SMAP soil moisture improves global evapotranspiration
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ABSTRACT

Accurate estimation of global evapotranspiration (ET) is essential to understand water cycle and land-atmosphere feedbacks in the Earth system. Satellite-driven ET models provide global estimates, but many of the ET algorithms have been designed independently of soil moisture observations. As water for ET is sourced from the soil, incorporating soil moisture into global remote sensing algorithms of ET should, in theory, improve performance, especially in water-limited regions. This paper presents an update to the widely-used Priestley-Taylor-Jet Propulsion Laboratory (PT-JPL) ET algorithm to incorporate spatially explicit daily surface soil moisture control on soil evaporation and canopy transpiration. The updated algorithm is evaluated using 14 AmeriFlux eddy covariance towers co-located with COSmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System (COSMOS) soil moisture observations. The new PT-JPLSM model shows reduced errors and increased explanation of variance, with the greatest improvements in water-limited regions. Soil moisture incorporation into soil evaporation improves ET estimates by reducing bias and RMSE by 29.9% and 22.7% respectively, while soil moisture incorporation into transpiration improves ET estimates by reducing bias by 30.2%, RMSE by 16.9%. We apply the algorithm globally using soil moisture observations from the Soil Moisture Active Passive Mission (SMAP). These new global estimates of ET show reduced error at finer spatial resolutions and provide a rich dataset to evaluate land surface and climate models, vegetation response to changes in water availability and environmental conditions, and anthropogenic perturbations to the water cycle.

1. Introduction

Water movement from land to the atmosphere, or evapotranspiration (ET), is an integral part of earth's ecological and climate systems. This process links the water, carbon, and energy cycles in the earth system. Therefore, accurate observations of ET facilitate detection of the human fingerprint on the water cycle and surface energy budget (Lo and Famiglietti, 2013; Sorooshian et al., 2011), studies on land-atmosphere feedbacks related to heat wave intensity (Miralles et al., 2014), quantification of agricultural and ecosystem water use (Allen et al., 2007; Anderson et al., 2011; Goulden et al., 2012; Goulden and Bales, 2014), identification of droughts where plants may become vulnerable to other biotic stressors and potential mortality (Anderson et al., 2013; McDowell, 2011; Mu et al., 2013), and provide benchmarks to evaluate and improve parameterizations in land surface models (Mueller et al., 2013; Rodell et al., 2011). With increasing global temperatures and the subsequent greater atmospheric capacity for water vapor, ET may accelerate with the water cycle and alter global water distribution making certain regions drier (Syed et al., 2010; Huntington, 2006). As land begins to dry, (Greve and Seneviratne, 2015; Jung et al., 2010) quantifying where and to what degree reductions in water availability limits ET becomes increasingly important.

Remote sensing algorithms are an effective way to derive observationally-constrained ET estimates at the necessary spatiotemporal resolutions to support earth observations (Fisher et al., 2017, 2008; Miralles et al., 2011; Mu et al., 2011; Su, 2002). Multiple manuscripts have reviewed the state and needs for ET remote sensing (Fisher et al., 2017; Wang and Dickinson, 2012) and one common theme across many of these remote sensing approaches is a limited or absent representation of soil moisture. Of the ET remote sensing algorithms, few approaches remain both physically defensible and globally applicable without reliance on data assimilation and prognostic land surface models. One model that lacks soil moisture representation and fits the aforementioned description is the Priestley-Taylor-Jet Propulsion Laboratory (PT-JPL) ET model.

The PT-JPL ET model, a widely used remote sensing retrieval
algorithm, has outperformed many models for the majority of globally distributed eddy covariance towers within model inter-comparison studies achieving both high explanation of variance and low error (Ershadi et al., 2014; Michel et al., 2016; Vinukollu et al., 2011). Despite a strong performance in these studies, the PT-JPL algorithm lacks soil moisture control and is restricted by its dependence on a combination of atmospheric conditions and vegetation characteristics to represent surface conditions. These limitations become especially evident in regions where the coarse near surface air temperature and water vapor pressure deviate from the underlying surface soil water availability at fine temporal frequencies, in areas with highly heterogeneous land covers, in areas of active land management, or in regions prone to atmospheric advection conditions. Therefore, incorporating soil moisture observations has great potential to address these limitations and improve global ET estimates but large challenges exist.

There are two main challenges to improve global estimates of ET using soil moisture: 1) observing accurate integrated values of soil moisture; and, 2) appropriately modeling how limitations from soil moisture interact with other environmental constraints to quantify ET.

The launch of the Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) satellite (2015) addresses the first challenge through providing global soil moisture observations (Entekhabi et al., 2010). The SMAP mission has leveraged lessons from other global soil moisture observing satellites, such as the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer- EOS (Njoku et al., 2003) and the Soil Moisture Ocean Salinity (Kerr et al., 2016) satellites to detect and mitigate potential radio frequency interference and provide observations at relatively high spatio-temporal (9–36 km, 3-daily) resolutions at a depth [5-cm] applicable to improve modeled ET (Johnson et al., 2016; Mohammed et al., 2016; Oliva et al., 2012; Piepmeier et al., 2014). These observations have been extensively evaluated as part of a rigorous calibration and validation campaign and shown to be within mission accuracy requirements (unbiased RMSE < 0.04 cm$^3$ cm$^{-2}$) and thus capable of supporting improvements to global ET quantification (Collander et al., 2017). Additionally, despite only providing surface soil moisture observations, recent in situ analyses have shown that surface soil moisture provides similar amounts of predictive information as rooting depth soil moisture for latent heat quantification (Qiu et al., 2016).

