

1 **Seasonal and Diurnal Variations in Moisture, Heat and  $CO_2$  Fluxes over a**  
2 **Typical Steppe Prairie in Inner Mongolia, China**

3  
4 Z. Gao<sup>1</sup>, D. H. Lenschow<sup>2</sup>, Z. He<sup>1</sup>, M. Zhou<sup>1,3</sup>, L. Wang<sup>1</sup>, Y. Wang<sup>4</sup>, J. He<sup>4</sup>, J.  
5 Shi<sup>4</sup>

6 *1. State Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer Physics and Atmospheric Chemistry,*  
7 *Institute of Atmospheric Physics, CAS, Beijing, China*

8 *2. National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), Boulder CO, USA*

9 *3. Key Laboratory for Polar Science, Polar Research Institute of China, Shanghai, China*

10 *4. Xilinhaote Meteorological Station, Inner Mongolia, China*

11 **Abstract**

12 In order to examine energy partitioning and  $CO_2$  exchange over a steppe prairie in  
13 Inner Mongolia, China, fluxes of moisture, heat and  $CO_2$  in the surface layer from June  
14 2007 through June 2008 were calculated using the eddy covariance method. The study site  
15 was homogenous and approximately 1500 m × 1500 m in size. Seasonal and diurnal  
16 variations in radiation components, energy components and  $CO_2$  fluxes are examined.  
17 Results show that all four radiation components changed seasonally, resulting in a seasonal  
18 variation in net radiation. The radiation components also changed diurnally. Winter surface  
19 albedo was higher than summer surface albedo because during winter the snow-covered  
surface increased the surface albedo. The seasonal variations in both sensible heat and  $CO_2$   
fluxes were stronger than those of latent heat and soil heat fluxes. This implies that both  
sensible heat and  $CO_2$  fluxes may be more significant climate signals than latent heat and  
soil fluxes. Sensible heat flux was the main consumer of available energy for the entire  
experimental period. The energy imbalance problem was encountered and the causes are  
analyzed.

1

2 Keywords: turbulent fluxes, eddy covariance, steppe prairie, Inner Mongolia

3

4

## 5 **1. Introduction**

6

7       The relatively recent increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide (hereinafter, referred to as  
8  $CO_2$ ) concentration has profound implications for the planet's climate (see, for example,  
9 the IPCC report) as well as on photosynthesis and the structure and function of plant  
10 communities. Vegetation therefore plays a crucial role in the global carbon balance  
11 (Woodward *et al.*, 1998; Mielnick *et al.*, 2001). The energy budget balance over land  
12 surfaces is the most important of all the ecological processes related to carbon sequestration  
13 in terrestrial ecosystems (Baldocchi *et al.*, 1997; Dugas *et al.*, 1999; Hao *et al.*, 2007).  
14 Surface fluxes of momentum, heat and moisture determine to a large extent the steady state  
15 of the atmosphere (Beljaars and Holtslag, 1991). Climate simulations are especially  
16 sensitive to the seasonal and diurnal variations in surface partitioning of available energy  
17 into sensible and latent heat fluxes (e.g., Rowntree, 1991; Dickinson *et al.*, 1991).

18       In order to evaluate the long-term energy balance and evapotranspiration, a number of  
19 experimental studies have been carried out on various terrestrial surfaces such as forest,  
20 grasslands and paddy fields throughout the world during the past decade (e.g., Baldocchi  
21 and Vogel, 1997; Toda *et al.*, 2002; Gao, *et al.*, 2003; Bi *et al.*, 2006; Hao *et al.*, 2007).  
22 Previous work has reported on measurements of the seasonal and/or diurnal variations of

1 heat, water vapor and CO<sub>2</sub> exchanges over different land surfaces in a variety of ecosystems  
2 ranging from the tropics to the northern high latitudes (e.g., Hartog, *et al.*, 1994; Delire, *et*  
3 *al.*, 1995; Betts, *et al.*, 1995; Campbell, *et al.*, 2001; Vourlitis *et al.*, 2001; Merquiol, *et al.*,  
4 2002; Xue *et al.*, 2004; Barros, *et al.*, 2005; Steven, *et al.*, 2005; Bi *et al.*, 2006; ; Hao *et al.*,  
5 2007).

6 Grasslands are approximately 32% of the Earth's natural vegetation (Adams *et al.*, 1990)  
7 and grassland ecosystems undergo considerable annual fluctuations in gross primary  
8 production (Frank and Dugas, 2001); grassland ecosystems also significantly and  
9 ~~asymmetrically~~ nonlinearly respond to climate change and pertinent biomass dynamics  
10 (Baldocchi *et al.*, 2001; Wever *et al.*, 2002). Prior researchers mainly paid attention to  
11 savanna areas and the Central Great Plains of the U.S. (Dugas *et al.*, 1999; Frank and Dugas,  
12 2001; Sims and Bradford, 2001; Suyker and Verma, 2001; Novick *et al.*, 2004). In contrast,  
13 there are few works focused on measurements of the seasonal and/or diurnal variations of  
14 heat, water vapor and CO<sub>2</sub> exchanges in the great steppes of Asia (Li *et al.*, 2006; Hao *et al.*,  
15 2007) because much of the data obtained so far is still insufficient.

16 The Eurasian Steppe, within which Inner Mongolia lies, is the largest grassland region  
17 in the world. This part of the Steppe lies in a semi-arid temperate continental climate regime  
18 (Hao *et al.*, 2007). Climate change will result in a wintertime warming trend and severe  
19 springtime drought in this region (Chen *et al.*, 2003). Therefore it is important to understand  
20 the seasonal and diurnal variations of water vapor and energy within this grassland  
21 ecosystem. Unfortunately, there is currently little detailed information on this in the  
22 literature.

23  
24 We conducted a micrometeorological experiment over a natural steppe prairie in Inner

1 Mongolia from June 2007 to improve the current understanding of energy partitioning and  
2  $CO_2$  exchange over a typical steppe prairie in Inner Mongolia and to find which surface  
3 energy components show the strongest climate signals. The main objective of the present  
4 work is therefore to quantify the seasonal and diurnal variations in energy and  $CO_2$   
5 exchanges over the above mentioned surface using eddy covariance techniques.

## 6 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 7 **2.1 Site**

8 Measurements have been collected at a grassland site (44°08'31"N, 116°18'45"E, 1160.8  
9 m above sea level) in the typical steppe prairie in Inner Mongolia since June 1, 2007. The  
10 field has reverted to its natural status in the past 50 years. Similar to the site of Hao *et*  
11 *al.*(2007), the xeric rhizomatous grass *Leymus chinensis* is the constructive species, and  
12 *Agropyron cristatum*, *Cleistogenes squarrosa*, and *Carex duriuscula* are the dominant  
13 species at our site. The heights of grass clumps are about 0.50-0.70 m, and coverage fraction  
14 depends on annual precipitation, ranging from 30% to 70%. Soil at the site was  
15 predominantly dark chestnut (Mollisol) soil with rapid drainage of water. It has only a thin  
16 layer of humus (the organic portion of the soil created by partial decomposition of plant or  
17 animal matters) which provides vegetation with nutrients.

