retrievals
510 indicates degradation of the open loop ET estimates. The results also indicate strong correlations
511 between the improvements/degradations of ET estimates and the changes in soil moisture fields
512 introduced by soil moisture assimilation. Finally, the analysis of the sensible heat flux estimates
513 indicates consistent trends in both surface energy partition terms (latent and sensible estimates).

514

515 **Acknowledgements**

516 We gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the NASA Earth Science Technology
517 Office (ESTO) (Advanced Information System Technology program award AIST-08-077), the
518 NASA Energy and Water Cycle Study (NEWS), the Air Force Weather Agency, and NOAA's
519 Climate Program Office. The efforts of NLDAS participants in generating the surface forcing is
520 greatly appreciated. Some of the data used in this effort were acquired as part of the activities of
521 NASA's Science Mission Directorate, and are archived and distributed by the Goddard Earth
522 Sciences (GES) Data and Information Services Center (DISC). Computing was supported by the
523 resources at the NASA Center for Climate Simulation.

524

525

526 **REFERENCES**

- 527 Baldocchi, D., et al., 2001; FLUXNET: A new tool to study the temporal and spatial variability
528 of ecosystem-scale carbon dioxide, water vapor, and energy flux densities, Bull. Am.
529 Meteorol. Soc., 82(11), 2415–2434.
- 530 Barlage, M., F. Chen, M. Tewari, K. Ikeda, D. Gochis, J. Dudhia, R. Rasmussen, B. Livneh, M.
531 Ek, and K. Mitchell, 2010: Noah land surface model modifications to improve snowpack
532 prediction in the Colorado Rocky Mountains, J. Geophys. Res., 115, D22101,
533 doi:10.1029/2009JD013470.
- 534 Bonan, G. B., K. W. Oleson, M. Vertenstein, S. Levis, X. Zeng, Y. Dai, R. E. Dickinson, Z-L.
535 Yang, 2002: The land surface climatology of the community land model coupled to the
536 NCAR community climate model, J. Clim., 15 (22), 3123-3149.
- 537 Boone, A., F. Habets, J. Noilhan, E. Blyth, D. Clark, P. Dirmeyer, Y. Gusev, I. Haddeland, R.
538 Koster, D. Lohmann, S. Mahanama, K. Mitchell, O. Nasanova, G.-Y. Niu, A. Pitman, J.
539 Polcher, A. B. Shmakin, K. Tanaka, B. van den Hurk, S. Verant, D. Verseghy, and P.
540 Viterbo, 2004: The Rhône-aggregation land surface scheme intercomparison project: An
541 overview. J. Climate, 17, 187-208, doi: 10.1175/1520-
542 0442(2004)017<0187:TRLSSI>2.0.CO;2.
- 543 Bowling, L.C. and D.P. Lettenmaier, 2010: Modeling the effects of lakes and wetlands on the
544 water balance of Arctic Environments, J. Hydromet., 11, 276-295, doi:
545 10.1175/2009JHM1084.1.
- 546 Cosgrove, B.A., D. Lohmann, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, E.F. Wood, J. Schaake, A. Robock, C.
547 Marshall, J. Sheffield, L. Luo, Q. Duan, R.T. Pinker, J.D. Tarpley, R.W. Higgins, and J.
548 Meng, 2003: Real-time and retrospective forcing in the North American Land Data

549 Assimilation System (NLDAS) project. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D22), 8842,
550 doi:10.1029/2002JD003118.

551 Crow, W.T. and E.F. Wood, 2003: The assimilation of remotely sensed soil brightness
552 temperature imagery into a land surface model using ensemble kalman filtering: A case
553 study based on ESTAR measurements during SGP97. *Advances in Water Resources*, 26,
554 137-149.

555 Dai, Y., X. Zeng, R.E. Dickinson, I. Baker, G.B. Bonan, M.G. Bosilovich, A.S. Denning, P.A.
556 Dirmeyer, P.R. Houser, G.-Y. Niu, K.W. Oleson, C.A. Schlosser and Z.-L. Yang, 2003:
557 The Common Land Model (CLM), *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, Vol. 84, No. 8, 1013-1024.

