

Detailed response to Reviewer 1

The authors highly acknowledge the fair and very constructive contributions of both reviewers and of the editor. The suggestions helped us to restructure and significantly improve the scientific content of the revised manuscript. Here is a detailed description of our responses to the review of the manuscript. Reviewer comments are in red italics.

To help the reviewers, the revised manuscript has been provided in this file with major modifications highlighted in bold. The responses are referred in line numbers corresponding to this manuscript version.

Major comments

1. Lack of scientific originality: To my opinion, the paper is lacking scientific originality in the sense that it makes a new contribution to the above mentioned objective of soil moisture validation. The authors basically describe the set up and calibration of the ISBA land surface scheme over the VAS. They calibrate the soil module of the ISBA land surface model to ground measurements made at the VAS.

The set-up of a model over a new test site is not a scientific novelty as such. The ISBA land surface scheme is very well established and a lot of scientific papers exist which are using the ISBA scheme. The establishment of a modeling framework for a new test site and the calibration of the model is daily business in the hydrological community. I therefore miss the originality and novelty of the contribution of the paper here.

Validating soil moisture products is a challenge and up to now in most cases papers describes how to relate one point measurement, or a value derived from a sparse network to a satellite product. We are trying another approach and we believe that the novelty resides in the approach. The tools and models are obviously not new as we want to rely on well established and accepted models. So what we want to achieve is a set of areas scattered around the different types of ecoclimate, which will deliver, continuously, a value representative of a whole pixel which can be compared to a satellite product at any overpass time. For this purpose we must have a continuous field of soil moisture over an area slightly larger than the actual pixel (3dB footprint) so that we can convolute the antenna pattern on it. To make such a large field of soil moisture ground measurements are not tractable so we rely on a limited set of ground sites and spatialize the soil moisture information with use of a SVAT coupled to a good set of forcings and a very good knowledge of soil types and land use. The set-up of a model over a new test site is not a scientific novelty as such. However, it is an important step to be considered. Specially, we tried a lot of configuration to minimize the error with respect to SMOS requirements. We also took into consideration different land uses (vineyards, shrubs).

Once the soil moisture fields are known, it is possible to compute satellite level brightness temperatures (to check calibration for instance) or to compare to satellite products as the model runs with a reasonably fine time step we can always have values at the time of overpass. To check the validity of the approach we did a test with existing sensors (AMSR-E). The paper describes how such approach is validated over one such site, the Valencia Anchor Station (VAS).

The idea is then to extend the approach on several other sites (arid, temperate, boreal etc) as such approach being exhaustive, can only be applied to a limited set of sites.

2. Representativeness of soil moisture fields: The authors re-calibrate the ISBA soil module using stations records of soil moisture. Soil hydraulic parameters are typically very sensitive model parameters that largely affect the partitioning of energy and water fluxes at the surface. On the other hand, it is difficult to obtain detailed information about soil properties, which makes site specific calibration often necessary. The authors perform this calibration at the local scale. It remains unclear, if this local calibration is in general applicable for the entire test site and other time periods. More specifically, I would like the authors to address at least the following questions: a) is the achieved calibration transferable? Can the calibration be evaluated using data from subsequent years? How is the accuracy of simulated for such an independent test period? b) Spatial representation: How representative is the achieved calibration for the entire test site? If the soil in the entire test site would be homogeneous, the local calibration certainly could be transferred, but it is not clear if this is the case. I would recommend the authors to address this point more consistently by providing additional information about the heterogeneity of soil texture distribution and discuss how they transferred the local soil calibration to the spatial scale.

a) is the achieved calibration transferable? Can the calibration be evaluated using data from subsequent years? How is the accuracy of simulated for such an independent test period?

The calibration of the SVAT model was done so as to be valid over the entire test site for any season/year. Of course fully validating this over many years and all the land use/soil type possibilities would be ideal but we did not have enough distributed data to test this thoroughly. What we can say is that if worked over all the points where we tested it and those are representative of most of the area, and it worked for all the years we had.

And yes, we think that the calibration can be evaluated using data from subsequent years. The soil moisture modelling for the entire study area was done from 2004 until 2008. For instance the model was calibrated using the Melbex 1 data in 2005 and it was validated using Melbex 2 campaign with data from 2007.

b) Spatial representation: How representative is the achieved calibration for the entire test site? If the soil in the entire test site would be homogeneous, the local calibration certainly could be transferred, but it is not clear if this is the case. I would recommend the authors to address this point more consistently by providing additional information about the heterogeneity of soil texture distribution and discuss how they transferred the local soil calibration to the spatial scale.

The most important parameters that can influence the soil moisture are the precipitation and the soil hydraulic parameters. For the precipitation we use the interpolation so as to have a distribution over the entire VAS 50x50 km² area.