18 This site is smooth, homogeneous and approximately 1500 m × 1500 m, surrounded by  
19 low hills whose heights are lower than 30 m with slopes less than 5°. Unfortunately, the leaf  
20 area index (LAI) has not been measured. This site has a semi-arid continental temperate  
21 steppe climate with a dry spring, autumn, humid summer and snow-covered winter. The  
22 average annual temperature is about 272.5 K, with a growing season of 150-180 days. The

1 annual precipitation range is 320-400 mm, and rainfall is concentrated within the period  
2 from June to August (Hao et al., 2007).

### 3 **2.2 Micrometeorological measurements**

#### 4 (i) *Fast response measurements.*

5 A three-dimensional sonic anemometer (CSAT3, Campbell Scientific Inc.) was used to  
6 measure the means and standard deviations of wind velocity components (i.e.,  $u$ ,  $v$  and  
7  $w$ ) and air temperature (T), and a LI-7500 (LiCor, USA) gas analyzer was used to measure  
8 the mean and standard deviations of water vapor density and  $CO_2$ . The gas analyzer was  
9 calibrated before the experiment using three values of standard gases (between 300 and 400  
10 ppmv  $CO_2$  in  $N_2$ ). These sensors were installed on a mast at 4.0 m above the ground  
11 (Figure 1). The sensor outputs were recorded at a sampling rate of 10 Hz and were  
12 averaged over 30 min periods. Appropriate corrections were made for non-zero mean  
13 vertical velocity. Following Moore (1986), we corrected eddy covariance values for the  
14 effects of path length averaging of the sonic anemometer and the gas analyzer, and for the  
15 spatial separation of sensors. Corrections were made for density fluctuations in calculating  
16 the fluxes of water vapor and  $CO_2$  (Webb *et al.*, 1980).

17 We eliminated outliers from 30-min measurements of turbulence by using a criterion  
18 of  $X(t) < (\bar{X} - 4\sigma)$  or  $X(t) > (\bar{X} + 4\sigma)$ , where  $X(t)$  denotes the measurement (i.e., wind  
19 speed components, temperature),  $\bar{X}$  is the mean over the interval and  $\sigma$  the standard  
20 deviation. Data during and after rain events was removed because the sonic anemometer  
21 could malfunction in these cases. The gaps shorter than a half hour were filled by linear  
22 interpolation.

1 (ii) *Slow response measurements*

2 Other supporting data were collected during the experiment. Soil heat flux was  
3 measured by embedding two heat flux plates (HFT-3, Campbell Scientific Inc.) at a depth of  
4 0.01 m. Soil temperature was measured at 6 depths (surface, 0.05 m, 0.10 m, 0.15 m, 0.20 m,  
5 and 0.40 m) in the soil. Upward and downward short- and long-wave radiation components  
6 were measured with radiometers (model 2AP Tracker, Kipp & Zonen Inc.) mounted at a  
7 height of 2.0 m. The data were recorded by a Datalogger (CR5000, Campbell Scientific Inc.)  
8 with a PCMCIA memory card. The data were sampled each minute and averages recorded  
9 every 10 min.

10 ~~The set of observational data includes the following meteorological quantities:~~  
11 ~~horizontal wind speed, air temperature, specific humidity, air pressure and precipitation.~~  
12 ~~Figure 2 shows the time series of (a) weekly mean wind vector ( $WV$  in  $m\ s^{-1}$ ), (b) weekly~~  
13 ~~mean air temperature ( $T_{air}$  in K), (c) weekly mean specific humidity ( $q$  in  $g\ kg^{-1}$ ), (d) daily~~  
14 ~~mean air pressure ( $P$  in hpa), and (e) daily precipitation ( $Prec.$  in  $mm\ day^{-1}$ ) obtained since~~  
15 ~~June 2007. It is obvious that all of these meteorological quantities undergo a marked~~  
16 ~~seasonal cycle. In the wet season (June through August), high temperature, high humidity,~~  
17 ~~and low wind speed were coincident with low air pressure and precipitation events were~~  
18 ~~frequent. The reverse occurred during the dry season.—~~

19 ~~The plots in Figures 2a-2c are derived from the fast response measurements. The~~  
20 ~~composition method is applied for estimation of daily variation for each week and then a~~  
21 ~~weekly average is calculated. The gaps in Figure 2 were caused by power outages at the site.~~  
22 ~~The plots in Figures 2d-2e are derived from the slow response instruments.—~~

1 Our site is located in a mid latitude semi arid continental temperate and westerlies  
2 climate zone. During the winter, cold dry air always came from the southwest, significantly  
3 influencing the area. Because of the influence of the temperate monsoon climate, the south  
4 to southwest wind was maintained through whole experimental period. Although the annual  
5 mean wind speed was about  $3.0 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  (shown in Figure 2a), the maximum hourly mean  
6 wind speed reached  $8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$

7 The seasonal variation of air temperature ( $T_{air}$ ) was remarkable dramatic. Monthly  
8 mean air temperature reached a maximum ( $295.0 \text{ K}$ ) in July and August, and the lowest air  
9 temperature ( $252.0 \text{ K}$ ) occurred in the middle of December. The difference between the  
10 highest air temperature and lowest air temperature was  $43 \text{ K}$  for the whole experimental  
11 period and the annual mean air temperature was  $277.5 \text{ K}$ . Similar seasonal variation  
12 occurred in specific humidity ( $q$ ), with the correlation coefficient between  $q$  and  $T_{air}$   
13 reaching  $0.82$ . Specific humidity varied also in response to variations in precipitation  
14 (Figure 2c and 2e). Because of the semi arid continental temperate climate,  $q$  is always less  
15 than  $12 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ , and less than  $5 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  during the period from October 2007 to April 2008.

16 Air pressure varied seasonally but in reverse phase to air temperature and specific  
17 humidity. Almost all precipitation occurred from June to August 2007 and in June 2008.  
18 Snow occurred during the periods: 2-10 December, 2007, 21, 29 January, and 15, 24, 27-30  
19 March, 2008.

## 20 **2.3 Theoretical Considerations**

21 The surface energy balance over the grass canopy can be approximated by:

$$22 \quad Rn = H + LE + G_0 + Re, \quad (1)$$

1 where  $R_n$  is the net radiation,  $H$  and  $LE$  are the sensible heat and latent heat fluxes,  
 2 respectively,  $G_0$  is the soil heat flux at the surface, and  $Re$  is the residual energy involved  
 3 in various processes, such as photosynthesis and respiration (Harazono *et al*, 1998, Burba *et*  
 4 *al.* 1999). We determine  $Re$  from the formula:  $Re = R_n - (H + LE + G_0)$ .  $R_n$  was  
 5 measured using slow response instruments (described above). Eddy fluxes of sensible heat  
 6 and latent heat were calculated as (e.g., Kaimal and Finnigan, 1994):

$$7 \quad H = \bar{\rho} C_p \overline{w' T'}, \quad (2)$$

$$8 \quad LE = L \overline{\rho w' q'}, \quad (3)$$

9 where  $\bar{\rho}$ ,  $C_p$  and  $L$  are the density of air ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ ), the specific heat of air ( $\text{J kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$ ),  
 10 and the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{J kg}^{-1}$ ), respectively.  $w'$ ,  $T'$  and  $q'$  are the  
 11 fluctuations in the vertical wind component ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ), air temperature (K) and specific  
 12 humidity, respectively.