558 Daly, C., R.P. Neilson, and D.L. Phillips, 1994: A statistical-topographic model for mapping
559 climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 33, 140-158, doi:
560 10.1175/1520-0450(1994)033<0140:ASTMFM>2.0.CO;2.

561 Dickinson, R. E., A. Henderson-Sellers, P. J. Kennedy, and M. F. Wilson, 1986: Biosphere–
562 atmosphere transfer scheme (BATS) for the NCAR Community Climate Model. Tech.
563 Note TN-275+STR, 69 pp.

564 Drusch, M., 2007: Initializing numerical weather prediction models with satellite derived surface
565 soil moisture: Data assimilation experiments with ECMWF's integrated forecast system
566 and the TMI soil moisture dataset. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D03102,
567 doi:10.1029/2006JD007478.

568 Dirmeyer, P. A., 2011: A history of the Global Soil Wetness Project (GSWP). *J. Hydrometeor.*,
569 (in press), doi: 10.1175/JHM-D-10-05010.1.

570 Dirmeyer, Paul A., A. J. Dolman, Nobuo Sato, 1999: The Pilot Phase of the Global Soil Wetness
571 Project. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 80, 851–878, doi: 10.1175/1520-
572 0477(1999)080<0851:TPPOTG>2.0.CO;2

573 Dirmeyer, Paul A., Xiang Gao, Mei Zhao, Zhichang Guo, Taikan Oki, Naota Hanasaki, 2006:
574 GSWP-2: Multimodel Analysis and Implications for Our Perception of the Land Surface.
575 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 87, 1381–1397, doi: 10.1175/BAMS-87-10-1381.

576 Ek, M. B., K. E. Mitchell, Y. Lin, E. Rogers, P. Grunmann, V. Koren, G. Gayno, and J. D.
577 Tarpley, (2003), Implementation of Noah land-surface model advances in the NCEP
578 operational mesoscale Eta model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D22), 8851, doi:
579 10.1029/2002JD003296.

580 Guo, Z., P. A. Dirmeyer, X. Gao, and M. Zhao, 2007: Improving the quality of simulated soil
581 moisture with a multi-model ensemble approach. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 133, 731-
582 747.

583 Henderson-Sellers, A., A. J. Pitman, P. K. Love, P. Irannejad, and T. H. Chen, 1995: The Project
584 for Intercomparison of Land Surface Parameterization Schemes (PILPS): Phases 2 and 3.
585 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 76, 489–503.

586 Jambor, U., P.R. Houser, M. Rodell, et al., 2002: Remotely sensed forcing data and the Global
587 Land Data Assimilation System. *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing*
588 *Symposium (IGARSS 2002)/24th Canadian Symposium on Remote Sensing, 24-28 Jun*
589 *2002, Toronto, Canada; Vols. I-VI, Proceedings – Remote Sensing: Integrating Our View*
590 *of the Planet, pp. 1405-1407.*

591 Jiménez, C., et al., 2011; Global intercomparison of 12 land surface heat flux estimates, *J.*
592 *Geophys. Res.*, 116, D02102, doi:10.1029/2010JD014545.

593 Jung, M., M. Reichstein, and A. Bondeau, 2009: Towards global empirical upscaling of
594 FLUXNET eddy covariance observations: validation of a model tree ensemble approach
595 using a biosphere model, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 2001-2013.

596 Jung, M., M. Reichstein, P. Ciais, S.I.Seneviratne, J. Sheffield, M.L. Goulden, G. Bonan, A.
597 Cescatti, J. Chen, R. de Jeu, A. Johnnes Dolman, W. Eugster, D. Gerten, D. Gianelle, N.
598 Gobron, J. Heinke, J. Kimball, B. E. Law, L. Montagnani, Q. Mu, B. Mueller, K. Oleson,
599 D. Papale, A.D. Richardson, O. Roupsard, S. Running, E. Tomelleri, N. Viovy, U.
600 Weber, C. Williams, E. Wood, S. Zaehle and K. Zhang, 2010: Recent decline in the
601 global land evapotranspiration trend due to limited moisture supply, *Nature*,
602 doi:10.1038/nature09396.

