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ABSTRACT

Making available regional estimates of daily evapotranspiration in water-scarce and climatic vulnerable regions is critical for improving agricultural and hydrological information as well as our understanding of land surface-atmosphere interactions. The aim of this study is to provide an operational algorithm for the Sahel relying on satellite products at 1-4 km spatial resolution without field calibration. An evapotranspiration model based on the Priestley-Taylor equation reduced according to multiple stresses based on Fisher’s model was evaluated in a savanna site in the Sahel (Mali) introducing a new formulation for the soil moisture constraint. The model was successful to estimate daily evapotranspiration at the field level, with a better performance when using a soil moisture constraint based on a Thermal Inertia index ($r^2=0.83$; MAE=$19.2 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$) than on an atmospheric water deficit index.

When up-scaling the model from field to satellite level, the decrease in accuracy was comparable to the results from a more complex SVAT model, with a better performance again of the Apparent Thermal Inertia index especially when calculated from MODIS rather than from SEVIRI data ($r^2=0.69$; MAE=$13.48 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$). The global MODIS 8-day evapotranspiration product (MOD16) was also evaluated at the site and failed to capture the dynamics of evapotranspiration in this Sahelian savanna.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evapotranspiration (or latent heat flux expressed in energy terms, $\Delta E$) represents 90% of the annual precipitation in water-limited regions which cover 40% of the Earth’s surface (Glenn et al. 2007). The Sahel is located in a transitional climate region and is thus expected to be extremely sensitive to climate change (Mougin et al. 2009a). Improving estimates of temporal and spatial variations of $\Delta E$ is crucial for understanding land surface-atmosphere interactions and to improve hydrological and agricultural management (Yuan et al. 2010).

$\Delta E$ can be estimated at regional scales using remote sensing data. Some models rely on the Penman-Monteith (PM) combination equation and $\Delta E$ can be partitioned into soil and vegetation components (Leuning et al. 2008).

With this approach, the challenge is to characterize the spatial and temporal variation in surface conductances (Zhang et al. 2010). A simple way to estimate surface conductances is to use prescribed sets of parameters based on biome-type maps (Zhang et al. 2010). Other approaches perform optimization with field data but can lead to a lack of estimates over vast regions of the globe, such as the Sahel, due to the scarcity of field measurements (Yuan et al. 2010).

(Priestley and Taylor 1972) simplified the Penman-Monteith equation (PT) for equilibrium evapotranspiration over large regions by replacing the surface and aerodynamic resistance terms with an empirical multiplier $\alpha_{PT}$ (Zhang et al. 2009). The PT equation is theoretically less accurate than PM although uncertainties in parameter estimation using PM can result in higher errors. (Fisher et al. 2008) proposed a model based on PT to estimate monthly actual $\Delta E$. The authors used biophysical constraints to reduce $\Delta E$ from a maximum potential value, $\Delta E_p$, in response to multiple stresses.

PM and PT satellite-based approaches have taken advantage of optical remote sensing data to estimate vegetation properties. However, thermal information has been incorporated in only few studies using coarse (0.25º) microwave AMSR-E data (Miralles et al. 2011) even though formulations using longwave infrared $T_s$ could help to track changes in surface conductance (Berni et al. 2009); (Boegh et al. 2002), soil evaporation (Qiu et al. 2006), surface water deficit (Boulet et al., 2007; Moran et al., 1994) or soil water content (Gillies & Carlson, 1995; Sandholt et al. 2002); Nishida et al., 2003) at spatial resolutions of 1-3 km. In relation to soil moisture, the early work of (Price 1977) and (Cracknell and Xue 1996) for mapping soil thermal inertia is now being revisited for soil moisture mapping. (Cai et al. 2007; Sobrino et al. 1998; Verstraeten et al. 2006).