13  $G_0$  is estimated by using a combination of soil calorimetry and measurement of the  
 14 heat flux density at depth of 0.1 m using heat flow transducers. The heat storage of the soil  
 15 layer above the plate is included as follows,

$$16 \quad G_0 = G_1 + C_g \Delta z \delta T / \delta t, \quad (4)$$

17 where  $G_1$  is the soil heat flux at depth of 0.1 m,  $C_g$  the volumetric heat capacity of the soil,  
 18 which can be easily derived from soil components (Gao, 2005),  $\Delta z$  the thickness of a thin  
 19 layer of the soil,  $T$  the mean soil temperature of the thin layer,  $\delta T$  the change in mean  
 20 soil temperature during the measurement period, and  $\delta t$  the change in time.

21 Since the 1980s, the development of fast response  $CO_2$  analyzers has enabled us to  
 22 directly measure  $CO_2$  fluxes over rice canopies using eddy covariance methods:



1 
$$F_c = \overline{w'c'}, \quad (5)$$

2 where  $F_c$  is  $CO_2$  flux ( $mg\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$ ) and  $c'$  is the fluctuation in the concentration of  $CO_2$   
 3 ( $mg\ m^{-3}$ ) (Desai *et al.*, 2008).

4 The ratio of the sum of sensible and latent heat fluxes ( $H + LE$ ) to available energy (the  
 5 difference of net radiation and soil heat flux:  $Rn - G_0$ ) is presented to examine the surface  
 6 heating rate  $\varepsilon$ .

7 Horst and Weil (1994) documented the stability dependency of footprint. The adequacy of the fetch  
 8 may be confirmed by footprint analysis for neutral flow(e.g. Schuepp *et al.*, 1990, and  
 9 Harazono *et al.* 1998). The cumulative normalized contribution to the surface flux from  
 10 upwind locations,  $C_F(\chi_L)$ , can be expressed as

11 
$$C_F(\chi_L) = \exp[-U(z-d)/ku_*\chi_L], \quad (6)$$

12 where  $d$  is the zero plane displacement,  $k$  is von Karman's constant,  $u_*$  is the friction  
 13 velocity,  $\chi_L$  is the distance upwind of the measuring point, and  $U$  is the average wind  
 14 speed between the surface and observation height  $z$ . Assuming a logarithmic profile for  
 15 horizontal wind speed  $u(z)$ , with  $z$ ,  $U$  is given by

16 
$$U = \int_{d+z_0}^z u(z)dz / \int_{d+z_0}^z dz = \frac{u_*[\ln((z-d)/z_0) - 1 + z_0/(z-d)]}{k(1 - z_0/(z-d))}$$
. The code from Schmid *et al* (1994) is

17 publicly available ([http://www.indiana.edu/~climate/SAM/SAM\\_FSAM.html](http://www.indiana.edu/~climate/SAM/SAM_FSAM.html)) and was used  
 18 in this study.

19

20 **3. Results and Discussion**

21 The set of observational data includes the following meteorological quantities:  
 22 horizontal wind speed, air temperature, specific humidity, air pressure and precipitation.

1 Figure 2 shows the time series of (a) weekly mean wind vector (WV in  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ), (b) weekly  
2 mean air temperature ( $T_{\text{air}}$  in K), (c) weekly mean specific humidity ( $q$  in  $\text{g kg}^{-1}$ ), (d) daily  
3 mean air pressure ( $P$  in hpa), and (e) daily precipitation (Prec. in  $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ ) obtained since  
4 June 2007. It is obvious that all of these meteorological quantities undergo a marked  
5 seasonal cycle. In the wet season (June through August), high temperature, high humidity,  
6 and low wind speed were coincident with low air pressure and precipitation events were  
7 frequent. The reverse occurred during the dry season.

8 The plots in Figures 2a-2c are derived from the fast response measurements. The  
9 composition method is applied for estimation of daily variation for each week and then a  
10 weekly average is calculated. The gaps in Figure 2 were caused by power outages at the site.  
11 The plots in Figures 2d-2e are derived from the slow response instruments.

12 Our site is located in a mid-latitude semi-arid continental temperate and westerlies  
13 climate zone. During the winter, cold dry air always came from the southwest, significantly  
14 influencing the area. Because of the influence of the temperate monsoon climate, the south  
15 to southwest wind was maintained through whole experimental period. Although the annual  
16 mean wind speed was about  $3.0 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  (shown in Figure 2a), the maximum hourly mean  
17 wind speed reached  $8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$

18 The seasonal variation of air temperature ( $T_{\text{air}}$ ) was remarkable. Monthly mean air  
19 temperature reached a maximum (295.0 K) in July and August, and the lowest air  
20 temperature (252.0 K) occurred in the middle of December. The difference between the  
21 highest air temperature and lowest air temperature was 43 K for the whole experimental  
22 period and the annual mean air temperature was 277.5 K. Similar seasonal variation

1 occurred in specific humidity ( $q$ ), with the correlation coefficient between  $q$  and  $T_{air}$   
2 reaching 0.82. Specific humidity varied also in response to variations in precipitation  
3 (Figure 2c and 2e). Because of the semi-arid continental temperate climate,  $q$  is always less  
4 than  $12 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ , and less than  $5 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  during the period from October 2007 to April 2008.

5 Air pressure varied seasonally but in reverse phase to air temperature and specific  
6 humidity. Almost all precipitation occurred from June to August 2007 and in June 2008.  
7 Snow occurred during the periods: 2-10 December, 2007, 21, 29 January, and 15, 24, 27-30  
8 March, 2008. The snow amounts were not measured.

### 9 **3.1 Footprint Analysis**

10 Data were collected at 4 m above the ground surface, which is higher than three times  
11 of the maximum height (0.6 m) of the grass clumps on the Steppe. Thus the flow assumes  
12 the properties of the conventional atmospheric surface layer such as the constant flux region.  
13 To estimate the average footprint for whose experiment, the contributions of the cumulative  
14 flux were computed using Equation (6), where  $U = 3.98 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ,  $z = 4.0 \text{ m}$ ,  $d = 0.2 \text{ m}$ ,  
15 and  $u_* = 0.30 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . Our analysis (Figure 3) indicates that approximately 90% of the  
16 measured flux at the measurement height was expected to come from within the nearest  
17 1100 m of upwind area for neutral stability during the entire period. The footprint flux  
18 distribution shows the maximum source weight location is 60 m upwind from the mast.