603 Kato, H., M. Rodell, F. Beyrich, H. Cleugh, E. van Gorsel, H. Liu, and T.P. Meyers, 2007:
604 Sensitivity of land surface simulations to model physics, land characteristics, and
605 forcings at four CEOP sites. *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, 85A, 187-204.

606 Koster, R. D., and P. C. D. Milly, 1997: The interplay between transpiration and runoff
607 formulations in land surface schemes used with atmospheric models. *J. Climate*, 10,
608 1578–1591.

609 Kovalskyy, V., G.M. Henebry, B. Adusei, M. Hansen, D.P. Roy, and D.M. Mocko, 2011:
610 Spatially explicit comparison and performance assessment of an event driven phenology
611 model coupled with VegET evapotranspiration model. To be submitted to *J. Geophys.*
612 *Res.*

613 Kumar, S. V., C. D. Peters-Lidard, Y. Tian, J. Geiger, P. R. Houser, S. Olden, L. Lighty, J. L.
614 Eastman, P. Dirmeyer, B. Doty, J. Adams, E. Wood and J. Sheffield, 2006: LIS - An

615 Interoperable Framework for High Resolution Land Surface Modeling, *Environmental*
616 *Modeling and Software*, 21, 1402-1415.

617 Kumar, S.V., R. H. Reichle, C. D. Peters-Lidard, R. Koster, X. Zhan, W. Crow, J. Eylander, and
618 P.R. Houser, 2008: A land surface data assimilation framework using the Land
619 Information System: Description and Applications, *Advances in Water Resources*, 31,
620 1419-1432, doi: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2008.01.013.

621 Kumar, S.V., R.H. Reichle, R.Koster, W.T. Crow, and C.D. Peters-Lidard, 2009: Role of
622 subsurface physics in the assimilation of surface soil moisture observations, *Journal of*
623 *Hydrometeorology*, doi:10.1175/2009JHM1134.1.

624 Lawrence, D.M., K.W. Oleson, M.G. Flanner, P.E. Thornton, S.C. Swenson, P.J. Lawrence, X.
625 Zeng, Z.-L. Yang, S. Levis, K. Sakaguchi, G.B. Bonan, and A.G. Slater, 2011:
626 Parameterization improvements and functional and structural advances in version 4 of the
627 Community Land Model. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Sys.*, 3, DOI: 10.1029/2011MS000045.

628 Livneh, B., Y. Xia, K. E. Mitchell, M. B. Ek, and D. P. Lettenmaier, 2010: Noah LSM Snow
629 Model Diagnostics and Enhancements, *J. Hydromet.*, 11, 721-738.

630 Liang, X., E. F. Wood, and D. Lettenmaier, Surface and soil moisture parameterization of the
631 VIC-2L model: Evaluation and modifications, 1996: *Global Planet. Change*, 13, 195-206.

632 Liu, Q., R.H. Reichle, R. Bindlish, M.H. Cosh, W.T. Crow, R. de Jeu, G.J.M. De Lannoy, G.J.
633 Huffman, T.J. Jackson, 2011: The contributions of precipitation and soil moisture
634 observations to the skill of soil moisture estimates in a land data assimilation system,
635 *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-10.05000.

636 Livneh, B, Y. Xia, K.E. Mitchell, M.B. Ek, and D. Lettenmaier, 2010: Noah LSM snow model
637 diagnostics and enhancements. *J. Hydrometeor.*, 11, 721–738.

638 Lohmann, D., K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, E.F. Wood, J.C. Schaake, A. Robock, B.A. Cosgrove,
639 J. Sheffield, Q. Duan, L. Luo, W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, and J.D. Tarpley, 2004:
640 Streamflow and water balance intercomparisons of four land surface models in the North
641 American Land Data Assimilation System project. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D07S91,
642 doi:10.1029/2003JD003517.