The general aim of this work is to develop an operational monitoring system for actual evapotranspiration in the Sahel using solely satellite and reanalyses data. We adapted a daily version of the two-source Fisher’s model with minimum requirements of climatic inputs, no field-calibration requirements and spatial resolution of 1-4 km. Fisher-daily, was evaluated at the point (flux site) level in a savanna site in the Sahel (Mali).

The specific objectives were:

- Evaluate two soil moisture parameterizations: an Apparent Thermal Inertia index and an atmospheric water deficit index.
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Evaluate the performance of MODIS vs. SEVIRI as inputs for the Apparent Thermal Inertia Index

Compare satellite model outputs with the performance of a global satellite LE product (MOD16A2)

2. DATA

2.1. Study site and Field data

The Agoufou site is an open woody savanna located at 15.34°N, 1.48°W in the Sahel (Mali). It is homogeneous over several kilometers, with trees representing less than 5% of vegetation cover. A comprehensive description of the site is provided by (Mougin et al. 2009b). The region experiences a single rainy season with most precipitation falling between late June and mid September followed by a long dry season of around 8 months (Figure 1). In-situ data for the 2007 growing season were provided by the African Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analyses (AMMA) project. Sensible heat flux was measured with sonic anemometers (CSAT) measuring the three vector components of the wind at 20 Hz. Latent heat fluxes were measured with the eddy–covariance system (Campbell CR3000 and CSAT3–LiCor7500, Campbell Scientific Inc. Logan, UT, USA and Li–Cor Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA). The four components of the net radiation were measured with a CNR1 (Kipp and Zonen CNR1, Delft, Holland). Measurement height for the flux sensors are 2.2 m. Soil heat fluxes were computed from soil temperature measurements. See (Timouk et al. 2009) for more details. Wind speed and direction (Vector A100R), land surface temperature (Everest 4000.4zl), air temperature and humidity (HMP 45C, Vaisala) and precipitation (Delta T, RG1) were also measured. Time domain reflectometry sensors (CampbellCS616, Campbell Scientific INC., USA) measured volumetric Soil Water Content at several depths with the shallower probe, the one used in this work, located at 5 cm.

The fraction of vegetation cover is 50%, with a maximum average height of 0.4 m for the herbaceous cover. A period starting prior and finishing after the rains was evaluated (DOY 170 to 315). No gap filling has been performed. Gaps in flux data are present notably in late July to early August.

2.2. Satellite and climatic data

Satellite data acquired from the MODIS sensor included: LAI and fPAR from combined product from Terra and Acqua platforms (MCD15A3) consisting of 4-day composites of 1 km pixel. The LAI and fPAR were assumed to be constant within the 4-day compositing period. Day and night LST (Lands Surface Temperature) and emissivity at 1 km were acquired from Terra (MOD11A1). Daily surface reflectance from Terra (MOD09GA) at 1 km was acquired to estimate albedo using a linear combination of spectral bands (Liang et al., 2001). Land Surface Temperature (LST) and broadband surface albedo (α) products were developed by the Satellite Application Facility for Land Surface Analysis (Land-SAF) with data from the Spinning Enhanced Visible and Infrared Imager (SEVIRI) radiometer, onboard of the MSG (Meteosat Second Generation). The MSG-SEVIRI sensor includes 12 separate channels and 15 min temporal resolution. As for any geostationary satellite the trade-off is the low spatial resolution of 4.8 km at nadir (spatial sampling is 3 km) and large view angles (Schmetz et al. 2002). The LST algorithm is based on a generalized split window adapted to SEVIRI data (Trigo et al. 2008). The albedo product is based on shortwave channels at 0.6, 0.8 and 1.6 µm. It has an effective temporal scale of 5 days and updated on a daily basis (Geiger et al. 2008). Incoming solar radiation, Relative Humidity (RH) and minimum, maximum and mean air temperature (Tair) were obtained from the NASA-power database from the Agroclimatology archive of 1º spatial resolution (http://power.larc.nasa.gov). For the year 2007 the solar parameters were taken from the NASA/GEWEX Surface Radiation Budget (GEWEX SRB 3.0 - http://cosweb.larc.nasa.gov/PRODOCS/srb/table_srb.html) project and the meteorological parameters are from NASA’s Global Model and Assimilation Office (GMAO - http://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov), Goddard Earth Observing System model version 4 (GEOS-4). To obtain the air temperature at the time of satellite overpass a sinusoidal function of day length, latitude and mean, minimum and maximum temperatures was used (Chapter 2, Campbell & Norman, 1998).