### 20 **3.2 Seasonal Variations on a Weekly Average Basis**

#### 21 **3.2.1 Radiation Components**

22 Figure 4 shows the seasonal variation of the four radiation components: (a) downward

1 shortwave radiation (hereinafter, referred to as DSR), (b) upward shortwave radiation (USR),  
2 (c) downward longwave radiation (DLR), (d) upward longwave radiation (ULR), and (e)  
3 albedo of the underlying surface, defined as the ratio of the maximum values of USR and  
4 DSR. The seasonal variations of DSR, DLR and ULR were similar. They maintained high  
5 values during the summer and low values during the winter. The seasonal variation of USR  
6 had not been obvious when ground was not snow-covered and the seasonal variation of  
7 albedo was relatively constant at 0.22. After snow occurred, USR increased and the albedo  
8 ~~drastically increased~~ increased dramatically.

9 The consistent seasonal variation  $T_{air}$ ,  $q$ ,  $P$ ,  $Prec.$ , DSR, DLR, and ULR are shown in  
10 Figures 2 and 4.

### 11 **3.2.2 Energy Components and $CO_2$ flux**

12 Figure 5 shows the seasonal variation of weekly means of (a) net radiation ( $Rn$ ), (b)  
13 sensible heat flux ( $H$ ), (c) latent heat flux ( $LE$ ), (d) soil surface heat flux ( $G_0$ ), and (e)  
14  $CO_2$  flux ( $F_{CO_2}$ ).  $Rn$  was calculated by using the four radiation components (i.e., DSR,  
15 USR, DLR, and ULR).  $H$ ,  $LE$  and  $F_{CO_2}$  were measured by fast response instruments  
16 and calculated using Equations (2, 3 and 5). Gaps occurring in  $H$ ,  $LE$ ,  $G_0$  and  $F_{CO_2}$   
17 were caused by instrument problems.

18  $Rn$ ,  $H$ ,  $LE$ ,  $G_0$ , and  $F_{CO_2}$  all showed remarkable seasonal variation. The negative sign  
19 in  $F_{CO_2}$  means that surface vegetation absorbed  $CO_2$ . The variations in  $Rn$ ,  $H$ ,  $LE$ ,  
20  $G_0$  and  $F_{CO_2}$  are generally consistent; however the weekly oscillation in  $LE$  was  
21 weaker than those in  $Rn$ ,  $H$ , and  $F_{CO_2}$ . The sensible heat flux was the main consumer of  
22 surface available energy ( $Rn - G_0$ ). The grass grew well in the summer, and the strong

1 photosynthesis led to the larger water vapor release and the larger negative  $F_{CO_2}$ .  $G_0$  was  
2 about several watts per square meter on average. During December 2007 when ground was  
3 covered by snow: (1)  $Rn$  was negative; (2) the grass was short and senescent, and  $CO_2$   
4 absorption therefore decreased; (3) the snow surface absorbed sensible heat flux from the  
5 air; (4)  $LE$  was close to zero; and (5)  $G_0$  was almost constant (negative several watts  
6 per square meters).

### 7 ***3.3 Diurnal Variations on Monthly Average Basis***

#### 8 ***3.3.1 Radiation Components***

9 In order to investigate the diurnal variation of the radiation components, the monthly  
10 means of the diurnal variation in the radiation components (DSR, USR, DLR, and ULR) are  
11 given in Figure 6 where a composite analysis method is used and the short lines are error  
12 bars. We find that diurnal variations in DSR, USR and ULR occurred in all months, whereas  
13 diurnal variations in DLR were not significant from November 2007 to February, 2008.  
14 Diurnal variations in DSR and ULR were largedramatic in summer, but weaker in winter.  
15 On average, the maximum values of DSR and ULR occurred in June 2007 and reached  
16  $804.4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and  $558.1 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  respectively. The minimum values of DSR and ULR occurred  
17 in December 2007, and reached  $354.9 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and  $264.7 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  respectively. The maximum  
18 value of DLR occurred in July 2007, and reached  $371.2 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The maximum value of USR  
19 occurred in February 2008 and reached  $257.8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and the minimum value of USR  
20 occurred in November 2007 and reached  $144.4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The large USR occurring from  
21 December 2007 through February 2008 were caused by large albedo of the snow-covered  
22 surface, resulting in the large surface albedo shown in Figure 6e. It is a clear indication that

1 the albedo of fresh snow was higher than 0.64.

2

### 3 **3.3.2 Energy Components**

4 The monthly mean diurnal variation courses of net radiation ( $Rn$ ), sensible heat flux  
5 ( $H$ ), latent heat flux ( $LE$ ), soil heat flux ( $G_0$ ), and  $CO_2$  flux ( $F_{CO_2}$ ) for all 334 sunny  
6 clear days during this 390-day observation period are given in Figure 7 where a composite  
7 analysis method is used and the short lines are error bars. Figure 7a shows that the diurnal  
8 variation pattern of  $Rn$  is similar to that of DSR, i.e., the diurnal variation was significant  
9 in summer and weak in winter. The maximum diurnal variation occurred in July and the  
10 peak value of  $Rn$  reached  $488.8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The minimum diurnal variation occurred in  
11 January 2008 and the peak value of  $Rn$  was  $115.3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ .

12 Figure 7b shows that seasonal variations in sensible heat flux were stronger than those  
13 in  $LE$ . The maximum value of  $H$  occurred in May 2008 and reached  $302.6 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  and  
14 the minimum value of  $H$  occurred in December 2007 and was  $54.4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ .

15 Figure 7c shows that the seasonal variation in latent heat flux was remarkable. Obvious  
16 diurnal variation of  $LE$  occurred in summertime, with a maximum value of  $106.8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$   
17 occurring in June 2008. Diurnal variation of  $LE$  was not significant in wintertime and the  
18 maximum value was  $30.0 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  which occurred in January 2008. Obvious diurnal variation  
19 of  $LE$  in summer might be attributed to the following: (1) precipitation frequently  
20 occurred (as shown in Figure 2) and steppe grass grew well in summer, and (2) the diurnal  
21 variation in net radiation was large in summer (as shown in Figure 7a).

22 Figure 7d shows the seasonal variation of soil surface heat flux ( $G_0$ ). Hao et al.(2007)

1 | estimated soil heat flux by averaging the output of two heat flux plates buried investigated  
2 | ~~the soil heat flux measured~~ at 0.05 m depth and ~~did not find~~ found ~~obvious~~ diurnal variations  
3 | in their selected four periods (i.e., pre-growth, growth, post-growth, and frozen soil) at their  
4 | steppe site in Inner Mongolia as shown in their Figure 4. However, these diurnal variations  
5 | in soil heat flux were weaker than those in sensible and latent heat fluxes. Our Figure 7d  
6 | shows that there is significant diurnal variation in  $G_0$ . The difference of our results from  
7 | those by Hao et al. (2007) can be attributed to two facts: (1) Hao et al. (2007) neglected the  
8 | soil heat storage in the soil layer extending from the surface to 0.05 m depth. Our analysis  
9 | shows that the soil heat storage in this shallow surface layer varied diurnally ~~changed~~ on  
10 | sunny clear days; and (2) we selected only clear sunny days for analysis, but Hao et al.  
11 | (2007) used all data for their investigation. Soil heat flux is very low or questionable on  
12 | rainy or cloudy days.