643 Luo, L., A. Robock, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, E.F. Wood, J.C. Schaake, D. Lohmann, B.A.
644 Cosgrove, F. Wen, J. Sheffield, Q. Duan, R.W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, and J.D. Tarpley,
645 2003: Validation of the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS)
646 retrospective forcing over the southern Great Plains. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D22), 8843,
647 doi:10.1029/2002JD003246.

648 Manabe, S., 1969: Climate and the circulation. I. The atmospheric circulation and the hydrology
649 of the earth's surface. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 97, 739–774.

650 Mesinger, F., G. DiMego, E. Kalnay, K.E. Mitchell, P.C. Shafran, W. Ebisuzaki, D. Jovic, J.
651 Woollen, E. Rogers, E.H. Berbery, M.B. Ek, Y. Fan, R. Grumbine, W. Higgins, H. Li, Y.
652 Lin, G. Manikin, D. Parrish, and W. Shi., 2006: North American Regional Reanalysis.
653 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 87, 343-360.

654 Mitchell, K.E., D. Lohmann, P.R. Houser, E.F. Wood, J.C. Schaake, A. Robock, B.A. Cosgrove,
655 J. Sheffield, Q. Duan, L. Luo, R.W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, J.D. Tarpley, D.P. Lettenmaier,
656 C.H. Marshall, J.K. Entin, M. Pan, W. Shi, V. Koren, J. Meng, B. H. Ramsay, and A.A.
657 Bailey, 2004: The multi-institution North American Land Data Assimilation System
658 (NLDAS): Utilizing multiple GCIP products and partners in a continental distributed
659 hydrological modeling system. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D07S90,
660 doi:10.1029/2003JD003823.

661 Mo, K.C., L.N. Long, Y. Xia, S.K. Yang, J.E. Schemm, and M. Ek, 2011: Drought Indices Based
662 on the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis and Ensemble NLDAS. *J. Hydrometeor.*,
663 12(2), 181-205, doi:10.1175/2010JHM1310.1.

664 Mu, Q., F.A. Heinsch, M. Zhao, and S. Running, 2007: Development of a global
665 evapotranspiration algorithm based on MODIS and global meteorology data, *Remote*
666 *Sensing of Environment*, 111(4), 519-536.

667 Mu, Q., M. Zhao, S.W. Running, 2011: Improvements to a MODIS Global Terrestrial
668 Evapotranspiration Algorithm, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, in press.

669 Mueller, B., et al., 2011: Evaluation of global observations-based evapotranspiration datasets
670 and IPCC AR4 simulations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L06402,
671 doi:10.1029/2010GL046230.

672 National Research Council, 2011: *Global Change and Extreme Hydrology: Testing Conventional*
673 *Wisdom*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 60pp.

674 National Research Council, 2010: *Assessment of Intraseasonal to Interannual Climate Prediction*
675 *and Predictability*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 192pp.

676 Njoku, E.G., T.L. Jackson, V. Lakshmi, T.Chan, and S.V. Nghiem, 2003: Soil moisture retrieval
677 from AMSR-E, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 41 (2): 215-229.

678 Owe, M., R.A.M. de Jeu, and T.R. H. Holmes, 2008: Multi-sensor historical climatology of
679 satellite-derived global land surface moisture, *J. Geophys. Res.* 13, F01002,
680 doi:1029/2007JF000769.

681 Pan, M., P. Ming, J. Sheffield, E.F. Wood, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, J.C. Schaake, A. Robock,
682 D. Lohmann, B. Cosgrove, Q. Duan, L. Luo, R.W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, and J.D.
683 Tarpley, 2003: Snow process modeling in the North American Land Data Assimilation

684 System (NLDAS): 2. Evaluation of model simulated snow water equivalent. *J. Geophys.*
685 *Res.*, 108(D22), 8850, doi:10.1029/2003JD003994.

