

Capability of the variogram to quantify the spatial patterns of surface fluxes and soil moisture simulated by land surface models

Article

Accepted Version

Garrigues, S., Verhoef, A. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9498-6696>, Blyth, E., Wright, A., Balan-Sarojini, B., Robinson, E. L., Dadson, S., Boone, A., Boussetta, S. and Balsamo, G. (2021) Capability of the variogram to quantify the spatial patterns of surface fluxes and soil moisture simulated by land surface models. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 45 (2). pp. 279-293. ISSN 1477-0296 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133320986147> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/95949/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309133320986147>

Publisher: Sage

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in

the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

**Capability of the variogram to quantify the spatial patterns
of surface fluxes and soil moisture simulated by land
surface models.**

Journal:	<i>Progress in Physical Geography</i>
Manuscript ID	PPG-20-145.R1
Manuscript Type:	Progress Report
Keywords:	Variogram analysis, Land surface model, Surface flux, spatial pattern, spatial variability, spatial structure, spatial structure of accuracy
Abstract:	<p>Up to now, relatively little effort has been dedicated to the quantitative assessment of the differences in spatial patterns of model outputs. In this paper, we employed a variogram-based methodology to quantify the differences in the spatial patterns of root-zone soil moisture, net radiation, and latent and sensible heat fluxes simulated by three land surface models (SURFEX/ISBA, JULES and CHTESSEL) over three European geographic domains, namely United-Kingdom, France and Spain. The model output spatial patterns were quantified through two metrics derived from the variogram: i) the variogram sill which quantifies the degree of spatial variability of the data and ii) the variogram integral range which represents the spatial length scale of the data.</p> <p>The higher seasonal variation of the spatial variability of sensible and latent heat fluxes over France and Spain compared to UK is related to a more frequent occurrence of a soil-moisture limited evapotranspiration regime during summer dry spells in the South of France and Spain. The small differences in spatial variability of net radiation between models indicates that the spatial patterns of net radiation are mostly driven by the climate forcing data set. However, the models exhibit larger differences in latent and sensible heat flux spatial variabilities, which are related to their differences in i) soil and vegetation ancillary datasets and ii) physical process representation. The highest discrepancies in spatial patterns between models are observed for soil moisture which is mainly related to the type of soil hydraulic function implemented in the models. This work demonstrates the capability of the variogram to enhance our understanding of the spatiotemporal structure of the uncertainties in land surface model outputs. We therefore strongly encourage the implementation of the variogram metrics in model intercomparison exercises.</p>

Abstract

Up to now, relatively little effort has been dedicated to the quantitative assessment of the differences in spatial patterns of model outputs. In this paper, we employed a variogram-based methodology to quantify the differences in the spatial patterns of root-zone soil moisture, net radiation, and latent and sensible heat fluxes simulated by three land surface models (SURFEX/ISBA, JULES and CHTESSEL) over three European geographic domains, namely United-Kingdom, France and Spain. The model output spatial patterns were quantified through two metrics derived from the variogram: i) the variogram sill which quantifies the degree of spatial variability of the data and ii) the variogram integral range which represents the spatial length scale of the data.

The higher seasonal variation of the spatial variability of sensible and latent heat fluxes over France and Spain compared to UK is related to a more frequent occurrence of a soil-moisture limited evapotranspiration regime during summer dry spells in the South of France and Spain. The small differences in spatial variability of net radiation between models indicates that the spatial patterns of net radiation are mostly driven by the climate forcing data set. However, the models exhibit larger differences in latent and sensible heat flux spatial variabilities, which are related to their differences in i) soil and vegetation ancillary datasets and ii) physical process representation. The highest discrepancies in spatial patterns between models are observed for soil moisture which is mainly related to the type of soil hydraulic function implemented in the models.

This work demonstrates the capability of the variogram to enhance our understanding of the spatiotemporal structure of the uncertainties in land surface model outputs. We therefore strongly encourage the implementation of the variogram metrics in model intercomparison exercises.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 25
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords: spatial variability, spatial structure, spatial pattern, variogram analysis, land surface model, surface fluxes, soil moisture.

1 Introduction

30 Accurate simulation of surface fluxes, such as evapotranspiration (ET), is essential to reduce the uncertainties
in predictions of the long-term evolution of the terrestrial water cycle and the occurrence of hydro-
meteorological hazards (Seneviratne et al. 2010; Vilasa et al., 2017). The different ways in which the control
of soil moisture on ET dynamics is modelled has been identified as a major source of discrepancies among
land surface model (LSM) predictions (Seneviratne et al. 2010). Various experiments have been designed to
35 compare multiple LSMs and evaluate them against observations at both regional (Henderson-Sellers et al.
1993; Boone et al. 2009) and global scales (Dirmeyer, 2011, Koster et al., 2006). Important efforts have been
dedicated to developing tools to evaluate and compare model performances at various spatial and temporal
scales using ground data sets (e.g. FLUXNET) and satellite observations (Kumar et al., 2012; Luo et al., 2012;
Best et al., 2015; Eyring et al., 2016).

40 Intercomparison of LSMs generally rely on first-order statistical metrics such as accuracy metrics (RMSE,
bias), density function overlap with observations, model against observation scatterplots or Taylor diagrams,
to quantify the discrepancies between models. Some process-based metrics have been developed to investigate
a specific feature of the model such as the dry-down dynamics (Ukkola et al. 2016; Harris et al., 2017) or the
bi-modal distribution of soil moisture (Vilasa et al., 2017).