13 | Figure 7e shows that the seasonal variation of  $F_{CO_2}$  was similar to that of  $H$  and  
14 |  $LE$ , but of opposite sign in the reverse phase. The most significant diurnal variation  
15 | occurred in May 2008 when the steppe grass was luxuriant. The peak value reached  $-0.69$   
16 |  $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ . Weak diurnal variation occurred in December 2007 when the grass was mostly  
17 | senescent and the peak value was only  $-0.21 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ . This small carbon in the winter was  
18 | probably the result of some grass still living in the winter.

19 |  
20 | -  
21 | In summary, Figures 5 and 7 show that the seasonal and diurnal variations in  $H$  and  $F_{CO_2}$   
22 | are larger than those in  $LE$  and  $G_0$ , which implies that both  $H$  and  $F_{CO_2}$  may be more  
23 | significant climate indicators (that is, they respond more strongly to climate change) than  
24 |  $LE$  and  $G_0$ . Hao et al. (2007) investigated diurnal variations in  $H$ ,  $LE$  and  $G_0$ , and  
25 | found  $LE$  was larger than  $H$  during growth (in 2003 and 2004) and post-growth seasons

1 (in 2004). The reason is that precipitation was frequent in 2003 and 2004, which can be seen  
2 in their Fig. 2, and precipitation caused high surface evaporation in their experiment areas.

3 Bi et al. (2007) examined energy partitioning and CO<sub>2</sub> exchange over grassland in  
4 the tropical monsoon environment of southern China by using  $H$ ,  $LE$ , and  $F_{CO_2}$  measured  
5 in the near-surface layer from May 2004 to July 2005. [In contrast to our results,](#) ~~They~~  
6 ~~found [that](#) both  $LE$  and  $F_{CO_2}$  may be more significant climate indicators than  $H$  and  $G_0$  in~~  
7 ~~that area. [Thus, surface turbulent fluxes in different climate zones in China respond to climate](#)~~  
8 ~~[change in different ways.](#)~~

### 10 3.4 Energy Partitioning

11 The monthly means of the Bowen ratio ( $\beta \equiv H / LE$ ) were 3.25, 3.25, 3.28, 3.34, 3.44, 3.49,  
12 3.56, 3.61, 3.54, 3.41, 3.32, 3.25 and 3.21 from June 2007 to June 2008. [It is obvious that](#)  
13 [the Bowen ratio was almost constant and did not vary monthly, which suggests partitioning](#) surface  
14 available energy ( $Rn - G_0$ ) into sensible and latent heat flux by [assuming a constant Bowen ratio.](#)

15 [\( \$Rn - G\_0\$ \) can be observed by using slow response instruments as mentioned above.](#) It is  
16 [also](#) obvious that the sensible heat flux was the main consumer of available energy ( $Rn - G_0$ )

17 for all the year round in this arid and semiarid area. Taking a yearly average, the Bowen  
18 ratio was 3.38,  $H / Rn = 62\%$ ,  $LE / Rn = 18\%$ ,  $G_0 / Rn = 9\%$ , and  $Re / Rn = 11\%$ . ~~Because the~~

19 ~~site was covered by grass, the residual energy ( $Re$ ) is mainly the heat storage in the grass.~~

20 The proportion of sensible heat flux in net radiation,  $H / Rn$  reached the maximum value  
21 (0.63) in June through August 2007 and May through June in 2008 and reached the  
22 minimum value of 0.61 in December 2007.  $H / Rn$  was lower than 0.62 during the  
23 period from October 2007 to February 2008, and was larger than 0.62 during summer 2007.

24 The proportion of latent heat flux in net radiation,  $LE / Rn$ , reached a maximum value (0.19)  
25 in June 2008, and reached a minimum value (0.17) in January 2008.  $LE / Rn$  was less than  
26 0.18 during the period from October 2007 through February 2008, and was larger than 0.18  
27 for the rest of the time.

28 Figure 8 shows the intercomparison of  $H + LE$  and  $Rn - G_0$ . The surface heating



1 rate  $\varepsilon$  is 0.93 and the correlation coefficient between  $H + LE$  and  $Rn - G_0$  is 0.85.  
2 Wever et al. (2002) examined the energy balance over a northern temperate grassland near  
3 Lethbridge, Alta., Canada, and found that the slope of the relationship between  $H + LE$   
4 and  $Rn - G_0$  ranged from 0.87 to 0.90. Hao et al.(2007) used soil heat flux measured at  
5 0.05 m depth rather than soil surface heat flux for energy balance analysis, and found that  
6  $H + LE = 0.69(Rn - G) + 17.09$ . Their failure to close the energy budget may be partly  
7 attributed to neglecting soil and vegetation heat storage.

8 Our analysis of the surface heating rate is focused on the data collected on  
9 ~~rain-free~~sunny days, because the sonic anemometer malfunctions during and after rain  
10 events.

11 Theoretically,  $\varepsilon$  should be very close to 1.0. The energy imbalance that occurred for  
12 these measurements is unexpected because the experiment was carried out over a relatively  
13 flat, homogeneous site with sufficient fetch and the flux calculations are rigorous. Such  
14 energy imbalances have also been encountered in other major field campaigns and caused  
15 difficulty for their climate applications (e.g. Kahan *et al.*, 2006). Previous researchers  
16 (Foken and Oncley, 1995; Panin *et al.*, 1996; Wicke and Bernhofer, 1996; Foken *et al.*, 1999;  
17 Kahan *et al.*, 2006; Oncley *et al.*, 2007; Su *et al.*, 2008) concluded that the causes of the  
18 imbalance of the energy budget were usually related to the errors/uncertainties in the  
19 individual energy component measurements and the influence of different footprints on the  
20 individual energy components. For our site, the difference in phases of  $Rn$ ,  $H$ ,  $LE$  and  
21  $G_0$  (Gao *et al.*, 2009), and the unavoidable uncertainties that occurred in the individual  
22 energy component measurements are the main causes of the energy imbalance encountered.

1

## 2 **3.5 Soil Temperature**

3        Surface radiation and energy budget balances are related to variations in soil  
4 temperature and soil water content. Figure 9 shows the seasonal variation of  
5 half-hourly-mean soil temperatures at soil surface and five depths (0.05 m, 0.10 m, 0.15 m,  
6 0.20 m, and 0.40 m), and water content at three depths (0.10 m, 0.20 m, and 0.50 m). The  
7 seasonal variation trends of soil temperature and water content are close to that of air  
8 temperature. The soil surface temperature is derived from ULR where the infrared  
9 emissivity is assumed to be 0.98 (Garratt, 1992).

10        As may be expected, the seasonal variations in soil temperature and water content in  
11 shallow layers were large. There is evidence of seasonal variation in soil temperature measured  
12 at 0.40 m depth. In general the range of seasonal variations measured in the deep layer was  
13 much less than those of soil temperature and water content measured in the shallower layers.  
14 The high soil temperatures occurred during summer (June - August), and low soil  
15 temperature occurred in January and February. The difference between the annual highest  
16 and lowest soil temperature ranged from 38 K to 59 K for these depths. Soil water content at  
17 0.10 m depth sensitively responded to precipitation with the most striking case happening  
18 on August 3 2007 when a thunderstorm made the greatest sudden change of soil wetness.