686 Peters-Lidard, C.D., P.R. Houser, Y. Tian, S.V. Kumar, J.V. Geiger, S. Olden, L. Lighty, J.L.
687 Eastman, B. Doty, P. Dirmeyer, J. Adams, K. Mitchell, E.F. Wood, and J. Sheffield,
688 2007: High-performance earth system modeling with NASA/GSFC's Land Information
689 System, *Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering*, 3(3), 157-165.

690 Pitman, A. J., and A. Henderson-Sellers, 1998: Recent progress and results from the Project for
691 the Intercomparison of Landsurface Parameterizations Schemes. *J. Hydrol.*, 212–213,
692 128–135.

693 Reichle, R.H., D. M. McLaughlin, and D.A. Entekhabi, 2002: Hydrologic data assimilation with
694 the ensemble Kalman filter, *Monthly Weather Review*, 130, 1, 103-114.

695 Reichle, R.H. and R Koster, 2004: Bias reduction in short records of satellite soil moisture,
696 *Geophys. Res. Lett.* L19501,doi:10.1029/2004GL020938.

697 Reichle, R.H., R.D. Koster, P. Liu, S.P.P. Mahanama, E.G. Njoku, and M. Owe, 2007:
698 Comparison and assimilation of global soil moisture retrievals from the Advanced
699 Microwave Scanning Radiometer for the Earth Observing System (AMSR-E) and the
700 Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112,
701 D09108, doi:10.1029/2006JD008033.

702 Robock, A., L. Luo, E.F. Wood, F. Wen, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, J.C. Schaake, D. Lohmann,
703 B. Cosgrove, J. Sheffield, Q. Duan, R.W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, J.D. Tarpley, J.B. Basara,
704 and K.C. Crawford, 2003: Evaluation of the North American Land Data Assimilation
705 System over the southern Great Plains during the warm season. *J. Geophys. Res.*,
706 108(D22), 8846, doi:10.1029/2002JD003245.

707 Rodell, M., P.R. Houser, U. Jambor, J. Gottschalck, K. Mitchell, C.-J. Meng, K. Arsenault, B.
708 Cosgrove, J. Radakovich, M. Bosilovich, J.K. Entin, J.P. Walker, D. Lohmann, and D.
709 Toll, 2004a The Global Land Data Assimilation System. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*,
710 85(3), 381-394.

711 Rodell, M., J.S. Famiglietti, J. Chen, S. Seneviratne, P. Viterbo, S. Holl, and C. R. Wilson,
712 2004b: Basin scale estimates of evapotranspiration using GRACE and other observations.
713 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L20504, doi:10.1029/2004GL020873.

714 Rodell, M., and P.R. Houser, Updating a land surface model with MODIS derived snow cover,
715 2004, *J. Hydromet.*, 5(6), 1064-1075.

716 Schaake, J.C., Q. Duan, V. Koren, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, E.F. Wood, A. Robock, D.P.
717 Lettenmaier, D. Lohmann, B.A. Cosgrove, J. Sheffield, L. Luo, R.W. Higgins, R.T.
718 Pinker, and J.D. Tarpley, 2004: An intercomparison of soil moisture fields in the North
719 American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS). *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D01S90,
720 doi:10.1029/2002JD003309.

721 Sellers, P. J., Y. Mintz, Y. C. Sud, and A. Dalcher, 1986: A simple biosphere model (SiB) for
722 use within general circulation models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 43, 505–531.

723 Sheffield, J., M. Pan, E.F. Wood, K.E. Mitchell, P.R. Houser, J.C. Schaake, A. Robock, D.
724 Lohmann, B. Cosgrove, Q. Duan, L. Luo, R.W. Higgins, R.T. Pinker, J. Dan Tarpley, and
725 B.H. Ramsay, 2003: Snow process modeling in the North American Land Data
726 Assimilation System (NLDAS): 1. Evaluation of model-simulated snow cover extent. *J.*
727 *Geophys. Res.*, 108(D22), 8849, doi:10.1029/2002JD003274.