45 While most studies have investigated the uncertainties in the temporal dynamics of surface fluxes, using the
metrics mentioned above, far fewer efforts have been dedicated to quantify the uncertainties in their spatial
dynamics (Harris et al., 2017). **The evaluation of the differences in spatial patterns simulated by land surface
models has been limited to qualitative assessment of spatial maps of key model output fluxes or variables, that
provides little insight into the spatiotemporal structures of the model output uncertainties.**

50 **The analysis of the spatial structures displayed by geospatial data sets brings insight on the nature and the
scale of spatial variation of Earth surface processes. Garrigues et al., 2007 employed stochastic models to
characterize the nature of the spatial structures displayed by satellite imagery and to identify the underlying
processes structuring distinct types of landscape. Besides, Garrigues et al., 2008 showed that the seasonal
evolution of cropland spatial structures observed in satellite imagery can be related to vegetation dynamic**

1
2
3
4 55 processes and agricultural practices. Tarnavsky et al., 2008 employed variogram analysis to assess the
5
6 differences in spatial information content across multiple satellite-based vegetation maps and to identify the
7
8 spatial resolution at which the differences in spatial information content between satellite data sets is
9
10 reduced. Similarly, Pontius et al., 2008 showed that the analysis of the variations of the spatial structures of
11
12 maps as a function of spatial resolutions brings insights on the differences in spatial information content
13
14 between geospatial data sets. Pontius and Malanson, 2005 used this approach to assess the differences in
15 60 accuracy between distinct land use models.
16
17

18
19 First-order statistics are not sufficient to reliably characterize the spatial structures of model outputs since they
20
21 do not account for spatial correlation (Julesz, 1962). Second-order spatial statistic metrics are required to
22
23 resolve the differences in the spatial patterns of geospatial data. A review of second-order spatial metrics
24
25 applied to remote sensing imagery is given in Garrigues et al. (2006). These authors highlighted that the
26 65 variogram is a robust tool to measure the spatial patterns of uncertainties in satellite observations. They
27
28 exploited the variogram to quantify: (i) the spatial variability of the data over the area of interest and (ii) the
29
30 spatial structures of the data, i.e. patches of similar outputs that repeat themselves independently within the
31
32 studied region at a characteristic spatial length scale. Furthermore, the implementation of variogram is more
33
34 straightforward than other metrics, such as wavelet decomposition (Csillag and Kabos, 2002).
35
36 70

37
38 In this paper, the variogram analysis methodology is applied to surface energy balance fluxes and root-zone
39
40 soil moisture content simulated by three LSMs, at the regional scale, over three European domains associated
41
42 with contrasted climate. The models are implemented using their standard configuration along with their
43
44 standard soil and vegetation parameters. This progress report aims to demonstrate the capability of the
45
46 variogram analysis to quantify the differences in the spatial patterns of surface fluxes and soil moisture, as
47 75 predicted by distinct land surface models. The results of the variogram analysis are used to discuss the drivers
48
49 of the differences in spatial patterns of model outputs.
50
51
52
53

54 **2 Models and simulation design**

57 **2.1 Model description**

1
2
3
4 80 Three LSMs are used in this work:

- 5
6
7 • SURFEX/ISBA (the Interactions between Soil, Biosphere, and Atmosphere; Noilhan and
8 Planton, 1989) v8.0 developed at Meteo France;
- 9
10
11 • JULES (the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator; Best et al., 2011) configured as GL6
12 and based on the code version 4.4, developed by the Met Office;
- 13
14
15
16
17 85 • CHTESSEL, (most recent version of the Tiled ECMWF Scheme for Surface Exchanges
18 Over Land; Basalmo et al. (2009)) employed at the European Centre for Medium-Range
19 Weather Forecasts (ECMWF).

20
21
22
23
24
25 Table 1 provides the main characteristics of these models. These models are driven by a climatology
26 of Leaf Area Index and vegetation height. Their spatial integration is achieved using their default soil
27 and vegetation ancillary data sets and land cover map. All models calculate a single source energy
28
29 90 and vegetation ancillary data sets and land cover map. All models calculate a single source energy
30 balance and use a multi-layer diffusion scheme to simulate water and heat transfer in the soil. While
31 SURFEX and JULES represent the functional coupling between the stomatal conductance (g_s) and
32 the net assimilation of CO_2 (photosynthesis, A), CHTESSEL relies on an empirical parametric
33 formulation of the stomatal conductance.

40 41 95 **2.2 Experiment design**

42
43
44 The simulations were conducted from 1994 to 2012 over a 0.5° grid over Europe and at a 3-hourly
45 time step, using the WFDEI (WATCH Forcing Data methodology applied to ERA-Interim data,
46 Weedon et al., 2014) atmospheric reanalysis. Two distinct simulations were conducted for JULES
47 using distinct soil hydraulic parametrizations: one is based on the van Genuchten, 1980 scheme
48
49
50
51
52 100 (JULES_{VG}) and one relies on the Clapp and Hornberger, 1978 scheme (JULES_{CH}). We used the 1979-
53 1993 period as a spin up period and the model's outputs were analyzed from 1994 to 2012.

54
55
56
57
58 The spatial patterns of the model outputs were evaluated over three European geographic domains,
59
60

namely United-Kingdom, France and Spain, which were selected to represent contrasted climate, soil and vegetation characteristics (Table 2). The variogram analysis is applied to the latent heat (LE), sensible heat (H), net radiation (RN) fluxes, and the root-zone liquid soil moisture content (θ) variables. Three-hourly model outputs are first averaged over 10-days. Next, the 10-day values are averaged over the entire simulation period (1994-2012), to represent a mean climatological annual timeseries, i.e. thirty-six 10-day values. The variograms of the mean climatological values of each flux and variable are then computed.

3 Geostatistical methodology to quantify the spatial patterns of model outputs

The variogram analysis consists of two steps: i) computing the empirical variogram over the domain of interest and ii) fitting a theoretical variogram model to the empirical variogram to retrieve the spatial variability and the size of the spatial structures of the data.