19        We also examined the diurnal variation of soil temperatures. Results show that soil  
20 temperatures diurnally changed in shallow layers, diurnal variation trends weakened with  
21 increasing depth and almost no diurnal variation occurred with soil temperature measured at  
22 a depth of 0.4 m.

1

## 2 3.6 Case Study of Diurnal Cycles

3 In this section we investigate the diurnal cycle of the radiation components, energy  
4 fluxes, CO<sub>2</sub> flux, and energy balance for ~~clear day~~sunny days under specific shortwave  
5 radiation environments: (1) on June 7 2008, the daily downward shortwave radiation  
6 reached the largest value of our experimental period; and (2) On December 22 2007, the  
7 albedo daily upward shortwave radiation reached the largest value of our experimental  
8 period. Figure 10 shows the diurnal cycle of radiation components for these two days, and  
9 the corresponding daytime surface albedo.

10 ~~The maximum values of downward shortwave radiation and upward shortwave~~  
11 ~~radiation were 1020 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 229 W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively, on June 7 2008; 424 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 304~~  
12 ~~W m<sup>-2</sup>, respectively, on December 22 2007.~~ The ~~corresponding~~ surface albedo values were  
13 0.22 and 0.70 on June 7 2008 and December 22, 2007, respectively. The winter surface  
14 albedo is higher than the summer surface albedo because of snowfall.

15 The downward longwave radiation components on June 7 2008 were greater than those  
16 on December 22 2007, and both of them showed almost no daily change. The upward  
17 shortwave radiation component on June 7 2008 diurnally changed in contrast to that on  
18 December 22 2007. Similar to Figure 10, the daily cycles of the energy flux components and  
19 CO<sub>2</sub> flux for the two days mentioned above were plotted in Figure 11. ~~The maximum values~~  
20 ~~of net radiation ( $R_n$ ), sensible heat ( $H$ ), latent heat ( $LE$ ), soil heat ( $G_0$ ), and CO<sub>2</sub> ( $F_{CO_2}$ )~~  
21 ~~fluxes were 564.0 W m<sup>-2</sup>, 294.5 W m<sup>-2</sup>, 141.9 W m<sup>-2</sup>, 168.1 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 0.63 mg m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> on~~  
22 ~~June 7 2008. The maximum values of  $R_n$ ,  $H$ ,  $LE$ ,  $G_0$ , and  $F_{CO_2}$  were 34.0 W m<sup>-2</sup>,~~

1 ~~20.2 W m<sup>-2</sup>, 9.8 W m<sup>-2</sup>, 19.2 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 0.07 mg m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> on December 22 2007.~~ On June 7  
2 2008, the sensible heat flux was larger than the latent heat flux; and on December 22 2007,  
3 the sensible heat flux and latent heat flux were close to zero. On June 7 2008, the daytime  
4 CO<sub>2</sub> absorption was significant because of the strong photosynthesis associated with the  
5 grass, and on December 22 2007, the daytime CO<sub>2</sub> absorption was close to zero owing to  
6 snow-covered surface.

7 Figure 12 shows the energy partitioning for June 7 2008 and December 22 2007.

8 ~~Sensible heat fluxes were 90.3 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 17.4 W m<sup>-2</sup>; latent heat fluxes were 58.2 W m<sup>-2</sup>  
9 and 0.71 W m<sup>-2</sup>; soil heat fluxes were 21.9 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 5.8 W m<sup>-2</sup>; and residual heat fluxes  
10 were 3.2 W m<sup>-2</sup> and 12.4 W m<sup>-2</sup> for June 7 2008 and December 22 2007 respectively.~~

#### 12 4. Summary and Conclusions

13 In order to investigate energy partitioning and CO<sub>2</sub> exchange over the land surface in  
14 a northern arid climate environment and to investigate which surface energy components are  
15 strong climate signals, eddy covariance measurements of moisture, heat and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes  
16 over steppe prairie in Inner Mongolia, China were carried out from June 2007 through June  
17 2008.

18 All four radiation components seasonally changed, resulting in a seasonal variation in  
19 net radiation. The components also changed diurnally. Winter surface albedo was higher  
20 than summer surface albedo, because in winter the surface was covered by snow.

21 Appropriate correction was made for turbulent fluxes. The seasonal variations in both  
22 sensible heat and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes were stronger than those in latent heat and soil heat fluxes,

1 which implies that both sensible heat and  $CO_2$  fluxes may be more significant climate  
2 signals than latent heat and soil fluxes. Sensible heat flux was the main consumer of  
3 available energy for the entire experimental period.

4 Surface energy partitioning was examined and the surface heating rate ( $\varepsilon$ ) was found to  
5 be 0.93 during the experiment. The energy imbalance problem was encountered. The main  
6 causes of the energy imbalance encountered were thought to be the difference in phases of  
7  $R_n, H, LE$  and  $G_0$  (Gao *et al.*, 2009), and the unavoidable uncertainties that occurred in  
8 the individual energy component measurements.

9

## 10 **Acknowledgments**

11 This study was mainly supported by MOST (2006CB400600,  
12 2006CB403500, 2006BAB18B03, and 2006BAB18B05), by CMA  
13 (GYHY(QX)2007-6-5), by NSFC (40233032), and by the Centurial Program  
14 sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Sciences. The work described in this  
15 publication was also supported by the European Commission (Call FP7-ENV-2007-1  
16 Grant nr. 212921) as part of the CEOP – AEGIS project (<http://www.ceop-aegis.org/>)  
17 coordinated by the Université Louis Pasteur. The National Center for Atmospheric  
18 Research is sponsored by the National Science Foundation. We are very grateful to  
19 the [anonymous reviewer for a careful review and valuable comments, which led to](#)  
20 [substantial improvement of this manuscript.](#)

21

22

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

## References

Adams J. M., Faure H., Faure-Denard L., McGlade J. M., and Woodward F. I.: Increases in terrestrial carbon storage from the Last Glacial maximum to the present. *Nature* 348, 711-714, 1990.

Baldocchi D. D., and Vogel C. A.: Seasonal variation of energy and water vapor exchange rates above and below a boreal jack pine forest canopy, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 102. D24, 28,939-28,951, 1997.

Baldocchi D. D., Vogel C. A., and Brad H.: Seasonal variation of carbon dioxide exchange rates above and below a boreal jack pine forest. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 83, 147–170, 1997.

Baldocchi D. D., Falge, E., and Gu, L. H., et al. : Fluxnet: A new tool to study the temporal and spatial variability of ecosystem-scale carbon dioxide, water vapor, and energy flux densities. *Bull. Am.Meteorol. Soc.* 82, 2415–2434 , 2001.

Barros A. P., Munoz F., Wood A. W., Voisin N., Bohn T., Rodriguez J. C., Lettenmaier D. P., Burges S. S., and Watts C. J.: Monitoring the diurnal cycle of land-atmosphere interactions in Sonora, Mexico during NAME/SMEX04, *AMS Conference on Hydrology*. 19, 2005.

Beljaars A. C. M., and Holtslag A. A. M.: Flux parameterization over land surfaces for atmospheric models. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 30, 327-341, 1991.