To address the second challenge, model testing and updates needs to be done with coterminous observations of meteorological conditions, soil moisture, and ET. Observations of soil moisture and ET are made globally in distributed networks of eddy covariance (EC) towers as part of FLUXNET and AmeriFlux networks (Baldocchi et al., 2001). However, sites often include measurements of soil moisture at only 1-4 points and these points may misrepresent actual land surface conditions within the EC footprint making model parameterization and calibration difficult. Fortunately, a new observation network from the COSmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System (COSMOS) provides integrated observations at similar scales to EC tower footprints (Zreda et al., 2012). EC observations of water and energy exchange at the earth’s surface colocated with integrated soil moisture observations provide a valuable dataset to compliment satellite observations of environmental variables necessary to test and evaluate ET models (Baldocchi et al., 2001).

Generally, land surface and remote sensing models relate the amount of ET to water availability and the atmospheric demand for ET, but vary to what degree and at what point water availability limits and eventually prevents ET. Various adaptations of soil moisture normalized by soil properties to compute the relative extractable water (REW) have been applied to limit transpiration [Fig. S1, Table S1]. Yet, soil moisture is just one of many environmental variables that limits the maximum stomatal conductance, as temperature and vapor pressure extremes have been found to regulate transpiration (Fisher et al., 2008; Jarvis and McNaughton, 1986; Monteith, 1965; Mu et al., 2011; Novick et al., 2016). Therefore, modeling approaches that have adopted REW-based stressors are often applied in series with other scalar stressors, such as temperature and vapor pressure, to reduce potential ET based on sub-optimal environmental limitations (Fisher et al., 2008; Jin et al., 2011; Miralles et al., 2011). However, plant access to soil moisture varies with rooting depth and much uncertainty exists with the role deep roots play in mitigating limitations from soil water availability during drought (Schenk and Jackson, 2002). Plant type, canopy height and aboveground biomass provide indicators of rooting depth and the potential to access deeper soil water (Canadell et al., 1996; Fan et al., 2017; Jackson et al., 1999). Miralles et al. (2011) postulate taller vegetation is less sensitive to soil water deficits compared to shorter canopy plants due to deep rooting potential to alleviate plants from seasonal drought conditions (i.e., when precipitation occurs outside of the summer maximum atmospheric demand). Recent global observations of canopy height create an opportunity to further inform plant sensitivity to environmental conditions (Simard et al., 2011).

We present an update to the PT-JPL algorithm by incorporating explicit surface soil moisture constraint from SMAP to model ET globally. To address previous model parameterization limitations, we use integrated in situ observations of soil moisture and ET to implement soil moisture control within the PT-JPL model. Then, we apply the new PT-JPL$_{SM}$ model globally using soil moisture data from the Soil Moisture Active Passive mission (SMAP). The following sections will provide: (1) a description of the PT-JPL algorithm with updates detailing soil moisture constraints on evaporation and transpiration, (2) details on the datasets used in this study, (3) results evaluating the updated PT-JPL$_{SM}$ model compared to the original PT-JPL model using eddy covariance towers from Ameriflux and globally using satellite datasets, and (4) discussion on the implications of soil moisture on global ET quantification improvement.

2. PT-JPL algorithm

2.1. PT-JPL ET algorithm

The Priestley Taylor-Jet Propulsion Laboratory (PT-JPL) ET algorithm applies ecophysiological constraints to model reductions of ET from the atmospheric potential ET due to sub-optimal environmental conditions (Fisher et al., 2008). The model incorporates a variety of data sources from satellite observations and reanalysis datasets [Fig. 1; Table 1]. Potential ET, or latent energy LE, is computed using the Priestley-Taylor model:

$$\text{PET} = \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} R_N - G$$

(1)

where $\text{PET}$ [mm day$^{-1}$] is the potential ET based on temperature and radiation, $\alpha$ is the Priestley-Taylor coefficient that is set to 1.26, $\lambda$ is the slope of the saturated vapor-pressure relationship [kPa ‘C$^{-1}$], and $G$ is the psychrometric constant [kPa ‘C$^{-1}$], and $R_N$ is the net radiation [W m$^{-2}$], $G$ is the ground heat flux [W m$^{-2}$], and $\lambda$ is the latent heat of vaporization [MJ kg$^{-1}$] (Priestley and Taylor, 1972). The water cycle and energy cycle are linked through ET and latent heat LE such that the latent heat of vaporization ET $\lambda = LE$. The PT-JPL algorithm is a three source ET model where each component of ET is used to calculate the total flux:

$$\text{LE} = \text{LE}_I + \text{LE}_T + \text{LE}_S$$

(2)

where $\text{LE}_I$ is evaporation from plant intercepted water, $\text{LE}_T$ is transpiration from vegetation, and $\text{LE}_S$ is soil evaporation. Ecophysiological $f$-functions, scalars between 0 and 1, limit each component from the potential rate.

Canopy interception is computed as:

$$\text{LE}_I = \frac{f_{\text{WET}} \alpha}{(\lambda + \gamma)} R_C$$

(3)

where $f_{\text{WET}}$ is the fraction of saturated soil computed as $f_{\text{WET}} = RH^4$, where $RH$ is the relative humidity of air, $R_C$ is the canopy net radiation calculated as $R_C = R_N - R_s^C$. $R_s^C$ is the net radiation at the soil surface.
computed as \( R_0^S = R_0 \exp(-k_R \text{LAI}) \) where \( k_R = 0.60 \) and LAI is the leaf area index.