3.1 Empirical variogram

The empirical variogram $\gamma^e(h)$ (Eq. 1) measures the dissimilarity between the model outputs $z(x_i)$ and $z(x_j)$ taken at two distinct grid cells x_i and x_j separated by a distance h (Eq.(1)). To provide statistically meaningful variogram values, the pairs of grid cells at a similar distance h are grouped into bins of separation distance. $N(h)$ is the number of grid cell pairs within each bin. The variogram is computed as the average of the squared differences of the model values ($z(x_i)$ and $z(x_j)$) of all pairs of grid cells that fall within each distance bin. To properly sample the range of separation distance h between grid cells, the bin size is set to one grid cell. The variogram is computed to a maximum distance equal to half the domain size to ensure that there are enough grid cell pairs within in each distance bin (Garrigues et al. 2006).

$$\gamma^e(h) = \frac{1}{2N(h)} \sum_{x_i, x_j \| x_i - x_j \| = h} (z(x_i) - z(x_j))^2 \quad (1)$$

3.2 Variogram modelling

We assume that the model outputs ($z(x_i)$ and $z(x_j)$) are realizations of a random function $Z(x)$. Under the second-order stationarity hypothesis (Chiles and Delfiner, 2012), which ensures the existence and the stationarity of the first and second moments of $Z(x)$, the theoretical variogram $\gamma(h)$ is defined by:

$$\gamma(h) = 0.5\text{Var}[Z(x+h) - Z(x)] = \sigma^2 - C(h) \quad (2)$$

where $C(h)$ and σ^2 are the covariance and the variance of $Z(x)$, respectively. $\gamma(h)$ is a function starting from 0 for $h = 0$ and converging to the sill, σ^2 , as h tends to infinity. The range, r , of the theoretical variogram is the distance at which it reaches the sill. Data separated by a distance larger than the range are spatially uncorrelated.

The linear model of regionalization, which models the variogram as a linear combination of elementary conditionally definite negative functions $g_k(h)$, is defined by:

$$\gamma(h) = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^k (b_k g_k(h)) \quad (3)$$

where b_k is the weight associated to each function $g_k(h)$. In an exploratory approach, distinct combinations of distinct g_k functions (spherical, exponential, Gaussian) were tested and it was found that a single exponential model was providing the best fit to our data.

Eq. (3) then becomes:

$$\gamma(h) = \sigma^2 \left[1 - \exp\left(\frac{-3h}{r}\right) \right] \quad (4)$$

The parameters σ^2 and r of the exponential variogram model are estimated by least-square fitting to the experimental variogram.

1
2
3
4 150 The integral range derived from the variogram (A, Eq. 5) is used to quantify the spatial structures of the data.
5
6 A is an area moment that represents the mean surface of the spatial structure of the variable over a given spatial
7
8 domain (Chiles and Delfiner, 2012).
9

$$A = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{h \in \mathbb{R}^2} (\sigma^2 - \gamma(h)) \quad (5)$$

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 155
17
18 The value of A for an exponential variogram model can be analytically derived from Eq. 4 and is directly
19
20 proportional to the variogram range:
21
22

$$A = \frac{2\pi r^2}{9} \quad (6)$$

29 160 3.3 Variogram modelling assumptions

30
31 The modelling of the variogram relies on the second order stationarity hypothesis which implies that the data
32
33 does not exhibit any spatial trend within the geographic domain and allows to use the variogram range to
34
35 quantify the length scale of the data. As demonstrated by Garrigues et al., (2006), the integral range can be
36
37 used as a posteriori yardstick to judge if the size of the geographic domain is large enough to measure properly
38
39 the length scale of the data with the variogram. We verified that the integral range of most of the modelled
40 165
41
42 variograms are small enough compared to the surface of the geographic domain that justifies the validity of
43
44 the second order stationarity hypothesis.
45

46 We chose to not include any nugget component (discontinuity at the origin) to represent unresolved sub-grid
47
48 variability. We checked that including a nugget term in Eq.3 did not improve the quality of the variogram fit
49
50 and does not change the estimation of the length scale of the data. This work is focused on the characterization
51 170
52
53 of large-scale spatial structures and the characterization of sub-grid heterogeneity, which would require data
54
55 at a finer spatial resolution, is beyond the scope of this work.
56

57 3.4 Spatial pattern analysis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The spatial patterns of the variables of interest are characterized by the square root of the variogram sill (i.e., σ), which quantifies the degree of spatial variability of the data, and by the variogram integral range (A), which quantifies the mean surface of the spatial structures (i.e patches) displayed by the data. The unit of σ is that of the variable (W m^{-2} for the surface fluxes and $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ for soil moisture). The unit of A is that of the surface of a grid cell (0.25 deg^2).

The analysis involves **quantifying the seasonal evolution of A and σ and assess the differences across geographic domains, variables and models**. We use the Root-Mean-Square-Difference (RMSD) to quantify the differences in A and σ between model experiments.

Variograms were also computed for two key surface properties:

- the maximum water content available for the plant transpiration (MaxAWC) which is defined as the difference between the soil moisture at field capacity and the soil moisture at wilting point; this is a key driver of ET dynamics (Garrigues et al. 2015). MaxAWC is constant in time so one variogram is computed for each model and each geographic domain.
- the monthly Leaf Area Index (LAI) which represent the vegetation seasonal cycle. For each LSM, a variogram of LAI was computed over each geographic domain at a monthly timestep. In this report, we showed the results for France to illustrate the relationship between the spatial patterns of LAI and that of surface fluxes.

4 Drivers of the spatial patterns of surface fluxes and soil moisture

Impact of climate

Figure 1 shows that the seasonal variations of A and σ of net radiation are low compared to those calculated for latent and sensible heat fluxes. Net radiation is strongly driven by the climate and its spatial pattern does not have a strong seasonal signal.

Impact of surface characteristics

1
2
3
4 The lower values of A generally obtained over France indicate smaller size of spatial structures
5 compared to UK and Spain. This is related to the smaller spatial structures observed for the soil
6 hydraulic properties (Figure 5) and for LAI (Figure 6) over France.
7
8

9
10
11 200 *Impact of vegetation dynamics*

12
13
14 The spatial variability of sensible and latent heat fluxes exhibits strong seasonal variations and is the
15 highest in late spring and early summer (Figure 2 and 3). This is related to the development of
16 vegetation in spring and summer which results in a higher spatial variability of LAI as shown by
17 Figure 7. The contrast between the response of vegetated and non-vegetated surface to the climate
18 forcing is more important in summer which increases the spatial variability of surface fluxes. Also,
19 evapotranspiration is more frequently limited by soil moisture during spring and summer; this
20 contributes to the larger spatial variability in latent heat fluxes.
21
22

23 205
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 *Impact of soil moisture stress*