Betts A. K., and Ball J. H.: The FIFE surface diurnal cycle climate, *Journal of Geophysical*

1        *Research*, 100(D12), 679-693, 1995.

2        Bi X., Gao Z., Deng X., Wu D., Liang J., Zhang H., Sparrow M., Du J., Li F., and Tan H.: Seasonal  
3        and diurnal variations in moisture, heat and  $CO_2$  fluxes over grassland in the tropical monsoon  
4        region of southern China, *J. Geophys. Res.* 112, D10106, doi: 10.1029/2006JD007889, 2007.

5        Burba G. G., Verma S. B., and Kim J.: Surface energy fluxes of *Phragmites australis* in a prairie  
6        wetland, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 94, 31-51, 1999.

7        Campbell C. S., Heilman J. L., McInnes K. J., Wilson L. T., Medley J. C., Wu G. W., and Cobos D.  
8        R.: Diel and seasonal variation in  $CO_2$  flux of irrigated rice, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,  
9        1, 108, 15--27, 2001.

10       Chen Z. Z., Wang S. P., and Wang Y. F.: Update progress on grassland ecosystem research in Inner  
11       Mongolia steppe, *Chinese Bull. Botany*, 20, 423-429, 2003.

12       Delire C, and Gerard J. G.: A numerical study of the influence of the diurnal cycle on the surface  
13       energy and water budgets. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 100(D3), 5071-5084, 1995.

14       Desai A. R., Noormets A. N., Bolstad P. V., Chen J., Cook B. D., Davis K. J., Euskirchen E. S.,  
15       Gough C.M., Martin J. G., Ricciuto D. M., Schmid H. P., Tang J. W. and Wang W.: Influence of  
16       vegetation and surface forcing on carbon dioxide fluxes across the Upper Midwest, USA:  
17       Implications for regional scaling, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,  
18       doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.08.001, 2008.

19       Dickinson R. E., Hendersin-Sellers A., Rosenzweig C., and Sellers P. J.: Evapotranspiration models  
20       with canopy resistance for use in climate models, a review, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 54, 373-388,  
21       1991.

22       Dugas W. A., Heuer M. L., and Msyeux H. S.: Carbon dioxide fluxes over Bermuda grass, native  
23       prairie, and sorghum. *Agricul. For. Meteorol.* 93, 121–139, 1999.

1 Foken T. and Oncley S. P. : ‘Results of the workshop “Instrumental and methodical problems of  
2 land surface flux measurements”’, – *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **76**, 1191-1193, 1995.

3 Foken T., Kukharets V. P., Perepelkin V. G., Tsvang L.R., Richter S. H., and Weisensee U.: ‘The  
4 influence of the variation of the surface temperature on the closure of the surface energy balance’,  
5 - *13th Symposium on Boundary Layer and Turbulence*, Dallas, TX., 10 -15 Jan. 1999, *Amer.*  
6 *Meteorol. Soc.*, 308-309, 1999.

7 Frank A.B., and Dugas W. A.: Carbon dioxide fluxes over a northern, semiarid, mixed grass prairie.  
8 *Agricul. For. Meteorol.* 108, 317-326 ., 2001.

9 Gao Z., Bian L. and X. Zhou.: Measurements of Turbulent Transfer in the Near-surface Layer over a  
10 Rice Paddy in China, *J. Geophys. Res.* 108(D13), 4387, dio: 10.1029/2002JD002779, 2003.

11 Gao Z.: Determination of soil heat flux in a Tibetan short-grass prairie, *Boundary-Layer*  
12 *Meteorology*, 114, 165-178, 2005.

13 Gao Z., Horton R., Liu H. P., Wen J., Su. Z. B., and Wang L.: Influence of wave phase difference  
14 between surface soil heat flux and soil surface temperature on land surface energy balance  
15 closure, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, submitted.

16 Garratt J. R.: *The Atmospheric Boundary Layer*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 316 pp ,  
17 1992.

18 Hao Y., Wang Y., Huang X., Cui X., Zhou X., Wang S., Niu H., and Jiang G.: Seasonal and  
19 interannual variation in water vapor and energy exchange over a typical steppe in Inner Mongolia,  
20 China, *Agricul. For. Meteorol.* 146, 57-69, 2007.

21 Harazono Y., Kim J., Miyata A., Choi T., Yun J. –I. and Kim J. –W.: Measurement of energy budget  
22 components during the International Rice Experiment (IREX) in Japan, *Hydrological Processes*,



- 1       **12**, 2018 -2092, 1998.
- 2       Hartog G. D., and Neumann H. H., Energy budget measurements using eddy correlation and Bowen  
3       ratio techniques at the Kinosheo Lake tower site during the Northern Wetlands Study, *Journal of*  
4       *Geophysical Research*, vol.99, No. D1, 1539-1549, 1994.
- 5       Horst T. W., and Weil J.C.: [How far is far enough?: The fetch requirements for micrometeorological](#)  
6       [measurement of surface fluxes](#). *J. Atmospheric Oceanic Technology*, **11**, 1019-1025, 1994.
- 7       Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change.  
8       In: Houghton, J. T., Meira Filho, L. G., Callander, B. A., Harris, N., Kattenberg, A., Maskell, K.  
9       (eds.), Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1995.
- 10      Kahan D. S., Xue Y., and Allen S. J.: The impact of vegetation and soil parameters in simulations of  
11      surface energy and water balance in the semi-arid sahel: A case study using SEBEX and  
12      HAPEX-Sahel data, *Journal of Hydrology*, 320, 238-259, 2006.
- 13      Kaimal J. C., and Finnigan J.: Atmospheric Boundary Flows, Their Structure and Measurement,  
14      *Oxford Univ. Press, New York*, 1994.
- 15      Li S., Werner E., Asanuma J., Kotani A., Davaa G., Dambaravjaa, O. and Michiaki S.: Energy  
16      partitioning and its biophysical controls above a grazing steppe in central Mongolia. *Agricul. For.*  
17      *Meteorol.* 137, 89-106, 2006
- Merquiol E., Pnueli L., Cohen M., Simovitch M., Rachmilevitch S., Goloubinoff P., Kaplan A, and  
Mittler R.: Seasonal and diurnal variations in gene expression in the desert legume *Retama*  
*raetam*, *Plant, Cell and Environment* ,25,1627-1638, 2002.
- Mielnick, P. C., Dugas W. A., Johnson H. B., Polley H. W., and Sanabria J.: Net grassland carbon  
flux over a subambient to superambient CO<sub>2</sub> gradient, *Global Change Biology*, 7, 747-754,