728 Syed, T.H., J.S. Famiglietti, M. Rodell, J.L. Chen, and C.R. Wilson, 2008: Analysis of terrestrial
729 water storage changes from GRACE and GLDAS. *Water Resour. Res.*, 44, W02433,
730 doi:10.1029/2006WR005779.

731 Troy, T.J., E.F. Wood, and J. Sheffield, 2008: An efficient calibration method for continental-
732 scale land surface modeling. *Water Resour. Res.*, 44, W09411,
733 doi:10.1029/2007WR006513.

734 Wei, H., Y. Xia, K.E. Mitchell, and M.B. Ek, 2011: Improvement of the Noah Land Surface
735 Model for Warm Season Processes: Evaluation of Water and Energy Flux Simulation.
736 To be submitted to *Geophys. Res. Letters*.

737 Xia, Y., K. Mitchell, M. Ek, J. Sheffield, E.F. Wood, B. Cosgrove, L. Luo, C. Alonge, H. Wei, J.
738 Meng, B. Livneh, D. Lettenmaier, V. Koren, Y. Duan, K. Mo, and Y. Fan, 2011a:
739 Continental-Scale Water and Energy Flux Analysis and Validation for the North-
740 American Land Data Assimilation System Project Phase 2 (NLDAS-2), Part 1:
741 Comparison Analysis and Application of Model Products. To be submitted to *J.*
742 *Geophys. Res.*

743 Xia, Y., K. Mitchell, M. Ek, J. Sheffield, B. Cosgrove, L. Luo, C. Alonge, H. Wei, J. Meng, B.
744 Livneh, Y. Duan, and D. Lohmann, 2011b: Continental-Scale Water and Energy Flux
745 Analysis and Validation for the North-American Land Data Assimilation System Project
746 Phase 2 (NLDAS-2), Part 2: Validation of Model-Simulated Streamflow. To be
747 submitted to *J. Geophys. Res.*

748 Xia, Y., M. Ek, H. Wei, and J. Meng, 2011c: Comparative Analysis of Relationships between
749 NLDAS-2 Forcings and Model Outputs. Submitted to *Hydrological Processes*.

750

751 **List of Tables**

752

753 Table 1: Parameters for perturbations to meteorological forcings and soil moisture prognostic
754 model variables in the data assimilation integrations. 37

755 Table 2: NLDAS domain-averaged root mean square and bias errors (all with 95% confidence
756 intervals) in latent heat flux (Q_{le}) and sensible heat flux (Q_h) estimates from five LDAS
757 simulations with respect to two reference datasets : (1) the gridded FLUXNET data from Jung et
758 al., (2009) and (2) MOD16 data from Mu et al. (2011), which only provides Q_{le} . Two of the
759 NLDAS simulations show differences due to Noah version, and two of the NLDAS simulations
760 include soil moisture data assimilation from the NASA and LPRM products, as discussed in the
761 text..... 38

762

763

764

765 **Table 1: Parameters for perturbations to meteorological forcings and soil moisture**
 766 **prognostic model variables in the data assimilation integrations.**

Variable	Perturbation Type	Standard Deviation	Cross Correlations with perturbations in			
Meteorological Forcings						
			Downward Shortwave	Downward Longwave	Precipitation	
Downward Shortwave	Multiplicative	0.3 [-]	1.0	-0.5	-0.8	
Downward Longwave	Additive	50 Wm ⁻²	-0.5	1.0	0.5	
Precipitation	Multiplicative	0.5 [-]	-0.8	0.5	1.0	
Noah LSM soil moisture states						
			Sm1	Sm2	Sm3	Sm4
Total soil moisture – layer 1 (sm1)	Additive	0.6E-3 m ³ m ⁻³	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.2
Total soil moisture – layer 2 (sm2)	Additive	1.1E-4 m ³ m ⁻³	0.6	1.0	0.6	0.4
Total soil moisture – layer 3 (sm3)	Additive	0.6E-5 m ³ m ⁻³	0.4	0.6	1.0	0.6
Total soil moisture – layer 4 (sm4)	Additive	0.4E-5 m ³ m ⁻³	0.2	0.4	0.6	1.0