32
33 The larger seasonal variations of σ for sensible and latent heat fluxes observed over France and Spain
34 compared to UK (Figure 2 and 3) is most likely related to a more frequent occurrence of the soil-
35 moisture limited regime in the South of France and in Spain. Soil moisture stress generates large
36 spatial contrasts in the energy partitioning between latent and sensible heat which explains the
37 increase of the spatial variability of surface fluxes during dry spells.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **5 Drivers of the differences in spatial patterns between models**

46
47 215 Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the differences in A and σ are lower for the comparison between SURFEX
48 and JULES compared to the comparison of these models with CHTESSEL which has the highest
49 RMSD. The largest discrepancies between models are obtained for sensible and latent heat fluxes and
50 root-zone soil moisture. We investigate below the main drivers of these discrepancies.
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 *Impact of forcing data set*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 220 Figure 1 shows small differences in in A and σ of net radiation across models. This is supported by
5
6 the higher RMSD of spatial variability between models, for H and LE , compared to those calculated
7
8 for RN (Table 4). The main explanation is that the climate forcing data set, which contains the main
9
10 drivers of net radiation, i.e., shortwave and longwave incoming radiation, is identical across
11
12 experiments. Conversely latent and sensible heat fluxes exhibit larger differences in spatial patterns
13
14
15 225 between experiments which arise from the differences in i) the soil and vegetation data sets
16
17 implemented in each model and ii) physical process representation such as stomatal conductance
18
19 parametrization.
20
21

22 *Impact of soil hydraulic parametrization*

23
24
25 The largest differences in σ between models are observed for the root-zone soil moisture. For France
26
27 230 and Spain, we identified two combinations of models with similar σ values (Figure 4, Table 4):

- 31 • JULES_{VG} and CHTESSEL with the highest σ values,
- 32
- 33 • JULES_{CH} and SURFEX with the lowest σ values.
- 34

35
36 Conversely for UK, JULES_{CH}, JULES_{VG} and SURFEX provide similar σ values of soil moisture
37
38 while CHTESSEL shows much higher values than the rest of the models.
39

40
41 235 The simulation of surface fluxes is hugely dependent on the soil hydraulic parametrization and soil
42
43 property map (Garrigues et al., 2015) which can exhibit different spatial patterns across models.
44
45 SURFEX and JULES_{CH} are based on the Clapp and Hornberger, 1978 model while JULES_{VG} and
46
47 CHTESSEL rely on the van Genuchten, 1980 model. This observation holds over France and Spain;
48
49 this suggests that the impact of the type of soil hydraulic parametrization on the surface flux spatial
50
51 patterns is stronger than the type of soil map used to infer the soil properties over these domains.
52
53 240 Conversely, over the UK, the substantial differences in spatial variability between CHTESSEL and
54
55 the rest of the model experiments are probably related to differences in the spatial distribution of soil
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 properties. This is confirmed by the variograms computed on the soil hydraulic properties (MaxAWC,
5
6 Figure 5) which exhibit large discrepancies in the spatial variability of MaxAWC between models
7
8
9 245 over UK.

10 11 *Impact of LAI*

12
13
14 The LAI value of each grid cell is the result of the LAI data set and the land cover map implemented
15
16 in each model. While the models rely on the same satellite LAI data set, they use different land cover
17
18 classifications (see Table 1) which may generate distinct spatial distributions of grid cell LAI values.
19
20
21 250 This is illustrated over France where the models exhibit large discrepancies in both the LAI spatial
22
23 structures (Figure 6) and the time course of the LAI spatial variability (Figure 7). Figure 7 shows that
24
25 over France, SURFEX and JULES display more pronounced seasonal variations of LAI spatial
26
27 variability than CHTESSEL which is concurrently observed for the latent heat flux in Figure 3.
28
29 Besides, JULES shows the highest values of LAI spatial variability during the summer which
30
31 concurrently results in the highest spatial variability of latent heat flux during the summer. The shift
32
33 255 in the seasonal variation of LAI spatial variability of SURFEX and JULES observed over France
34
35 (Figure 7) is also observed for the latent heat flux (Figure 3). These examples clearly show that the
36
37 LAI spatial variability is a key driver of the spatial variability of the simulated surface fluxes.
38
39
40
41

42 **6 Conclusions**

43
44
45 260 **This work shows that variogram modeling is a powerful tool to quantify the differences in land surface**
46
47 **model outputs through two components:**

- 48
49 - the degree of spatial variability quantified by the variogram sill,
- 50
51 - the surface of the spatial structure of the data represented by the variogram integral range.

52
53
54 Variogram analysis was applied to surface fluxes and soil moisture simulated by three land surface
55
56
57 265 models over three European domains with contrasted climates (UK, France and Spain).
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The main outcomes are

5
6
7 -The models show larger differences in the spatial variabilities of the turbulent heat fluxes, which are
8
9 more prominently driven by i) soil and vegetation ancillary data and ii) physical process
10
11 representation, compared to the net radiation spatial variability which is mainly driven by the radiative
12
13
14 270 climate forcing.

15
16 - The seasonal evolution of the spatial variability of LAI and that of latent heat flux show large
17
18 similarities. The increase in spatial variability of sensible and latent heat fluxes in spring and summer
19
20 is related to the enhancement of the spatial variability of LAI which creates a larger spatial contrast
21
22 in the surface response to the climate forcing. The higher seasonal variations of spatial variability in
23
24
25 275 turbulent heat fluxes observed over France and Spain are most likely related to a more frequent
26
27 occurrence of soil-moisture limited ET regime during summer dry spells in Spain and South of
28
29 France.