Canopy transpiration is computed as:

\[
LE_T = (1 - f_{\text{WET}}) \frac{\Delta}{(\Delta + \gamma)} R_0^C 
\]

where \( f_G \) is the fractional canopy greenness computed as:

\[
f_G = \frac{f_{\text{PAR}}}{f_{\text{IPAR}}} \]

where \( f_{\text{PAR}} \) is the fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and \( f_{\text{IPAR}} \) is the fraction of intercepted PAR; \( f_T \) is the suboptimal temperature constraint computed as:

\[
f_T = \frac{T - T_{\text{OPT}}}{T_{\text{OPT}}} \]

where \( T \) is the maximum daily air temperature and \( T_{\text{OPT}} \) is the optimum temperature computed as:

\[
T_{\text{OPT}} = \frac{\text{PAR}_{\text{OPT}} \text{PAR}_{\text{MAX}}}{\text{VPD}_{\text{OPT}}} \]

which computes when maximum plant activity is likely to occur; and \( f_M \) is the vegetation moisture constraint computed as:

\[
f_M = \frac{f_{\text{APAR}}}{f_{\text{APAR MAX}}} \]

where \( f_{\text{APAR MAX}} \) is the annual maximum \( f_{\text{APAR}} \).

Soil evaporation is computed as:

\[
LE_S = \left( f_{\text{WET}} + f_{\text{SM}} (1 - f_{\text{WET}}) \right) \frac{\Delta}{(\Delta + \gamma)} (R_0^S - G) 
\]

where \( f_{\text{SM}} \) is the soil moisture constraint computed as \( f_{\text{SM}} = \frac{R_{\text{H}}}{V_{\text{PD}}} \) which is the vapor pressure deficit. For further detail reference Fisher et al., 2008.

Soil water control on evaporation is implicitly represented through \( f_M \) where \( f_M \) is the soil moisture constraint on \( E_T \). RH is the relative humidity, and \( V_{\text{PD}} \) is the vapor pressure deficit. This equation is formed from Bouchet's theory of land atmosphere equilibrium. However, the assumption that land and atmosphere are in equilibrium at the fine spatial resolutions and acute temporal scales fails for certain regions. Similarly, plant water availability is implicitly represented by observations based on plant greenness and therefore phenological changes from peak greenness potentially introduces latent vegetation response to water limitations and overestimates transpiration.

### 2.2. Updates to the PT-JPL model

We update the original model, hereafter called PT-JPLSM, to incorporate explicit soil water availability control on evaporation and transpiration. Because we now model ET at sub-monthly time scales, we also integrate a new G parameterization.

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Product name</th>
<th>Time available</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Spatial resolution</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net radiation</td>
<td>MERRA2 M2T1XNLND</td>
<td>1979–present</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.5° × 0.5°</td>
<td>GMAO, 2015a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>MERRA2 M2I1NXASM</td>
<td>1979–present</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.5° × 0.5°</td>
<td>GMAO, 2015b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapor pressure</td>
<td>MERRA2 M2I1NXASM</td>
<td>1979–present</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.5° × 0.5°</td>
<td>GMAO, 2015b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI</td>
<td>MOD13A2 MYD13A2</td>
<td>2000–present</td>
<td>8-daily</td>
<td>5 km × 5 km</td>
<td>Didan 2015a, 2015b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil moisture</td>
<td>SPL3SMP_E v1 SPL3SMP v4</td>
<td>2015–present</td>
<td>3-daily</td>
<td>9 km × 9 km</td>
<td>O'Neil et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil properties</td>
<td>SPL4SMLM</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 km × 9 km</td>
<td>O'Neil et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy height</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 km × 1 km</td>
<td>Simard et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1. Soil moisture control on evaporation

Surface soil moisture and soil properties control the rate of evaporation. As such we employ the available water content to scale the rate of evaporation. The relative extractable water is a commonly used stressor that normalizes the impact from soil properties. The original model employs the \( f_{SM} \) scalar to limit the rate of evaporation from the soil surface. This scalar was formulated to represent relative extractable water through the Boucenh’s theory of where the land surface and near surface atmosphere are in equilibrium across certain space and time scales. Here we update the model to represent true relative extractable water using:

\[
f_{REW} = \frac{\theta_{obs} - \theta_{tp}}{\theta_{FC} - \theta_{tp}} \tag{6}\]

where \( \theta_{obs} \) is the soil moisture observation, \( \theta_{tp} \) is the soil-plant wilting point, and \( \theta_{FC} \) is the soil field capacity. We replace \( f_{SM} \) with \( f_{REW} \) in the new evaporation algorithms.

\[
LE = \left[f_{WET} + f_{REW}(1 - f_{WET})\right] \alpha \Delta \left(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{WP}\right) \tag{7}\]

This method has been implemented in other remote sensing ET algorithms that use ET to model surface and root zone soil moisture (Anderson et al., 2007; Martens et al., 2017).