The SVAT model used is ISBA and the soil hydraulic parameters are calculated in function of the texture. We had access to a detailed soil texture map (see fig 3), so by using this map and also the equation for the computation of the soil hydraulic distribution we are able to characterise the entire area, as it is usually done

3. Scaling and satellite intercomparison: The scaling of soil moisture fields is the most demanding task in the validation of satellite soil moisture products. The paper presents inter-comparisons of ISBA simulated soil moisture fields against three different soil moisture products. The intercomparison indicates very high uncertainties for the different remote sensing products. The ISBA soil moisture simulations are taken as the absolute truth in that intercomparison. The paper needs a further assessment of the uncertainties of the soil moisture product and the uncertainties of the reference soil moisture (see point above), to better quantify the actual accuracy of the soil moisture products.

In fact, the ISBA soil moisture simulations are not taken as an absolute truth but there are considered as a reference (a yard stick). It is true that we tended to consider that a model which runs operationally shouldn't be too far from the mark in terms of spatial and temporal patterns, but we accept the idea that the values are not the “truth”. We needed however to have a reference to establish some sort of comparison. It should be noted that the remotely sensed products we used were “scaled” and thus not delivering physical values. Consequently, the use of a model driven with a good forcing gives in general a good spatial and temporal distribution. When we compared ISBA with satellite data, a good temporal behaviour is obtained. The amplitudes also are in general, with a scaling factor, fully compatible in relative. Finally, ISBA is just a “tool” and we did not feel the need to establish its limitations and related uncertainties as this has already been done thoroughly in the literature (Mahfouf and Noilhan, 1991; Calvet et al., 1998).

The remote sensing soil moisture products available until now are obtained from different satellites which were not perfectly adequate to measure the soil moisture (too high in frequency for instance). Most of the studies until now used the AMSR-E soil moisture product in absolute values and the ERS-SCAT product is given directly in percentage.

4. Expected added value by remote sensing: The estimated errors of remote sensing data seem to be rather high. I would expect that partitioning the year in a wet and dry season just assign a climatological mean soil moisture dynamic will result in smaller errors than the observed ones. Please comment

The instruments that have been or are currently operating are not perfectly adequate for soil moisture retrievals. The first dedicated soil moisture mission is SMOS. The remote sensing soil moisture products used are not very adequate due the high frequency.

However, the partitioning of the year for the wet and dry season was done (line 492-495)

For the soil moisture product we considered the first part as well as the end of the year. During the vegetation growing period, as the AMSR-E signal is very perturbed the comparison was not done. We also compared with the AMSR-E polarisation ratio. In this case the partition of the year was done in 3 parts, the vegetation growing period was also considered .

Detailed comments:

• p.651, l.29: what does 0.04 mean? This is the mission target of SMOS and not what will be achieved. It's exactly the objective of the SMOS cal/val activities to asses that accuracy. Further, the mission benchmark is a rms error of 0.04 and not an absolute error of a single measurement. Be more specific, as readers might not be aware of these differences.

You are right, this sentence need to be clarified. It was replaced by (L51-53):

“Consequently, the SMOS mission benchmark is to provide global maps of soil moisture with an accuracy better than 0.04 m³/m³ (Kerr et al., 2001).”

• *p. 652, l.2: the resolution of SMOS is varying with incidence angle. Nominal resolution is in the order of 40km. However for shallow angles like 55 degree, the resolution should be coarser than 50km, as provided by the authors. Please check and correct.*

You are right, this sentence need to be clarified. It was replaced by(L53-55):

“SMOS will achieve a maximum spatial resolution of 50 km over land (43 km on average over the field of view), providing multi-angular dual polarized (or fully polarized) brightness temperatures over the globe (Kerr et al., 2001).”

• *Chapter 2.1: the description of the test site is lacking a description of the spatial heterogeneity of the soil. Please provide a map and further information about soil heterogeneity as this is very important for the evaluation of soil moisture heterogeneity in the test site.*

We agree with you. A new map (see fig. 3) and further information about soil heterogeneity are provided.

• *Chapter 2.1 and Figures 12: The spatial variability of the test site can not be identified from the information given. To accurately simulate soil moisture dynamics in a heterogeneous area, it is important that the measured forcing data, especially the precipitation data, is most representative for the area and that model parameters like land cover and soil hydraulic properties are known. It remains unclear how representative the data used, really is for the larger area provided in Figure 2. It is recommended to generate one Figure from Figure 1 and 2, containing three sub-figures, covering all the same spatial domain in the same geometry with the following content: subfigure a) topography and stations subfigure b) land cover and stations (probably not all) subfigure c) soil texture/types and stations (probably not all)*

We agree with you about the necessity to provide a map and further information about the spatial variability of the test site. A map of topography, clay and sand were added in the paper (see Fig. 3)

• *p.658, l. 10: Authors use Meteosat data for the forcing of ISBA model. It remains unclear which kind of data they use. Do they use a data product like those provided from the LandSAF or do they make their own retrievals? Please clarify.*

Agreed, it was not clear. The clarification is now implemented in the text (L215-223).