30
31
32 - The highest discrepancies in spatial patterns between models are observed for soil moisture. Over
33
34 France and Spain, the spatial patterns of soil moisture are primarily related to by the type of soil
35
36
37 280 hydraulic function (van Genuchten (1980) versus Clapp, R. and G. Hornberger (1978)) while over UK the
38
39 differences between models are related mainly to differences in soil maps that determine the
40
41 parameters of the soil hydraulic functions.
42
43

44
45 This report highlights the capability of the variogram **to measure** the spatial patterns of land surface
46
47 model outputs, to monitor the seasonal changes in spatial patterns and **to quantify** the differences in
48
49 285 spatial patterns across variables, geographic domains and models. The integral range is a powerful
50
51 metric to verify if the model simulations resolve similar spatial features. The variogram sill allows
52
53 the detection of differences in the spatial variability across models that can be related to differences
54
55 in the spatial distribution of the surface parameters used by each model. We therefore strongly
56
57 encourage the implementation of the variogram metrics in model intercomparison exercises to
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 290 enhance our understanding of the spatiotemporal structure of the uncertainties associated with land
5
6 surface models. Besides, the variogram analysis proposed in this work can be applied to satellite
7
8 observations of surface fluxes and surface characteristics to evaluate **the accuracy of** the spatial
9
10 patterns of surface fluxes simulated by land surface models.
11
12

13
14 A key assumption of the variogram modelling approach, used in this work, is the second-order
15
16 295 stationarity which implies that the data does not exhibit any spatial trend and allows to use the variogram to
17
18 quantify the length scale of the data. The integral range, which represents the average surface of the data spatial
19
20 structure, can be used to verify a posteriori the validity of this assumption. The size of the geographic domain
21
22 should be adjusted to have an integral range much smaller than the surface of the geographic domain used to
23
24 compute the variogram. Besides, in this work we chose to model the variogram using a single
25
26 exponential model to demonstrate the capability of the variogram metrics to characterize the model
27 300 outputs spatial patterns. A first improvement could be to include additional elementary functions in
28
29 the linear model of regionalization (Eq. 2) to describe multiple length scales in the data. While this
30
31 can be relevant for small spatial domains, we did not find any improvements for the large domains
32
33 investigated in this work. Another possible avenue for improvement is to use alternative types of
34
35 covariance models. Genton and Kleiber (2015) demonstrate the flexibility of the Matern covariance
36
37 function to describe correlation at both large (scale parameter) and small distances (smoothness
38
39 305 parameter). In addition, in this work, we modeled the spatial patterns for each 10-day time step and
40
41 then we observed the temporal evolution of the variogram metrics. An alternative approach could be
42
43 to implement a space-time version of the linear model of regionalization to describe the
44
45 spatiotemporal structure of the model outputs (De Iaco et al., 2013). Variograms can be modelled
46
47 within a multivariate framework to investigate the co-variability between variables. This could be
48
49 applied in further research to analyze the spatial dynamics of ET-soil moisture relationships, and to
50 310 identify the discrepancies in the representation of the spatial dynamics of drought across models.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 315
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 320
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

References

- 325 Abramowitz, G. (2012) Towards a public, standardized, diagnostic benchmarking system for land surface models. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 5: 819-827. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-819-2012>, 2012.
- 330 Balsamo, G, P. Viterbo, A. C. M. Beljaars, B. J. J. M. van den Hurk, M. Hirschi, A. K. Betts, and K. Scipal, (2009) A revised hydrology for the ECMWF model: Verification from field site to terrestrial water storage and impact in the ECMWF-IFS. *J. Hydrometeor.* 10: 623–643.
- Balsamo, G, P. S. Boussetta, E. Dutra, A. C. M. Beljaars, P. Viterbo and B. J. J. M. Van de Hurk, (2011) Evolution of land surface processes in the IFS. ECMWF Newsletter, No. 127, ECMWF, Reading, United Kingdom, 17–22
- 335 Best, M.J., and co-authors (2011) The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES), Model description – Part 1: Energy and water fluxes. *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.* 4: 595–640. doi:10.5194/gmdd-4-595-2011.
- 340 Best, M.J., G. Abramowitz, H.R. Johnson, A.J. Pitman, G. Balsamo, A. Boone, M. Cuntz, B. Decharme, P.A. Dirmeyer, J. Dong, M. Ek, Z. Guo, V. Haverd, B.J. van den Hurk, G.S. Nearing, B. Pak, C. Peters-Lidard, J.A. Santanello, L. Stevens, and N. Vuichard (2015) [The Plumbing of Land Surface Models: Benchmarking Model Performance](https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0158.1). *J. Hydrometeor.* 16:1425–1442. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0158.1>
- Boone, A. and Etchevers, P, (2001) An intercomparison of three snow schemes of varying complexity coupled to the same land-surface model: Local scale evaluation at an Alpine site. *J. Hydrometeorol.* 2:374–394.
- 345 Boone, A., Habets, F., Noilhan, J., Clark, D., Dirmeyer, P., Fox, S., Gusev, Y., Haddeland, I., Koster, R., Lohmann, D., Mahanama, S., Mitchell, K., Nasonova, O., Niu, G.-Y., Pitman, A., Polcher, J., Shmakin, A. B., Tanaka, K., van den Hurk, B., Verant, S., Versegny, D., Viterbo, P., and Yang, Z.-L. (2004) The Rhone-Aggregation Land Surface Scheme Intercomparison Project: an overview. *J. Climate.* 17: 187–208.
- 350 Boussetta, S., Balsamo G., Beljaars A., Agustí-Panareda A., Calvet J.-C., Jacobs C., van den Hurk B., Viterbo P., Lafont S., Dutra E., Jarlan L., Balzarolo M., Papale D., and van der Werf, G., 2013: Natural land carbon dioxide exchanges in the ECMWF Integrated Forecasting System: Implementation and offline validation. *J. Geophys. Res.* 118: 5923–5946. doi: 10.1002/jgrd.50488
- 355 Brooks, R. H. and A. T. Corey, (1964) Properties of porous media affecting fluid flow. *J. Irrig. Drain. Am. Soc. Civil Eng.* 2: 61–88, 1966.
- 360 Carrer, D., Roujean, J.-L., Lafont, S., Calvet, J.-C., Boone, A., Decharme, B., Delire, C., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.-P. (2013) A canopy radiative transfer scheme with explicit FAPAR for the interactive vegetation model ISBA-A-gs: Impact on carbon fluxes. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences.* 118:888–903. doi:10.1002/jgrg.20070
- Calvet, J.-C., J. Noilhan, J.-L. Roujean, P. Bessemoulin, M. Cabelguenne, A. Olioso, and J.-P. Wigneron (1998) An interactive vegetation SVAT model tested against data from six contrasting sites. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* (92):73-95.
- 365 Calvet, J.-C., V. Rivalland, C. Picon-Cochard, and J.-M. Guehl, (2004) Modelling forest transpiration and CO₂ fluxes – response to soil moisture stress. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* (124(3–4)):

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

143–156, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2004.01.007.