2.2.2. Soil moisture control on transpiration

In the original PT-JPL formulation plant moisture stress is inferred from the deviation from maximum greenness (\( f_M \)). As the model was originally developed for application at monthly or longer timescales, the latent responses from vegetation to moisture deficits did not impact quantification of ET, as it does at higher temporal frequencies, i.e. daily calculations. Therefore, we formulate and include a new soil water availability constraint on transpiration. Since shorter vegetation responds more quickly than compared to taller vegetation to precipitation deficits, above ground observations may provide insight into plant resiliency to a limited moisture supply (Knoop and Walker, 1985). Plant access to deeper water has been shown to increase resilience and survival probability to prolonged drought (Canadell et al., 1996; Giardina et al., 2017; Nepstad et al., 1994; Padilla and Pugnaire, 2007). Unfortunately, the science communities understanding of rooting depth, density and access to the water table has limited previous attempts to implement soil moisture limitations within ET models (Kelliher et al., 1993). Therefore, we implicitly represent plant resilience to soil water deficits through above ground satellite observable canopy characteristics. Previous studies have applied canopy characteristics to infer sensitivity to soil water availability (DeWaele et al., 2017; Martens et al., 2017). We acknowledge at aggregated scales a robust direct relationship between above ground biomass or canopy and resilience to drought depends on other factors such as functional rooting depth, species composition, water table depth, geology, and plant age (Fan et al., 2017; Giardina et al., 2017). However, for the purposes of this study, we apply canopy height as one variable to infer plant sensitivity to surface soil water availability. We posit that canopy height is related to the rooting depth and potential to access water from deeper sources. Therefore, canopy height data facilitate a continuous quantification of plant sensitivity to surface soil water conditions (Canadell et al., 1996; Jackson et al., 1999; Martens et al., 2017; Nepstad et al., 1994). We calculate the new transpiration constraint as:

\[
f_{TRM} = 1 - \left(\frac{\theta_{CR} - \theta_{obs}}{\theta_{CR} - \theta_{WP}}\right) CH_{scalar} \tag{8}\]

where \( \theta_{CR} \) is the critical soil moisture at which soil water availability limits ET, \( CH_{scalar} = \sqrt{CH} \) is a canopy height (CH) scalar that impacts the sensitivity to soil water availability, set to range from 1 to 5.

\[
\theta_{CR} = \left(1 - p\right)\left(\theta_{FC} - \theta_{WP}\right) + \theta_{WP} \tag{9}\]

\[
p = \frac{1}{1 + PET} - a \cdot \frac{1}{1 + CH} \tag{10}\]

\[
\theta_{WPCH} = \frac{\theta_{WP}}{CH_{scalar}} \tag{11}\]

\[
f_{TRM} = \left(1 - RH^{\left(1 - \frac{VWC}{100}\right)}\right) f_M + \left(RH^{\left(1 - \frac{VWC}{100}\right)}\right) f_{REW} \tag{12}\]

where \( p \) is a parameter dependent on both \( PET \) [mm/day] and \( CH \) [m] that quantifies at which point soil water availability begins to limit transpiration below the potential rate, \( a \) is a parameter set to 0.1 representing the weight of influence \( CH \) imposes on \( \theta_{CR} \), and \( \theta_{WPCH} \) is the canopy height adjusted surface soil moisture wilting point. Eq. (8) was formed from the influence of Martens et al. (2017), but adjusted to incorporate the atmospheric demand and canopy height as continuous scalars to avoid dependence on land classification datasets. Eqs. (9) and (10) were amended from van Diepen et al. (1989), to account for the influences of plant access to deeper water reserves and atmospheric demand intensifying or mitigating vegetation sensitivity to water availability (van Diepen et al., 1989). The shape of this response curve illustrates how canopy height, the potential ET rate, and soil water availability impact the transpiration rate [Fig. S2]. Additionally, we apply a weighting scheme using 30-day mean relative humidity and soil moisture to determine when \( f_M \) or \( f_{REW} \) are the dominant control on transpiration globally [Fig. S3]. This approach conserves the intent of the original model while leveraging the strength of soil moisture information. By weighting the influence of each scalar, we maintain or improve transpiration estimates across dry and wet ecohydrological regimes. The parameters in Eqs. (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12) were not optimized to the evaluation dataset to maintain model ability to represent ET and soil water limiting conditions globally. The new eco-physiological scalar \( f_{TRM} \) in Eq. (12) is combined in series with the combined stresses from \( f_G \) and \( f_T \):

\[
LE_T = \left(1 - f_{WET} f_{TRM} f_G f_T\right) \frac{\Delta}{\left(\Delta + \gamma\right)} \theta_{FC} \tag{13}\]

2.2.3. Ground heat flux

Previously, since PT-JPL was implemented at monthly time resolution \( G \) was estimated to be 0. For daily ET calculation, we derive \( G \) as described in Allen et al. (2007), but update the parameterizations based on tall and short canopies. The updated model parameters were calibrated to a \( G \) evaluation dataset (Purdy, 2018; Purdy et al., 2016). Both PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM are updated to include \( G \). The equations used to model \( G \) and the updated parameterizations are presented in the supplemental material.

3.Datasets and data processing

3.1. Global and in situ model forcing datasets

We combine satellite observations of vegetation and surface soil moisture with meteorological data from a reanalysis dataset to model ET globally. We evaluate the model using both in situ and gridded forcing datasets. In situ meteorological (\( R_{NET}, T_{AIR}, e_\lambda \)), soil moisture (\( \theta \)), and latent heat observations at integrated spatial scales from these two networks facilitate updates to the PT-JPL algorithm. Gridded forcing data from MERRA, the MODerate resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MODIS), ICESat/GLAS, and SMAP provide spatially continuous data sources to model ET globally. All datasets are open access and available from: the NASA Land Process Distributed Archive Center (https://e4ftl01.cr.usgs.gov/; http://daac.ornl.gov/MODIS/), the Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center (https://goldsmr4.gesdisc.eosdis.nasa.gov:443), the National Snow and Ice Data Center (https://nsidc.org), the Cosmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System (COSMOS) (http://cosmos.hwr.arizona.edu), the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory’s Ameriflux
3.1.3. SMAP surface soil moisture (SPL3SMP & SPL3SMP_E)

Soil moisture data are filtered for high-quality data which prevents using SMAP observations in urban areas, areas with high fractions of surface water, areas impacted by radio frequencies in the same microwave wavelengths as SMAP, and densely forested or highly productive agricultural regions where vegetation water content is high. The densely forested and agriculture regions that have high vegetation water content suffer from degraded surface soil moisture retrieval accuracy from space. However, many of these areas exist in regions with abundant water availability and high humidity, which mitigates potential issues of data value for ET modeling globally.