Figure 1: Study site in the Sahel (Agoufou, Mali) (15.34°N, 1.48°W), an open woody savanna instrumented within the Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analyses (AMMA) project.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Fisher-Daily Model Description

The daily model proposed here (hereafter Fisher-daily) is a modified version of the algorithm described in (Fisher et al. 2008). Actual $AE$ is partitioned into canopy transpiration $(AEC)$ and soil evaporation $(AEs)$ (equation 1).

$$AE = AEc + AES$$  (equation 1)

Three plant physiological constraints were considered to regulate evapotranspiration: green canopy fraction ($f_c$), a plant temperature constraint ($f_T$) and a plant moisture constraint ($f_M$) (equation 2).

$$AEC = f_c f_T f_SM AEp_c$$  (equation 2)

All the equations and variables are described in Table 1. The soil evaporation component was constrained by a soil moisture limitation, $f_SM$ (equation 3).

$$AES = f_SM AEp_s$$  (equation 3)

In this work, we calculated three different estimates of $f_SM$ (see Table 1). The first is based on field measurements of volumetric soil water content ($SWC$) ($f_SM-SWC$), where $SWC$ was rescaled between a minimum ($SWC_{min}$) and a maximum value ($SWC_{Max}$) (Fisher et al. 2008). In our case, $SWC_{min}$ was estimated as the minimum value of the dry season and $SWC_{Max}$ as the $SWC$ 24 hours after a strong rainfall event, which can be considered as an estimate of the field capacity. If $SWC > SWC_{Max}$ then $f_SM-SWC = 1$.

The second approach to estimate $f_SM$ was the original Fisher’s model formulation based on the link between atmospheric water deficit and soil moisture ($f_SM-VPD$) (Bouchet 1963); (Morton 1983). The third $f_SM$ estimate was based on the apparent thermal inertia ($ATI$) concept using $Ts$ and albedo ($f_SM-ATI$). It was introduced by (Price 1977) and expanded by (Cracknell and Xue 1996); (Sobrino et al. (1998) and (Lu et al. 2009). In this study we estimated $ATI$ following Verstraeten et al. (2006) (see equation 4) relying on broadband albedo ($\alpha$), and the difference between maximum daytime ($T_{Smax}$) and minimum nighttime ($T_{Smin}$) surface temperature, and a solar correction factor $C$ that normalizes for changes in solar irradiance with latitude, and the solar declination angle. It is assumed that $ATI$ reflects both soil and canopy water content if the $Ts$ includes both soil and vegetation components (Verstraeten et al. 2006; (Tramutoli 2000).

$$ATI = C \frac{1-\alpha}{T_{Smax} - T_{Smin}}$$  (equation 4)

To relate remotely sensed $ATI$ and soil moisture and obtain $f_SM-ATI$ it was assumed that the minimum and maximum seasonal $ATI$ ($ATI_{min}$ and $ATI_{max}$) correspond to residual and saturated soil moisture contents following Verstraeten et al. (2006) (see equation in Table 1).

3.2. Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis was performed to evaluate the effects of uncertainty on input or parameters. Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) of Fisher-daily model was performed using Extended Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (EFAST) (Saltelli et al. 1999). A Fourier decomposition is used to obtain the fractional contribution of the individual input factors to the variance of the model prediction (Campolongo F. 2000).