Calvet, J.-C., Lafont, S., Cloppet, E., Souverain, F., Badeau, V. and C. Le Bas, (2012) Use of agricultural statistics to verify the interannual variability in land surface models: a case study over France with ISBA-A-gs. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **5**:37–54, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-37-2012.

370 Clapp, R. and G. Hornberger, (1978) Empirical equations for some soil hydraulic properties. *Water Resour. Res.* **14**: 601–604.

Chiles J, Delfiner P (2012) *Geostatistics : Modeling spatial uncertainty*, 2nd edn. Wiley, New York

375 Csillag, F., & Kabos, S. (2002) Wavelets, boundaries and the analysis of landscape pattern. *Ecoscience.* **9**: 177–190.

Decharme, B., A. Boone, C. Delire, and J. Noilhan (2011) Local evaluation of the Interaction between Soil Biosphere Atmosphere soil multilayer diffusion scheme using four pedotransfer functions. *J. Geophys. Res.* **116**: D20126, doi:10.1029/2011JD016002.

380 Decharme, B., E. Martin, and S. Faroux (2013): Reconciling soil thermal and hydrological lower boundary conditions in land surface models. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **118**:7819–7834, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50631.

Decharme, B., E. Brun, A. Boone, C. Delire, P. Le Moigne and S. Morin, (2016) Impacts of snow and organic soils parameterization on northern Eurasian soil temperature profiles simulated by the ISBA land surface model. *The Cryosphere*, **10**: 853–877. doi:10.5194/tc-10-853-2016.

385 De Iaco , S., Myers, D. E., Palma, M. and Posa, D., (2013) Using simultaneous diagonalization to identify a space–time linear coregionalization model. *Math. Geosci.* **45**: 69–86. MR3018750

Desborough, C. E.(1997). The Impact of Root Weighting on the Response of Transpiration to Moisture Stress in Land Surface Schemes, *Mon. Weather Rev.* **125**:1920–1930.

390 Dirmeyer, P. A., (2011) A history and review of the Global Soil Wetness Project (GSWP). *J. Hydrometeor.* **12**:729–749, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-10-05010.1.

Dolman, A. J. and De Jeu, R. A. M., (2010) Evaporation in Focus. *Nat. Geosci.*,**3**:296, doi:10.1038/ngeo849.

43 395 Egea, G., Verhoef, A., Vidale, P. L. (2011). Towards an improved and more flexible representation of water stress in coupled photosynthesis stomatal conductance models. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* **151** :1370-1384.

45 400 Eyring, V., Righi, M., Lauer, A., Evaldsson, M., Wenzel, S., Jones, C., Anav, A., Andrews, O., Cionni, I., Davin, E. L., Deser, C., Ehbrecht, C., Friedlingstein, P., Gleckler, P., Gottschaldt, K.-D., Hagemann, S., Juckes, M., Kindermann, S., Krasting, J., Kunert, D., Levine, R., Loew, A., Mäkelä, J., Martin, G., Mason, E., Phillips, A. S., Read, S., Rio, C., Roehrig, R., Senftleben, D., Sterl, A., Ulft, L. H., Walton, J., Wang, S., Williams, K. D. (2016). ESMValTool (v1.0)—A community diagnostic and performance metrics tool for routine evaluation of Earth system models in CMIP. *Geoscientific Model Development.* **9**(5): 1747–1802. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1747-2016>

405 Faroux, S., A. T. Kaptué Tchuenté, J.-L. Roujean, V. Masson, E. Martin, and P. Le Moigne (2013) Ecoclimap-II/Europe: a twofold database of ecosystems and surface parameters at 1 km resolution based on satellite information for use in land surface, meteorological and climate models. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **6**:563-582, doi:10.5194/gmd-6-563-2013.

ECMWF, (2011), *IFS documentation Cy37r2, Part IV: Physical processes, Chapter 8*,
<https://www.ecmwf.int/en/elibrary/9239-part-iv-physical-processes>

410 FAO (2003). Digital soil map of the world (DSMW). Technical report, Food and Agriculture
 Organization of the United Nations, re-issued version.

Garrigues, S., Allard, D., Baret, F., & Weiss, M. (2006): Quantifying spatial heterogeneity at the
 landscape scale using variogram models. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 103:81–96.

415 Garrigues, S., Allard, D., Baret, F., (2007). Using first- and second-order variograms for
 characterizing landscape spatial structures from remote sensing imagery. *IEEE Transactions on
 Geoscience and Remote Sensing*. **45** (6): 1823-1834. DOI: 10.1109/TGRS.2007.894572

Garrigues, S., Allard, D., Baret, F., (2008). Modeling temporal changes in surface spatial heterogeneity
 over an agricultural site. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. **112** (2):588-602. DOI :
[10.1016/j.rse.2007.05.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.05.014)

420 Garrigues, S., A. Olioso, D. Carrer, B. Decharme, J.-C. Calvet, E. Martin, S. Moulin, and O.
 Marloie (2015) Impact of climate, vegetation, soil and crop management variables on multi-year
 ISBA-A-gs simulations of evapotranspiration over a Mediterranean crop site. *Geosci. Model
 Dev.*, **8**:3033–3053. doi:10.5194/gmd-8-3033-2015.

425 Garrigues S., A.Boone, B. Decharme, A. Olioso , C. Albergel, J-C. Calvet , S. Moulin, S. Buis,
 E.. Martin (2018) Impacts of the soil water transfer parametrization on the simulation of
 evapotranspiration over a 14-year Mediterranean crop succession. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*,
 19:3-25. DOI:JHM-D-17-0058.1

Genton, M.G and Kleiber, W., (2015) Cross-covariance functions for multivariate geostatistics,
Statistical Science, 30: 147-163.

430 Goudriaan, J., H.H. van Laar, H. van Keulen, and W. Louwse, (1985) Photosynthesis, CO₂ and
 plant production. *Wheat Growth and Modelling*, W. Day, and R.K. Atkin, Eds, NATO ASI
 Series, Plenum Press, New York, Series A, **86**, 107–122.