3.1.4. Soil properties

The soil properties used in this study are from the SMAP L4RZ dataset and sourced from the Harmonized World Soil Database version 1.2.1 (HWSD1.21) and the State Soil Geographic project (STATSGO2). These data have been re-gridded to the EASE-2 grid to maintain consistency with the SMAP Level 2 retrieval algorithms (Das et al., 2013). For the 36-km runs, we use the nested mean of the 9-km soil properties. Soil properties extracted from this dataset include the porosity and the wetting point.

3.1.5. MERRA2: net radiation, temperature, vapor pressure

Net radiation, air temperature, and vapor pressure data from MERRA2 reanalysis datasets M2T1NXLND and M2T1NXASM were used in this study. The MERRA2 reanalysis data provides 3-hourly data at a 0.5° latitude × 0.625° longitude global grid. We take a daily average air temperature, water vapor pressure, and net radiation, daytime maximum temperature and net radiation, and daytime minimum water vapor pressure and resample these data to the EASE grid resolutions (9- km and 36-km) to complete this study. Resampling meteorological data to finer spatial resolutions introduces uncertainty but is required due to the lack of continuous global datasets. Global ET quantification continues to rely on continuous forcing datasets from reanalysis datasets (Anderson et al., 2011; Martens et al., 2017; Mu et al., 2011). Therefore, the quality of the computed ET ultimately is dependent on the accuracy of each reanalysis variable and the subsequent potential biases including the density of observation networks in North America and Europe (Badgley et al., 2015).
3.2. AmeriFlux and COSMOS: in situ evaluation datasets

Eddy covariance observations of LE with coincident integrated measures of soil moisture are used for model evaluation [Table 2]. Many EC towers that are part of these networks measure soil moisture with 1 to 4 dielectric sensors. With limited observations, the inherent variability in soil moisture adds observational uncertainty with potential to confound model formulation and parameterizations (Ryu and Famiglietti, 2005). Soil moisture variability increases with spatial extent and during the transition from saturated to dry conditions, conditions critical for the success of modeling soil water control on ET (Famiglietti et al., 2008). The COsmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System (COSMOS) overcomes issues of spatial representativeness by using observations of cosmic-ray neutrons to measure soil moisture at integrated scales similar to the footprints of ET measurements from EC towers (Köhli et al., 2015; Zreda et al., 2012, 2008). Additionally, these observations have been used to validate SMAP observations within expected mission error limits (Montzka et al., 2017). Coincident observations of soil moisture, ET, and meteorological data from EC towers facilitates model updates and evaluation.

We use observations from 14 EC sites that cover 7 plant functional types and varying climatic conditions. Half of the 14 sites are classified as water limited based on the Budyko Classification where the aridity index, calculated as the mean annual potential evapotranspiration divided by the mean annual precipitation, is > 1. We supplement the meteorological observations of FLUXNET and soil moisture observations from COSMOS with satellite observations of vegetation characteristics. Vegetation observations of CH and NDVI are extracted from satellite sources at 1-km resolution (http://daac.ornl.gov/MODIS/).

Table 2 provides the site locations, plant functional types, terrain, and climate sampled of the locations. We indicate whether the site was used to evaluate model updates using in situ evaluation, gridded forcing variables, or both in situ and gridded forcing variables. In situ LE evaluations were only performed for sites with high quality meteorology, soil moisture, and LE observations with at least 1 year of data. Gridded forcing assessments were performed for sites with LE observations since

![Figure 2](image.jpg)

**Fig. 2.** In situ model performance across 14 AmeriFlux eddy covariance sites distributed across the US. The PT-JPLSM model is shown with orange and the original model is shown in blue. Sites are ordered based on their aridity index from top (more dry) to bottom (more wet) [Table 2]. PT-JPLSM better estimates ET at more arid locations compared to PT-JPL [Table 3].
Balance, we force energy balance closure daily (Foken et al., 2011; eddy covariance observations of LE 수행 in the scope of the current study (Amiro, 1998; Chen et al., 2009). Since to gridded forcing data mismatches, but this type of analysis is outside analysis. These constraints limited the available tower observations to 8 sites from AmeriFlux in situ observations during this time period and the SMAP recommended quality flag limit the number of sites used in this analysis. These constraints limited the available tower observations to 8 locations distributed across the continental United States. Numerous studies have examined the impact on eddy covariance tower footprint to gridded forcing data mismatches, but this type of analysis is outside of the scope of the current study (Amiro, 1998; Chen et al., 2009). Since eddy covariance observations of LE suffer from energy closure imbalance, we force energy balance closure daily (Foken et al., 2011; Twine et al., 2000).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>PT-JPL</th>
<th>PT-JPLSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIAS</td>
<td>RMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SCg</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>145.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SCg</td>
<td>137.90</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Wkg</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>27.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SCc</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>56.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Ton</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>75.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Me2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>65.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-CZ2</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>106.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Umb</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>50.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Moz</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>49.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Mms</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>57.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-CZ3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>60.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Rol1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Hol1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Gele</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>55.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al &gt; 1</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>87.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al &lt; 1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sites</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>70.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Monthly scatter plot of ET model without (blue) and with (orange) soil moisture.