- 2001.
- Moore C. J.: Frequency response to corrections for eddy correlation system. *Bound.-Layer Meteor.*, **37**, 17-35, 1986.
- Novick K. A., Stoy, P. C., Katul, G. G.: Carbon dioxide and water vapor exchange in a warm temperate grassland. *Oecologia*, 138, 259-274, 2004.
- Oncley, S. P., Foken T., Vogt R., Kohsiek W., DeBruin H. A. R., Bernhofer C., Christen A., van Gorsel E., Grantz D., Feigenwinter C., Lehner I., Liebenthal C., Liu H., Mauder M., Pitacco A., Ribeiro L., Weidinger T. : The energy balance experiment EBEX-2000. Part I: overview and energy balance, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 123:1–28, DOI 10.1007/s10546-007-9161-1, 2007.
- Panin G. N., Tetzlaff G., Raabe A., Schönfeld H. J., Nasonov A. E.: ‘Inhomogeneity of the land surface and the parametrization of surface fluxes - a discussion’, *Wiss. Mitt. aus dem Inst. für Meteorol. der Univ. Leipzig und dem Institut für Troposphärenforschung e.V. Leipzig*, 4, 204-215, 1996.
- Rowntree P. R.: Atmospheric parameterization schemes for evaporation over land: basic concepts and climate modeling aspects, in *Land Surface Evaporation. Measurement and Parameterization*, edited by T. J. Schmugge and J. C. Andre, 5-29., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- Schmid H. P.: Source areas for scalars and scalar fluxes, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 67, 293-318, 1994.
- Schuepp P. H., Leclerc M. Y., MacPherson J. I. and Desjardins R. L.: Footprint prediction of scalar fluxes from analytical solution of the diffusion equation. *Bound.-Layer Meteor.*, **50**, 355-373,

1990.

Sims P.L., Bradford J. A.: Carbon dioxide fluxes in a southern plains prairie. *Agricul. For. Meteorol.* 109, 117-134, 2001.

1 Steven J. H., Walter C. O., and Arturo M. M.: Diurnal, seasonal and annual variation in the net  
2 ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a desert shrub community (Sarcocaulis) in Baja California,  
3 Mexico, *Global Change Biology*, 11, 927-939, 2005.

4 Su, Z., Timmermans, W., Gieske, A., Jia, L., Elbers, J. A., Olioso, A., Timmermans, J., Van Der  
5 Velde, R., Jin, X., Van Der Kwast, H., Nerry, F., Sabol, D., Sobrino, J. A., Moreno, J. and  
6 Bianchi, R.: Quantification of land-atmosphere exchanges of water, energy and carbon dioxide in  
7 space and time over the heterogeneous Barrax site, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*,  
8 29:17, 5215- 5235, 2008.

9 Suyker A. E., and Verma S. B.: Year-round observations of the net ecosystem exchange of carbon  
10 dioxide in a native tallgrass prairie. *Glob. Change Biology*, 7, 279-289, 2001.

11 Toda M., Nishida K., Ohte, N. Tani M., and Musiak K. : Observations of Energy Fluxes and  
12 Evapotranspiration over Terrestrial Complex Land Covers in the Tropical Monsoon Environment,  
13 *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan* 80(3), 465-484, 2002.

14 Vourlitis G. L., Filho N. P., Hayashi M. M. S., Nogueira J. De. S., Caseiro F. T., and Campelo J. H.:  
15 Seasonal variations in the net ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a mature Amazonian transitional  
16 tropical forest (cerradão), *Functional Ecology*, 15, 388-395, 2001.

17 Webb E. K., Perman G. I., and Leuning R.: Correction of flux measurements for density effects due  
18 to heat and water transfer. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 106, 85-100, 1980.

1 Wever L. A., Flanagan, L. B., and Carlson, P.J.: Seasonal and interannual variation in  
2 evapotranspiration, energy balance, and surface conductance in northern temperate grassland.  
3 *Agricul. For. Meteorol.* 112, 31-49, 2002.

4 Wicke W., and Bernhofer C.: Energy balance comparison of the Hartheim Forest and an adjacent  
5 grassland site during the HartX Experiment, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* 53, 49-58, 1996.

6 Woodward F. L., Lomas M. R., and Betts R. A.: Vegetation-climate feedbacks in a greenhouse world.  
7 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, London, 353, 29-39, 1998.

8 Xue Y., Juang H. M., Li W., Prince S., DeFries R, Jiao Y, and Vasic R.: Role of land surface  
9 processes in monsoon development: East Asia and West Africa. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D03105,  
10 doi:10.1029/2003JD003556, 2004.

11

## 12 **Figure Captions**

13 Figure 1. Photo of the setup at the measurement site.

14 Figure 2. Meteorological data collected at the grassland site during the period from June  
15 2007 to June 2008 at the steppe prairie site.

16 Figure 3 Footprint flux and contributions of the cumulative flux according to Eq. (5) for  
17 neutral stability where  $U = 3.98 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ,  $z = 4.0 \text{ m}$ ,  $d = 0.2 \text{ m}$ , and  $u_* = 0.30 \text{ m}$   
18  $\text{s}^{-1}$ .

19 Figure 4. Seasonal variations of weekly mean downward shortwave radiation (DSR),  
20 upward shortwave radiation (USR), downward longwave radiation (DLR), upward  
21 longwave radiation (ULR) and surface albedo during the period from June 2007 to  
22 June 2008 at the steppe prairie site.

1 Figure 5. Seasonal variations of weekly mean net radiation ( $Rn$ ), sensible heat flux ( $H$ ),  
2 latent heat flux ( $LE$ ), soil heat flux ( $G_0$ ) and  $CO_2$  flux ( $F_{CO_2}$ ) during the period  
3 from June 2007 to June 2008 at the steppe prairie site.

4 Figure 6. Diurnal variations of weekly mean downward shortwave radiation (DSR), upward  
5 shortwave radiation (USR), downward longwave radiation (DLR), upward longwave  
6 radiation (ULR) and surface albedo during the period from June 2007 to June 2008 at  
7 the steppe prairie site.

8 Figure 7. Diurnal variation of weekly mean net radiation ( $Rn$ ), sensible heat flux ( $H$ ),  
9 latent heat flux ( $LE$ ), soil heat flux ( $G_0$ ) and  $CO_2$  flux ( $F_{CO_2}$ ) during the period from  
10 June 2007 to June 2008 at the steppe prairie site..

11 Figure 8. Inter-comparison of the measured ( $H + LE$ ) against available energy ( $Rn - G_0$ )  
12 during the period from June 2007 to June 2008 at the steppe prairie site.

13 Figure 9. Temporal variations of soil surface temperature (K) and at the depths of 0.05 m,  
14 0.10 m, 0.15 m, 0.2 m, and 0.4 m, and of soil water content at the depths of 0.10 m,  
15 0.20 m, and 0.5 m.

16 Figure 10. Diurnal variation of downward shortwave radiation (DSR), upward shortwave  
17 radiation (USR), downward longwave radiation (DLR), upward longwave radiation  
18 (ULR) and surface albedo on June 7, 2008, and on December 22, 2007 at the steppe  
19 prairie site.

20 Figure 11. Diurnal variations of net radiation ( $Rn$ ), sensible heat flux ( $H$ ), latent heat flux  
21 ( $LE$ ), soil heat flux ( $G_0$ ), and  $CO_2$  flux ( $F_{CO_2}$ ) on June 7, 2008 and on December 22,  
22 2007 at the steppe prairie site.

1 Figure 12. Surface energy partitioning on June 7, 2008 and on December 22, 2007 at the  
2 steppe prairie site.  
3  
4