To identify the relative importance of each model input in terms of its contribution to the output variance of daily evapotranspiration, perturbations for each variable were applied around the mean value of the growing season and also around mean monthly values. $Rn$, $G$, $NDVI$ and $Tair$ were varied by ±10% around their monthly means and annual mean based on uncertainty of measurements. For the constant model parameters: $m_1$, $b_1$, $m_2$, $b_2$, $k_{Rn}$ and $k_{PAR}$, the range of uncertainty was based on values used in the literature (Table 2). A perturbation of ±25% around the mean was considered for the soil moisture constraint ($f_SM$) and the plant temperature constraint ($f_T$).
Table 1: Equations and variables involved in estimating Fisher-daily model biophysical constraints, plant variables and energy variables. \( f_{APAR} \) is the fraction of Absorbed Photosynthetically Active Radiation, \( f_{IPAR} \) the fraction of intercepted photosynthetically active radiation, \( T_{opt} \) is optimum temperature for plant growth (25 °C), \( T_{a} \) (daily mean air temperature (°C), \( f_{APAR \text{MAX}} \) is maximum \( f_{APAR} \), \( SWC \), Soil Water Content (m \(^3\)m\(^{-3}\)), \( RH \) is relative humidity (%), \( VPD \) is the vapor pressure deficit (kPa), \( T_s \) is daily average radiometric surface temperature, \( T_{s\text{MIN}} \) is the seasonal minimum \( T_s \), \( T_{s\text{MAX}} \) is the seasonal maximum \( T_s \). \( ATI \) is the apparent thermal inertia index (°C\(^{-1}\), \( R_n \) is daily net radiation (W m\(^{-2}\)). Values for parameters: \( k_R = 0.6 \) (Impens and Lemeur 1969); \( k_{PAR} = 0.5 \) (Brownsey et al. 1976); \( m_1 = 1.16 \); \( b_1 = -0.14 \); (Myneni and Williams 1994); \( m_2 = 1.0 \); \( b_2 = -0.05 \) (Fisher et al. 2008), \( \gamma \) (psychrometric constant) = 0.066 kPa°C\(^{-1}\); \( \beta = 1 \) kPa, \( \alpha_{PT} = 1.26 \) Priestley -Taylor coefficient; \( \Delta \) is the slope of the saturation-to-vapor pressure curve (Pa K\(^{-1}\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( f_g )</td>
<td>Green canopy fraction</td>
<td>( f_g = \frac{f_{APAR}}{f_{PAR}} )</td>
<td>(Fisher et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_T )</td>
<td>Plant temperature constraint</td>
<td>( f_T = 1.1814 \left[1 + e^{-0.2(T_{opt} - T_{a})} \right]^{-1} )</td>
<td>(Potter et al. 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_M )</td>
<td>Plant moisture constraint</td>
<td>( f_M = \frac{f_{APAR}}{f_{APAR MAX}} )</td>
<td>(Fisher et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{SM} )</td>
<td>Soil moisture constraint</td>
<td>( f_{SM, SWC} = 1 - \frac{SWC - SWC_{min}}{SWC_{max} - SWC_{min}} )</td>
<td>(Fisher et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{SM, RH} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( f_{SM, ATV} = \frac{ATI - ATV_{min}}{ATI_{max} - ATV_{min}} )</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{IPAR} )</td>
<td>( PAR ) fraction absorbed by green vegetation</td>
<td>( f_{APAR, MODIS} )</td>
<td>(Myneni et al. 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{IPAR} )</td>
<td>( PAR ) fraction intercepted by total vegetation</td>
<td>( f_{IPAR} = m_2 \cdot NDVI + b_2 )</td>
<td>(Fisher et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_c )</td>
<td>Fractional vegetation cover</td>
<td>( f_c = f_{IPAR} )</td>
<td>(Campbell JS 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( LAI )</td>
<td>Leaf Area Index</td>
<td>( LAI_{MODIS} )</td>
<td>(Myneni et al. 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_n )</td>
<td>Net radiation to the soil</td>
<td>( R_n = R_n \cdot e^{(-\lambda_n L A I)} )</td>
<td>(Ross, 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda E_p_c )</td>
<td>Priestley-Taylor potential evapotranspiration for canopy</td>
<td>( \lambda E_p_c = \frac{\alpha_{PT} \lambda}{\Delta + \gamma} (R_n - R_n) )</td>
<td>(Norman et al. 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda E_p_s )</td>
<td>Priestley-Taylor potential evapotranspiration for soil</td>
<td>( \lambda E_p_s = \frac{\alpha_{PT} \lambda}{\Delta + \gamma} (R_n - G) )</td>
<td>(Norman et al. 1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Ranges of variation for input parameters and variables in Fisher-daily model. For $R_n$, $G$, $NDVI$ and $T_{air}$ ranges of ± 10% around monthly means and annual mean was considered. For the constant model parameters: $m_1$, $b_1$, $m_2$, $b_2$, $k_{R_n}$ and $k_{PAR}$, the range of uncertainty was based on values used in the literature. For the soil moisture constraint ($f_{SM}$) and the plant temperature constraint ($f_T$) a range of ± 25% around the mean was considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input var</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{air}$</td>
<td>±10% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_n$</td>
<td>±10% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>±10% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_T$</td>
<td>±25% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{SM}$</td>
<td>±25% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$NDVI$</td>
<td>±10% of mean</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>[1.16, 1.42]</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>[-0.039, -0.025]</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_2$</td>
<td>[0.9, 1.2]</td>
<td>(Fisher et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>[-0.06, -0.04]</td>
<td>Fisher et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{R_n}$</td>
<td>[0.3, 0.6]</td>
<td>Ross (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{PAR}$</td>
<td>[0.3, 0.6]</td>
<td>Ross (1976)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Evaluation of soil moisture constraints using field and satellite data