435 Harris, P.P., S.S. Folwell, B. Gallego-Elvira, J. Rodríguez, S. Milton, and C.M. Taylor (2017) An
 Evaluation of Modeled Evaporation Regimes in Europe Using Observed Dry Spell Land Surface
 Temperature. *J. Hydrometeor.*, 18: 1453–1470, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-16-0227.1>

Henderson-Sellers, A., Yang, Z.-L., & Dickinson, R. E. (1993). The Project for intercomparison of
 land-surface parameterization schemes. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological
 Society*. **74**(7):1335– 1349.

440 HWSD, 2009, Harmonized World Soil Database, Documentation,
www.fao.org/docrep/018/aq361e/aq361e.pdf

Jarvis, P. G., (1976). The interpretation in the variations of leaf water potential and stomatal
 conductance found in canopies in the field. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London*, B. 273:593–610.

Julesz, B. (1962). Visual pattern discrimination. *Institute of Radio Engineers Transactions on
 Information Theory*. 8:84–92

445 Koster, R. D., Sud, Y. C., Guo, Z., Dirmeyer, P. A., Bonan, G., Oleson, K. W., et al. (2006)
 GLACE: The Global Land-Atmosphere Coupling Experiment. Part I: Overview. *Journal of
 Hydrometeorology*. 7(4): 590–610. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM510.1>

Kumar, S. V., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Santanello, J., Harrison, K., Liu, Y., and Shaw, M. (2012)
 Land surface Verification Toolkit (LVT) – a generalized framework for land surface model

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 450 evaluation. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 5:869-886, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-869-2012>.
- Luo, Y. Q., Randerson, J. T., Abramowitz, G., Bacour, C., Blyth, E., Carvalhais, N., Ciais, P., Dalmonech, D., Fisher, J. B., Fisher, R., Friedlingstein, P., Hibbard, K., Hoffman, F., Huntzinger, D., Jones, C. D., Koven, C., Lawrence, D., Li, D. J., Mahecha, M., Niu, S. L., Norby, R., Piao, S. L., Qi, X., Peylin, P., Prentice, I. C., Riley, W., Reichstein, M., Schwalm, C., Wang, Y. P., Xia, J. Y., Zaehle, S., Zhou, X. H. (2012) A framework for benchmarking land models. *Biogeosciences*. 9(10):3857–3874. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-3857-2012>
- Masson, V., et al., (2013) The SURFEXv7.2 land and ocean surface platform for coupled or offline simulation of earth surface variables and fluxes. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 6: 929-960.
- 460 Noilhan, J., and S. Planton (1989) A simple parameterization of land surface processes for meteorological models. *Mon. Wea. Rev.* 117:536-549.
- Pontius, R G and J. Malanson, (2005). Comparison of the structure and accuracy of two land change models. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*. 19(2): 243–265
- Pontius, R.G., Thontteh, O., Chen, H., (2008). Components of information for multiple resolution comparison between maps that share a real variable. *Environ. Ecol. Stat.* 15:111–142, DOI 10.1007/s10651-007-0043-y
- 465 Seneviratne, S. I., D. Lüthi, M. Litschi, and C. Schär (2006) Land–atmosphere coupling and climate change in Europe. *Nature*. 443:205–209, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05095>.
- 470 Seneviratne, S.I., Corti, T., Davin, E.L., Hirschi, M., Jaeger, E.B., Lehner, I., Orlowsky, B., Teuling, A.J., (2010). Investigating soil moisture–climate interactions in a changing climate: A review. *Earth Sci. Rev.* 99 :125–161. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2010.02.004
- Senevirtane, and Coauthors, (2013) Impact of soil moisture–climate feed-backs on CMIP5 projections: First results from the GLACE-CMIP5 experiment. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 40:5212–5217, doi:10.1002/grl.50956.
- 475 Tarnavsky, E. V., Garrigues, S., Brown M. E., (2008). Multiscale Geostatistical Analysis of AVHRR, SPOT-VGT, and MODIS NDVI products. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 112(2): 535-549. DOI:10.1016/j.rse.2007.05.008
- 480 Ukkola, A. M., De Kauwe, M. G., Pitman, A. J., Best, M. J., Abramowitz, G., Haverd, V Decker, M., Haughton, N. (2016) Land surface models systematically overestimate the intensity, duration and magnitude of seasonal scale evaporative droughts. *Environmental Research Letters*. 11: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748>
- 485 van Genuchten, M. T. (1980), A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 44 :892–898
- Verhoef, A. and Egea, G. (2014) Modeling plant transpiration under limited soil water: Comparison of different plant and soil hydraulic. *Agr. Forest Meteorol.* 191 :22–32.
- Vilasa, L., D. G. Miralles, R. A. M. de Jeu, and A. J. Dolman (2017), Global soil moisture bimodality in satellite observations and climate models, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 122, 4299–
- 490

1
2
3
4 4311, doi:10.1002/2016JD026099.
5

6 Weedon, G.P., Balsamo, G., Bellouin, N., Gomes, S., Best, M.J. and Viterbo, P. (2014) The
7 WFDEI meteorological forcing data set: WATCH Forcing Data methodology applied to ERA-
8 Interim reanalysis data. *Water Resources Research*. 50:7505–7514, doi:10.1002/2014WR015638.
9

10 495

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 500
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 505
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Characteristics of SURFEX, JULES and CH-TESSSEL land surface models. A-gs denotes the functional coupling between the stomatal conductance (g_s) and the net assimilation of CO_2 (A)