767

768

769

770 **Table 2: NLDAS domain-averaged root mean square and bias errors (all with 95%**
 771 **confidence intervals) in latent heat flux (Q_{le}) and sensible heat flux (Q_h) estimates from**
 772 **five LDAS simulations with respect to two reference datasets : (1) the gridded FLUXNET**
 773 **data from Jung et al., (2009) and (2) MOD16 data from Mu et al. (2011), which only**
 774 **provides Q_{le} . Two of the NLDAS simulations show differences due to Noah version, and**
 775 **two of the NLDAS simulations include soil moisture data assimilation from the NASA and**
 776 **LPRM products, as discussed in the text.**

Q_{le}	FLUXNET		MOD16	
	RMSE (Wm⁻²)	Bias (Wm⁻²)	RMSE (Wm⁻²)	Bias (Wm⁻²)
GLDAS	24.7 ± 0.3	5.5 ± 0.4	28.0 ± 0.2	4.4 ± 0.3
NLDAS (Noah v2.7.1)	19.3 ± 0.3	11.9 ± 0.4	21.5 ± 0.2	10.3 ± 0.3
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)	27.6 ± 0.3	12.9 ± 0.4	22.7 ± 0.2	11.2 ± 0.3
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)+NASA DA	29.4 ± 0.3	15.9 ± 0.4	24.5 ± 0.2	14.2 ± 0.3
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)+LPRM DA	25.6 ± 0.3	10.9 ± 0.3	21.9 ± 0.2	9.2 ± 0.3
Q_h				
GLDAS	23.4 ± 0.2	-5.6 ± 0.4	N/A	N/A
NLDAS (Noah v2.7.1)	21.1 ± 0.3	-7.0 ± 0.4	N/A	N/A
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)	32.5 ± 0.3	-9.2 ± 0.4	N/A	N/A
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)+NASA DA	34.5 ± 0.3	-12.2 ± 0.4	N/A	N/A
NLDAS (Noah v3.2)+LPRM DA	30.4 ± 0.3	-7.3 ± 0.4	N/A	N/A

777

778

779

780 **List of Figures**

781

782 Figure 1: Schematic illustrating the data flows in an uncoupled Land Data Assimilation System.
783 As shown, input parameter and meteorological data or “forcings” can be obtained from various
784 sources. If data assimilation is employed, the observations of land surface states can be used to
785 update model states using various data assimilation approaches, such as Direct Insertion (DI) or
786 Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF). 41

787 Figure 2: Comparison of the average seasonal cycles of RMSE and Bias for latent heat flux (Q_{le})
788 estimates from the three LDAS simulations: GLDAS Noah, NLDAS-like simulations with Noah
789 2.7.1 (NLDAS-N271) and Noah 3.2 (NLDAS-N32) compared against the gridded FLUXNET
790 data (left column) and MOD16 data (right column). All units are in Wm^{-2} 42


791 Figure 3: Intercomparison of seasonally-averaged Q_{le} for the period Jan 2002-Dec 2008 over the
792 NLDAS domain from five sources: gridded FLUXNET (Jung et al., 2010); MOD16 data (Mu et
793 al. 2011); GLDAS Noah (Rodell et al., 2004); NLDAS-like simulations with Noah 2.7.1 and
794 Noah3.2 produced using LIS (Kumar et al., 2006). All units are in Wm^{-2} 43

795 Figure 4: Comparison of the seasonal cycles of RMSE and Bias in Q_{le} estimates from NLDAS-
796 equivalent simulations for the period Jan 2002- Dec 2008 against the gridded FLUXNET data
797 (left column) and MOD16 data (right column). The comparisons present the impact of the
798 assimilation of surface soil moisture retrievals on latent heat flux estimates. OL represents the
799 “open loop” model simulation without data assimilation, which is equivalent to the NLDAS-N32
800 curves in Figure 2. NASA-DA and LPRM-DA represents simulations that assimilate the NASA
801 and LPRM retrievals of AMSR-E soil moisture, respectively. All units are in Wm^{-2} 44