We evaluated which of the three parameterizations of the soil moisture constraint to soil evaporation (see Table 1) produced better results using different input data. First, the model was run with field measurements for $R_n$ and $T_{air}$. The soil moisture constraint calculated from field data, $f_{SM-SWC}$, was used as a benchmark as it should provide the more accurate results. The two soil moisture constraints: $f_{SM-VPD}$ and $f_{SM-ATI}$ were first calculated using inputs from field measurements. Also it was tested the change in accuracy when using $f_{SM-ATI}$ from satellite MSG. The different model versions are summarized in Table 3. In a second step, the model was run using solely satellite and climatic reanalyses products. Thus, forcing data from NASA-Power for $R_n$ and $T_{air}$ were used and the soil moisture constraints for $f_{SM-VPD}$ and $f_{SM-ATI}$ were calculated exclusively from satellite and reanalyses data (see Table 3). In this step we evaluated the differences when calculating $f_{SM-ATI}$ from MODIS and from SEVIRI data.

Instantaneous $R_n$ from satellite data was estimated by calculating the shortwave and longwave components as described in (Garcia et al. 2007). To estimate daily $R_n$ from instantaneous $R_n$, a sinusoidal function based on day-length was used (Jackson et al., 1983).

Model results were compared with $AE$ from Eddy Covariance fluxes and the coefficient of determination ($r^2$), Mean Average Error (MAE), the bias, the RMSE (Root Mean Square Error) and MPE (Mean Absolute Percentage Error) were used as indicators of model performance. To compare modeled $AE$ with $AE$ measurements from Eddy we forced the closure of the equation for energy balance considering the criteria of preserving the Bowen ratio (Twine et al. 2000).