	SURFEX	JULES	CH-TESSSEL
Energy balance	One-source	One-source	One-source
Canopy radiative transfer	Multi-layer (10) canopy	Multi-layer canopy	Big-leaf
Heat and water soil transfers	Multi-layer soil diffusion scheme (14 layers)	Multi-layer soil diffusion scheme (4 layers)	Multi-layer soil diffusion scheme (4 layers)
Soil retention model	Clapp, R. and G. Hornberger, 1978	Clapp, R. and G. Hornberger, 1978 or van Genuchten (1980)	van Genuchten (1980)
Root-zone depth	1 to 3 m depends on plant functional type and location	1.00m	2.89m
Field capacity pressure head	-3.3 m	-3.3 m	- 1.0 m
Wilting point pressure head	-150.0 m	-150.0 m	-150.0 m
Stomatal conductance	A-gs (Jacobs et al., 1996)	A-gs (Jacobs et al., 1996)	Jarvis approach (Jarvis, 1976)
Photosynthesis model	Goudriaan et al. (1985)	Collatz et al. (1991) and Collatz et al. (1992)	Goudriaan et al. (1985)
Soil water stress parameter	Available soil water content in the root-zone	Available soil water content in the root-zone	Available soil water content in the root-zone
Application of soil water stress	Mesophyll and stomatal conductance	Photosynthesis parameters	Jarvis approach
Leaf Area Index	MODIS climatology	MODIS climatology	MODIS climatology
Land cover map	ECOCLIMAP	IGBP	GLC2000
Soil map	HSWD	HSWD	FAO/ Digital Soil Map of the World (DSMW)
Plant functional types	needle leaf trees, evergreen broadleaf trees, deciduous broadleaf trees, C3 crops, C4 crops, C4 irrigated crops, herbaceous, tropical herbaceous, and wetlands	(broadleaf forest, needleleaf forest, C3 grass, C4 grass and shrub	PFTs (semi-desert, water and land mixtures, crops, short grass, evergreen needleleaf, deciduous needleleaf, deciduous broadleaf, deciduous needleleaf, tall grass, tundra, irrigated crops, bogs and marshes, evergreen shrubs,

			deciduous shrubs, mixed forest, interrupted forest).
References	Masson et al., 2012 Decharme et al., 2011 Garrigues et al., 2015	Best et al., 2011 Clark et al., 2011	Balsamo et al., 2009 ECMWF, 2011 Boussetta et al., 2013

For Peer Review

Table 2: Geographic domains. ULC and LRC mean upper left corner and lower right corner, respectively.

Domain	ULC Latitude	ULC Longitude	LRC Latitude	LRC Longitude
France (FR)	50.25	-2.25	43.75	5.75
Spain (SP)	43.25	-9.25	36.25	2.25
United-Kingdom (UK)	58.75	-9.25	50.75	1.75

For Peer Review

Table 3: Root-Mean-Square-Difference (RMSD) in integral range (A) of 10-day mean values of RN, H, LE and root-zone soil moisture between SURFEX, JULES_{CH}, JULES_{VG} and CHTESSEL.

Experiments	RN			H			LE			Soil moisture		
	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP
SURFEX vs JULES _{VG}	11.91	5.66	15.23	21.33	8.53	12.09	27.20	17.12	5.79	8.92	20.87	11.30
SURFEX vs JULES _{CH}	11.98	5.82	15.43	16.78	8.34	9.40	27.72	16.66	7.14	22.10	15.72	11.78
SURFEX vs CHTESSEL	15.01	3.01	6.72	35.61	7.80	14.00	34.54	20.68	11.38	5.12	20.24	11.30
JULES _{VG} vs JULES _{CH}	0.12	1.35	1.76	13.58	4.78	4.56	14.80	5.72	2.52	17.67	19.81	4.63
JULES _{VG} vs CHTESSEL	10.72	6.74	9.04	33.60	9.41	7.06	27.04	13.67	8.57	10.28	26.34	0.00
JULES _{CH} vs CHTESSEL	10.75	6.87	9.28	33.95	7.95	7.93	23.31	14.93	9.20	20.75	23.31	4.63
Mean values	10.08	4.90	9.58	25.81	7.80	9.17	25.77	14.80	7.43	14.14	21.05	7.27

Table 4: Root-Mean-Square-Difference (RMSD) of spatial variability (σ) of 10-day RN, H, LE and root-zone soil moisture between SURFEX, JULES_{CH}, JULES_{VG} and CHTESSEL.

Experiments	RN			H			LE			Soil moisture		
	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP	UK	FR	SP
SURFEX vs JULES _{VG}	0.06	0.03	0.14	0.23	0.21	0.14	0.24	0.17	0.29	1.83	2.65	5.65
SURFEX vs JULES _{CH}	0.06	0.03	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.24	0.17	0.18	3.21	0.44	0.36
SURFEX vs CHTESSEL	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.24	0.25	0.21	7.28	2.10	4.63
JULES _{VG} vs JULES _{CH}	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.03	0.07	0.19	1.72	2.89	5.54
JULES _{VG} vs CHTESSEL	0.17	0.10	0.21	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.08	0.19	0.25	8.75	0.67	1.05
JULES _{CH} vs CHTESSEL	0.17	0.10	0.21	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.08	0.13	0.10	10.38	2.33	4.52
Mean	0.1	0.06	0.135	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.20	5.53	1.85	3.63

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: Temporal evolution of the integral range (A) and the spatial variability (σ) of RN at 10-day time step over UK, France and Spain, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), JULES_{CH} (green) and CHTESSEL (red) experiments.

Figure 2: Temporal evolution of the integral range (A) and the spatial variability (σ) of H at 10-day time step over UK, France and Spain, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), JULES_{CH} (green) and CHTESSEL (red) experiments.

Figure 3: Temporal evolution of the integral range (A) and the spatial variability (σ) of LE at 10-day time step over UK, France and Spain, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), JULES_{CH} (green) and CHTESSEL (red) experiments.


Figure 4: Temporal evolution of the integral range (A) and the spatial variability (σ) of the root-zone soil moisture at 10-day time step over UK, France and Spain, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), JULES_{CH} (green) and CHTESSEL (red) experiments.

Figure 5: Comparison of the integral range (A) and the spatial variability (σ) of the maximum available water content (MaxAWC) across models and geographic domains. Models are represented by distinct colors: SURFEX in magenta, JULES_{VG} in blue, JULES_{CH} in green and CHTESSEL in red. Geographic domains are represented by distinct symbols: UK (triangle), France (circle), Spain (square).


Figure 6: Seasonal evolution of the integral range (A) of LAI over France, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), and CHTESSEL (red) models.

Figure 7: Seasonal evolution of the spatial variability (σ) of LAI over France, for SURFEX (magenta), JULES_{VG} (blue), and CHTESSEL (red) models.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