802 Figure 5: Comparison of the latent heat flux improvement metric (RMSE (DA) – RMSE (OL))
803 from the data assimilation integrations using the NASA AMSR-E soil moisture retrievals
804 (NASA-DA). The two columns represent the reference datasets used in the RMSE computations:
805 FLUXNET (left column) and MOD16 (right column). The red and blue shades indicate
806 improvements and degradations as a result of data assimilation, respectively. All units are in
807 Wm^{-2} 45

808 Figure 6: Same as Figure 5, but from data assimilation integrations using LPRM AMSR-E soil
809 moisture retrievals (LPRM-DA). 47


810 Figure 7: Comparison of the mean soil moisture difference maps (soil moisture (DA) – soil
811 moisture (OL)) from soil moisture data assimilation integrations. The left and right panels
812 represent the NASA-DA and LPRM-DA, respectively. All units are in m^3m^{-3} 48
813
814




815
 816 **Figure 1: Schematic illustrating the data flows in an uncoupled Land Data Assimilation**
 817 **System. As shown, input parameter and meteorological data or “forcings” can obtained**
 818 **from various sources. If data assimilation is employed, the observations of land surface**
 819 **states can be used to update model states using various data assimilation approaches, such**
 820 **as Direct Insertion (DI) or Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF).**

821

822



824 **Figure 2: Comparison of the average seasonal cycles of RMSE and Bias for latent heat flux**
 825 **(Q_{le}) estimates from the three LDAS simulations: GLDAS Noah, NLDAS-like simulations**
 826 **with Noah 2.7.1 (NLDAS-N271) and Noah 3.2 (NLDAS-N32) compared against the gridded**
 827 **FLUXNET data (left column) and MOD16 data (right column). All units are in Wm⁻².**



829

830


831

832

Figure 3: Intercomparison of seasonally-averaged Qle for the period Jan 2002-Dec 2008 over the NLDAS domain from five sources: gridded FLUXNET (Jung et al., 2010); MOD16 data (Mu et al. 2011); GLDAS Noah (Rodell et al., 2004); NLDAS-like simulations with Noah 2.7.1 and Noah3.2 produced using LIS (Kumar et al., 2006). All units are in Wm^{-2} .

833


834



835

836 **Figure 4: Comparison of the seasonal cycles of RMSE and Bias in Qle estimates from**
837 **NLDAS-equivalent simulations for the period Jan 2002- Dec 2008 against the gridded**
838 **FLUXNET data (left column) and MOD16 data (right column). The comparisons present**
839 **the impact of the assimilation of surface soil moisture retrievals on latent heat flux**
840 **estimates. OL represents the “open loop” model simulation without data assimilation,**
841 **which is equivalent to the NLDAS-N32 curves in Figure 2. NASA-DA and LPRM-DA**
842 **represents simulations that assimilate the NASA and LPRM retrievals of AMSR-E soil**
843 **moisture, respectively. All units are in Wm⁻².**

844




846 **Figure 5: Comparison of the latent heat flux improvement metric (RMSE (DA) – RMSE**
 847 **(OL)) from the data assimilation integrations using the NASA AMSR-E soil moisture**
 848 **retrievals (NASA-DA). The two columns represent the reference datasets used in the**
 849 **RMSE computations: FLUXNET (left column) and MOD16 (right column). The red and**

850 **blue shades indicate improvements and degradations as a result of data assimilation,**
851 **respectively. All units are in Wm^{-2} .**


852

853



855 **Figure 6: Same as Figure 5, but from data assimilation integrations using LPRM AMSR-E**
856 **soil moisture retrievals (LPRM-DA).**

858
859



860 **Figure 7: Comparison of the mean soil moisture difference maps (soil moisture (DA) – soil**
861 **moisture (OL)) from soil moisture data assimilation integrations. The left and right panels**
862 **represent the NASA-DA and LPRM-DA, respectively. All units are in m^3m^{-3} .**