March 31, 2015, the start date of SMAP observations. Data availability from AmeriFlux in situ observations during this time period and the SMAP recommended quality flag limit the number of sites used in this analysis. These constraints limited the available tower observations to 8 locations distributed across the continental United States. Numerous studies have examined the impact on eddy covariance tower footprint to gridded forcing data mismatches, but this type of analysis is outside of the scope of the current study (Amiro, 1998; Chen et al., 2009). Since eddy covariance observations of LE suffer from energy closure imbalance, we force energy balance closure daily (Foken et al., 2011; Twine et al., 2000).

4. Results

4.1. Model evaluation with in situ forcing

The PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM models were executed daily for in situ evaluation and global analyses with SMAP. The in situ modeled LE from both PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM shows strong agreement with observations [Fig. 2, Table 3]. Fig. 2 compares one year of mid-day modeled LE with in situ observations from 14 EC towers. Sites are ordered from dry (top) to wet (bottom) based on the aridity index, a ratio of annual precipitation to PET. The PT-JPLSM model demonstrates greater skill than PT-JPL model at water limited sites [Table 3]. On average the PT-JPLSM shows a decrease in BIAS (PT-JPL: 70.7 Wm⁻², PT-JPLSM: 23.8 Wm⁻²), a large decrease in RMSE (PT-JPL: 87.8 Wm⁻², PT-JPLSM: 40.9 Wm⁻²), and an increase in explanation of variance (PT-JPL: 0.59, PT-JPLSM: 0.75) when compared to the PT-JPL. Mean annual BIAS, RMSE, and explanation of variance improved across all water limited sites. The greatest overall statistical improvement was observed at US-SCs and US-SCg. Both of these sites have very dry conditions and a large fraction of LE comes from soil evaporation. Additionally, the years examined for these sites were part of the multi-year California drought, which exacerbated the importance of soil moisture to model LE. In addition to US-SCs and US-SCg, the largest improvements in explanation of variance occurred US-Ton, US-Me2, and US-CZ2. At the US-Ton, US-Me2, and US-CZ2 the PT-JPLSM model demonstrates improvements to model estimation of LE during the seasonal dry down. Lastly, at US-SCs and US-Wkg LE response to short interval precipitation events is best modeled by PT-JPLSM where increases and subsequent dry down of soil moisture control LE [Fig. S4].

For the mesic to wet sites (US-UMB, US-Moz, US-MMS, US-CZ3, US-Rol1, US-Hol1, US-Gele) the PT-JPLSM shows, on average, a small decrease in BIAS (PT-JPL: 34.3 Wm⁻², PT-JPLSM: 33.7 Wm⁻²), a small decrease in RMSE (PT-JPL: 53.6 Wm⁻², PT-JPLSM: 53.4 Wm⁻²), and a small decrease in explanation of variance (PT-JPL: 0.86, PT-JPLSM: 0.81) when compared to PT-JPL. For very wet regions, we posit transpiration from vegetation at these EC tower locations is more sensitive to atmospheric conditions and phenological changes than fluctuations in surface soil water availability. For these locations, the model weighting scheme places more importance on \( f_M \) as a control on transpiration. The PT-JPLSM model shows reduced errors at US-CZ3 with soil moisture limitations. This site was in the midst of a multi-year drought with the forest moving towards water-limiting conditions providing support for use of soil moisture for water limiting regimes. For wet forested sites (US-MMS and US-Hol1), we find changes to the model resulted in an increase in error for mid-day LE estimates. However, the increased errors (15% and 10% LE) still fall within mid-day LE observational uncertainty for these sites (Hollinger and Richardson, 2005; Oliphant et al., 2004). The results from these sites demonstrate soil moisture has no added value in areas of high soil water availability. Overall, the new algorithm results in an improvement of model skill for mesic to wet sites.

We find site-wide average improvement in BIAS, RMSE, and \( R^2 \) as a result of model improvements. Additionally, incorporating explicit soil moisture improved estimates of mean monthly LE [Fig. 3]. The PT-JPLSM model shows greater explanation of variance (PT-JPL: 0.70, PT-JPLSM: 0.78) and a slope (PT-JPL: 1.26, PT-JPLSM: 1.07) closer to 1.0 compared to the PT-JPL model. Observations between 0 and 150 Wm⁻² are better represented by the new model with a scatter closer to the 1:1 line from reduced overestimation in LE. Since the algorithm models each component separately, we quantify the added value from incorporating soil moisture into soil evaporation and canopy transpiration separately. We find by only replacing \( L_E^t \), BIAS is reduced by 30%, RMSE is reduced by 23%, and explanation of variance improves by 4.7%. By only replacing \( L_E^s \), BIAS is reduced by 30%, RMSE is reduced by 17%, and explanation of variance is reduced by 0.9%. The results of modeling LE using in situ forcing data demonstrates value in surface soil moisture observations for modeling ET. Next, we evaluate PT-JPLSM with gridded meteorology and surface soil moisture observations from SMAP with in situ LE observations and compared to the original model.
4.2. Model evaluation of global PT-JPLSM using SMAP soil moisture

The PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM algorithms were successfully applied globally using the SMAP SM_L3_P and SM_L3_P_E data. We only evaluate the gridded PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM for times when SMAP observations are available (e.g., we mask out days in PT-JPL for when SMAP data do not exist). We avoid temporal interpolation in the evaluation to prevent erroneous results. For example, interpolation during dry down events is predictable, but considerable error might be introduced interpolating before and after precipitation would lead to underestimation of total LE. Therefore we evaluate the modeled LE forced by the two SMAP soil moisture data products and at eight EC validation sites that meet SMAP QA/QC for 2015 [Table 2]. Fig. 4 compares the PT-JPLSM model using soil moisture from SM_L3_P (red) and SM_L3_P_E (blue) with the PT-JPL model at 9 km (cyan) and 36 km (green) and the site observations from 4/1/2015 to 12/31/2016. Both the PT-JPLSM and PT-JPL models capture the seasonal cycle of LE for each EC tower [Fig. 4]. Table 4 provides summary statistics for each location.

Similar to the in situ analysis, PT-JPLSM demonstrates improved seasonal dry down and response to precipitation events with both 9-km and 36-km products. For two sites that experience a Mediterranean climate (US-Ton & US-Var), where winter precipitation precedes spring warm up, PT-JPLSM shows an earlier decrease in modeled LE during seasonal dry downs when using SMAP data. These improvements are reflected in lower error and higher explanation of variance for PT-JPLSM when compared to PT-JPL at both US-Ton and US-Var [Table 4]. At US-Whs, US-Wkg, US-SRG, and US-Var we find PT-JPLSM model evaluated at 9-km shows better agreement with observations compared to the 36-km results [Table 4]. Poor model performance is observed for PT-JPLSM and PT-JPL at US-SRM. We posit that underestimation of modeled LE using SMAP data at the US-SRM might be due in situ LE observations not being representative over the heterogeneous area, a result from non-representative soil properties controlling the point at which soil moisture limits ET (e.g., wilting point), or an underestimation of soil moisture from SMAP. For the more humid sites, US-PFa and US-MOz, where soil water availability is non-limiting, the PT-JPLSM model shifts the transpiration weight towards the original model formulation which is more reliant on atmospheric conditions and phenological change. For these sites, similar to the in situ analysis we see similar model errors and explanation of variance for both the 9 km and 36 km results, but higher estimates of LE from the PT-JPLSM algorithm resulting in greater error at US-PFa and slightly greater LE error within the range of observational uncertainty at US-MOz. Site-wide mean statistics indicate that when compared to PT-JPL, PT-JPLSM reduces error by 2% and 2% for both 9 km and 36 km estimates and increases explanation of variance.

### Table 4

PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM model performance evaluation for both 9 km and 36 km resolutions compared with 8 sites from Fig. 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>9 km</th>
<th></th>
<th>36 km</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>RMSE</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Whs</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SRM</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Wkg</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Ton</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SRG</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Var</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-PFa</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-MOz</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All site mean 22.4 0.36 22.0 0.47 26.8 0.33 26.3 0.41
4.3. Changes in global ET patterns from SMAP data

We compare the PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM for 2016 modeled on the 9-km grid surface. Fig. 5 shows ET from each model for 2016 (middle) and PT-JPLSM-PT-JPL difference (bottom). ET data are evaluated on the 9-km EASE 2.0 Grid.

Fig. 5. Mean annual PT-JPLSM ET for 2016 using SMAP_L3_P_E (top), mean annual PT-JPL ET for 2016 (middle) and PT-JPLSM-PT-JPL difference (bottom). ET data are evaluated on the 9-km EASE 2.0 Grid.

variance by 30.1% and 18.1% for the 9 km and 36 km forcing datasets respectively. Additionally, Table 4 shows PT-JPLSM LE modeled at 9 km results in lower error and higher explanation of variance compared to LE modeled at 36 km. Despite the soil moisture from SM_L3_P_E (9 km) being influenced by L-band microwave radiation from a larger area, the observed soil moisture data are more centered on tower locations compared to coarser the SM_L3_P (36-km) demonstrating added value for ET quantification. The limited number of validation sites prevented a robust global evaluation. Therefore, we perform a global inter-comparison between LE generated from the original PT-JPL model and new PT-JPLSM model. Using this analysis, we demonstrate when and where soil water-limiting conditions create the greatest disparity for global LE quantification, how soil moisture impacts LE partitioning, and how LE modeled with soil moisture impacts inter-annual variability.

5. Discussion

5.1. Inter-annual variability of ET for 2015–2017

Global LE datasets provide a valuable tool to quantify hydrological and ecological responses to climate perturbations. We analyze inter-annual variability of LE during the peak months of the 2015–2016 El Niño intensity and compare the data to the following year [Fig. 6]. Previous studies have used LE to measure global hydrological response to El Niño. During El Niño years, global average negative LE anomalies occur relative to average LE (Miralles et al., 2014). We find that PT-JPLSM mean global LE for the 2015–2016 El Niño was 1.7% less than the following year. Fig. 7 shows the change in mean annual LE for both PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM. For areas identified as having warmer or drier than average conditions during El Niño Years, such as Australia, Indonesia, Southeastern Africa, we find negative anomalies, e.g. lower LE when compared with the subsequent La Niña year (Vecchi and Wittenberg, 2010). In water-limited regions expected to experience more precipitation during El Niño, such as Argentina and the South West USA, we find positive LE anomalies. Similar response patterns prevail across both PT-JPL and PT-JPLSM. However, we find subtle changes in areas such as Australia, India, and Eastern Brazil. These areas show similar signs of change, but transitional boundaries are changes which reflect changes in soil water availability. Interestingly we find increases in LE across the tropics, which contrast patterns of decreases in LE found by Miralles et al. (2014). Despite these regions experiencing decreases in precipitation, increased incoming radiation produced greater LE than the following year. As these regions are regions known as being energy-limited, contrasting LE datasets and models create an opportunity for future exploration into the controlling mechanisms of LE across these regions (Nemani et al., 2003). The PT-JPLSM LE data show the potential ability to distinguish explicit inter-annual changes in LE as a result of soil water limitation and serve as a tool to identify vegetation stress and drought intensity. Overall, PT-JPLSM demonstrates the value of using soil moisture within LE models for capturing seasonal changes, especially in drier regions where soil moisture exerts greater control on inter-annual variation.