Table 3: Seven versions of Fisher-daily differing in (a) the forcing variables $R_n$ and $T_{air}$ being from in-situ or from satellite data (b) the formulation for the soil moisture constraint: $f_{SM-SWC}$ (from measured volumetric soil water content), $f_{SM-VPD}$ (from atmospheric water deficit), and $f_{SM-ATI}$ (from apparent thermal inertia) and (c) the input data for the soil moisture constraints obtained from in-situ or satellite (MSG or MODIS data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forcing Nr</th>
<th>Model name</th>
<th>$f_{SM}$/data</th>
<th>$R_n$, $T_{air}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field-SWC</td>
<td>SWC/in situ</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-VPD</td>
<td>VPD/in situ</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-ATI</td>
<td>ATI/in situ</td>
<td>In situ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite-VPD</td>
<td>VPD/NASA Power</td>
<td>NASA-Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite-ATI MSG</td>
<td>ATI/MSG</td>
<td>NASA-Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite-ATI MODIS</td>
<td>ATI/MODIS</td>
<td>NASA-Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Comparison of model satellite outputs with the global MODIS (MOD16) evapotranspiration product

Finally, model satellite outputs were compared to the global MODIS evapotranspiration product (MOD16) developed by Mu et al., (2011; 2007). Daily model estimates and eddy covariance $AE$ measurements were aggregated at 8-day time scale considering only clear-sky days in order to compare with the MOD16 product at the same time-step. Only MOD16 data passing quality checks (flags) were considered for model evaluation. The results were converted from Wm$^{-2}$ into mmday$^{-1}$ to match the units of MOD16.
4. RESULTS

4.1. Sensitivity analysis

Considering the variability around mean annual conditions, the contribution to uncertainty was less than 20% for most parameters. The greatest uncertainty was due to two of the biophysical constraints: \( f_{SM} \) and \( f_T \) with 22.19% and 17.68% respectively (total effect). Five other variables involved in \( LAI \) estimation and energy partition between soil and canopy contributed around 12% to model uncertainty (Figure 2).

However, the relative importance of each variable depends on the time of the year. At the beginning of the season, \( \lambda E \) was most sensitive to accuracy in \( f_{SM} \) reaching the maximum value of explained variance among all variables and months (40%). During the maximum peak of \( NDVI \), in the middle of the season, the greatest sensitivity was due to \( f_T \) and \( m_1 \) (involved in \( f_M \) and \( f_g \) estimates via \( f_{APAR} \)). During the senescent phase, the model was more sensitive to accuracy in \( k_{PAR} \) and \( k_{Rn} \) involved in energy partition into soil and vegetation.

4.2. Evaluation of soil moisture parameterizations using field and satellite data

Figure 3 shows the changes in the accuracy of \( \lambda E \) retrievals from using different soil moisture parameterizations. Using measured \( SWC \) the model \( \lambda E \) explains up to 86% of the variance, which considering that the closure error of the eddy covariance data represents 5.78% of the available energy (\( Rn-G \)) at daily scale is also close to the instrumental accuracy. However, in this site during the growing season there was a systematic underestimate of \( \lambda E \) during the period of maximum growth followed by an overestimate. When using the atmospheric water deficit index correlations were well below those found for \( f_{SM-SWC} \) \((r^2=0.61)\) and with high biases around 25 Wm\(^{-2}\). Regarding the thermal Inertia soil moisture constraint \( f_{SM-ATI} \), using in-situ data, model performance was practically equivalent to that using \( SWC \) \((f_{SM-SWC})\), with \( r^2=0.83 \) and slightly higher errors but similar or lower biases. When running the model using satellite MSG instead of in-situ data for \( f_{SM-ATI} \), good results were obtained for \( r^2=0.80 \) and MAE=20.21 Wm\(^{-2}\) but higher biases than with in-situ data were detected due to \( \lambda E \) underestimates during the growing season. This was due to the fact that the diurnal Ts difference (\( Ts_{Dmax}-Ts_{Dmin} \)) was always higher for MSG than for in-situ data producing lower soil moisture \((f_{SM})\) values.
Figure 3: Daily $\lambda E$ (Wm$^{-2}$) in Agoufou (Mali) from Eddy Covariance data (black dots) and modeled (white dots) during 2007. The model was run using different soil moisture constraints: $f_{SM-SWC}$ from measured volumetric soil water, $f_{SM-VPD}$ from atmospheric water deficit, $f_{SM-ATI_{in-situ}}$ from apparent thermal inertia from in-situ measurements and $f_{SM-ATI_{MSG}}$ from apparent thermal inertia from MSG-SEVIRI measurements. In model versions $Rn$ and $Tair$ were from in-situ measurements.
We evaluated the sensitivity of fSM-VPD to $b$ values between 0.05 to 2, and to the use of daily average or midday conditions for RH and VPD. Table 4 shows the results for the two levels of $b$ that provided the best results: $b=0.1$ kPa, that was applied at a global scale by in (Mu et al., 2007), and $b=1$ kPa applied in (Fisher et al., 2008). The best results corresponded to $b=1$ kPa and daily average conditions which are the parameters subsequently used for the satellite model estimates instead of the midday original conditions.