5.2. ET partitioning

Appropriate partitioning of ET into transpiration, canopy interception, and soil evaporation is an overlooked area of ET science, yet greatly important to appropriately model these mechanistic responses to environmental conditions. Fig. 7 shows the fraction of transpiration, interception, and soil evaporation globally and each components contribution to mean annual LE. The top map illustrates the percent contribution from each component and reveals expected global patterns of surrounding the tropical belt compared to PT-JPL. These regions are dominated by transpiration and we posit that weighting moisture stress based on a ‘greenness’ index equally with soil moisture lessened phenological control on LE [Fig. 5]. EC observations were not available in these regions for this study to determine if the differences result in model improvement or degradation. The largest decreases of LE from PT-JPLSM compared to PT-JPL occur in regions, where soil evaporation makes up the largest fraction of ET. These areas include the Southwest United States and Northern Mexico, the East Coast of Brazil, Northern Africa, Southern Africa, The Horn of Africa, western Asia and Central Australia [Fig. 5]. The largest decreases from PT-JPLSM occur in summer months for each respective region [Fig. SS]. These differences highlight the limited ability of fSM to represent relative extractable water for daily ET modeling and highlight the value in calculating REW from using SMAP observations. Based on the results of the in situ evaluation and the gridded evaluation [Section 4.1], we find support that the reduced soil evaporation better reflects true ET magnitudes for these regions.
dominant ET components (e.g. soil evaporation is greatest in deserts, transpiration is dominant in forested regions, and interception is a large fraction in rainforests). Previous ET model partitioning estimates estimate transpiration to be between 25% and 65% (Wang and Dickinson, 2012) and recent remote sensing algorithms estimate transpiration to be as high as 80% of ET globally (Miralles et al., 2011). We estimate soil evaporation, canopy transpiration, and evaporation from interception to be 23 ± 1.7%, 54 ± 1.6%, and 21 ± 0.8% of total ET respectively. The PT-JPLSM fraction of soil evaporation and canopy interception are greater than similarly reported fractions from GLEAM model 7–15% and 11–12% respectively (Martens et al., 2017; Miralles et al., 2011). Additionally, we calculate a lower fraction of canopy transpiration 54% compared to GLEAM (74–80%). The large disparity in soil evaporation and canopy interception can be traced to the radiation partitioning and the forcing datasets that influence \( R_n^T \) and \( R_n^I \) and the environmental stress imparted on the transpiration rate. We posit that the difference in canopy intercepted evaporation occurs as a result of the model's dependence on RH to calculate \( f_{WET} \). Coarse resolution meteorological forcing resampled to finer spatial resolutions introduces larger fractions of wet surface area, especially in coastal and tropical regions where regions are more influenced by water vapor pressure. Despite these differences in ET partitioning, we find the global patterns to be similar. These large differences warrant further investigation into appropriate partitioning methodology across biomes and climates. More ground-based observations of each component at scales relevant for modeling and remote-sensing comparison are needed to reign in this large uncertainty.

6. Conclusion

We present an update to the widely used PT-JPL ET model to address one of the model's main gaps: the implicit representation of soil water control. We incorporate soil moisture constraints on evaporation and transpiration. In situ analyses demonstrate the largest improvements for ET estimates in dry regions. We apply SMAP soil moisture observations to model ET globally using PT-JPLSM. The PT-JPLSM model shows improved model performance when compared to ground observations. Finer spatial resolution soil moisture observations at 9 km from the SMAP Level 3 Passive Enhanced product resulted in reduced LE error and increased explanation of variance compared LE forced with the 36 km SMAP Level 3 Passive product. The soil moisture constraint resulted in lower global estimates of evaporation and
transpiration for water-limited regions. These lower ET estimates have implications for feedbacks between the water cycle and the carbon cycle. Arid and semi-arid regions have been identified as a major contributor to the inter-annual variability in CO₂ uptake and are key areas to better understand how strong coupling between land-atmosphere moisture exchange impacts carbon uptake (Levine et al., 2016; Miralles et al., 2014, 2012; Poulter et al., 2014). The lower estimates provide a more accurate dataset to quantify water use efficiency and track impacts from drought and climate perturbations such as El Niño events. The updated PT-JPL5m ET model shows expected patterns of changes in ET for El Niño and La Niña years. Based on the results in this study we conclude that modifications to the PT-JPL algorithm to include soil

Fig. 7. Evapotranspiration components as expressed as a percentage of total ET. Red indicates more soil evaporation, blue indicates more transpiration, yellow indicates more canopy interception evaporation. Below, total contribution to annual ET from transpiration, soil evaporation, and interception.
moisture produce more realistic ET estimates globally. This dataset provides the opportunity to identify vegetation vulnerable to drought and water limiting conditions.
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