Table 4: Evaluation of Fisher-daily $\lambda E$ with Eddy Covariance data for different parameterizations of the soil moisture constraint derived from atmospheric water deficit. Results are shown for midday and daily average conditions for RH (relative humidity) and VPD (Vapor Pressure Deficit) and for $b=0.1$ kPa and $b=1$ kPa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cond</th>
<th>$b$ (kPa)</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>MAE</th>
<th>bias</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>MPE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 compares three model versions based only on satellite and reanalysis input data with eddy covariance $\lambda E$. The correlations were lower with respect to those obtained when using in-situ $Rn$ and $Tair$ especially for the case of the fSM-ATI index, which showed the highest biases when using SEVIRI data of around 20 Wm$^{-2}$. This is due to a bias in the $Rn$ estimates from SEVIRI that needs to be corrected in future algorithm versions.

Although the use of MODIS data resulted in a lower amount of observations (N=33 vs. N=66) compared to SEVIRI, as there is only a day and a night overpass, the results were more accurate and with a lower bias. Despite of the decrease in accuracy compared to in-situ modeling (Figure 3), results aggregated at daily-time scale were similar to those from a SVAT model based on Shuttleworth and Wallace dual coupled to an hydrological model run with the same dataset and using a higher number of parameters (Ridler et al., 2012). The SVAT model assimilated LST from the MSG-SEVIRI sensor and soil moisture from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on the Earth (AMSR–E) resulting in $r^2=0.63$ and MAE=39.24 Wm$^{-2}$ compared with field data and producing also underestimates in $\lambda E$ but a higher number of observations were available.

4.3. Comparison of model satellite outputs with the MODIS (MOD16) evapotranspiration product

When aggregating at 8-day time-step the satellite model results, the accuracy improved with respect to daily time-step with $r^2$ between 0.70-0.80 depending on the soil moisture constraint used with better results for Apparent Thermal Inertia than for the atmospheric water deficit approach. The best results corresponded to the use of the Thermal Inertia index (ATI) derived from MODIS data (Figure 5). However, the MOD16 ET product failed to capture the dynamics of evapotranspiration in this ecosystem with most of the model estimates disregarded due to quality flags and failure to capture the senescence process.
Future work should focus on bias correction and interpolation, between cloudy days. Model intercomparisons with the same climatic forcings are desirable for comparison of the MOD16 and our version of the Fisher-daily model as well.

The version proposed here of the Fisher model using a soil moisture constraint based on apparent thermal inertia, \( f_{SM-ATI} \) offers great potential for regionalization in the Sahel region as no field-calibrations are required and water vapor deficit estimates, required in the original version, are not necessary, being air temperature and incoming solar radiation the only input variables required, apart from routinely available satellite products.
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