• *Chapter 2.3.: perform an independent calibration and validation of ISBA soil module (see comments above)*

Agreed. The clarification was made in the text (see Sect. 3.1 ; L260).

• *p.662, l.25: Authors state that IDW technique is “the most adapted method” for interpolation of meteorological data. This is not the case as there are a lot more sophisticated tools existing in geostatistics to interpolate data, like e.g. kriging techniques. IDW is not the most adapted, but the most simple technique. Why did authors choose IDW and how does the choice of the interpolation technique affect the uncertainties in the model simulations? Authors might conduct a sensitivity study, by doing cross-validation analysis (leave a single station out and recompute)*

You are right; we will develop more the why the IDW method was used. (see sect 3.2.1. L345)

We considered the IDW method as the most appropriated method because of the small number of the meteorological stations over the entire VAS area as well as because of their distribution. By doing the cross-validation analysis in general both techniques give the same results. Different test were done for different dates and for different meteorological stations/rain gauges. The differences between the use of IDW or kriging are not significant so the choice of a sophisticated technique like the kriging is not justified.

• *p. 664, l. 13: How is the penetration depth considered?*

The soil discretization was done so as to be possible to compare with soil moisture at different depths. In the case of comparing with in situ data we compared for 5 cm (Melbex 1 and 2 soil moisture probes) and in the case of AMSR-E soil moisture product we use soil moisture representative for 2cm depth.

• *p.669, l. 17: “The value of 0.024 obtained ...”: This statement is only valid if the authors could prove that the achieved calibration accuracy is applicable for the entire test site. Otherwise, one can not argue that the reference simulations have this high soil moisture accuracy. Again, authors need to more specifically address the scaling problem and uncertainties of the reference soil moisture simulations.*

It is also not clear, how the authors make the intercomparison between the ISBA model and the in situ data (Figures 34). Is this a comparison between a 10x10 km² ISEA grid cell and the local soil moisture measurements or a comparison between a “local” ISBA simulation at the point scale against the ground measurement. To more specifically address the scaling issue, authors should provide both, point like and 10x10 km² simulations against ground measurements. This would allow a better judgment of the uncertainties associated with the spatial averaging, which typically results in a reduction of the dynamical range of soil moisture.

We agree with your comment, the sentence is now rephrased.

“The value of 0.0240 m³/m³ obtained for the RMSE when comparing the simulated soil moisture and the data from Melbex II campaign is perfectly adequate for assessing the SMOS validation with an accuracy better than 0.04 m³/m³”.

In fact all the comparisons between ISBA model and the in situ data are done at punctual scale. A new section (see 4.2. “Ground measurements versus 10_10km² soil moisture”, L461) containing a comparison between point like and 10x10km² simulations against ground measurements is added in the paper.

Table 3: Authors provide a table with the model parameters and data used. Model parameters are aggregated to 10x10 km² grid. It is assumed that authors do that averaging by taking the spatial mean. However, for the parameter roughness length, a simple averaging is not valid due to the non-linear nature of this parameter. Please specify how the aggregation was done for the different parameters.

You are right; this information was added in the paper (see Sect. 3.2. “Spatialization method” L327).

For the LAI (from MODIS), roughness and the fraction of vegetation (from ECOCLIMAP) as there are product at 1 km resolution, there were aggregated to 10x10 km² grid by taking the spatial mean. In fact for the roughness length we disposed of ECOCLIMAP data. Over the VAS area this parameter is quite homogeneous.

For the texture the map that we dispose is at 10 m resolution. The aggregation to the 10x10 km² was done by considering the majority of the texture class in the grid area.

The temperature, pressure, wind speed, wind direction, relative humidity and the precipitations were interpolated in a 10x10 km² grid by using the meteorological stations/rain gauges.

The shortwave radiation was from LandSAF extracted in function of the 10x10 km² coordinates and the longwave radiation calculated using the interpolated data.

• Table 3: precipitation interpolation: the interpolation of meteorological parameters is highly dependent on topography. How do authors take into account topography in their interpolation approach? Neglecting topography effects in the interpolation might result in high uncertainties in the model simulations. Please clarify.

You are right. The topography subject needs to be clarified

In fact the VAS area has a relatively flat topography so we did not considered the topography in our interpolation

• Table 5: The intercomparison of ISBA and ground measurements are made at which temporal scale? Hourly, Daily ?

The comparison was done at an hourly scale.

• Chapter 3: The statistical comparison with the in situ data is a bit confusing, as authors take relative saturation for the comparison. It is not clear, if the given RMSE values indicate absolute or relative values. We guess, these are relative values, but clarification is needed. Please provide units. In case of relative values write [-/-]

Sorry for this inconvenience, we agree with your comment, the comparison is a bit confusing.

All the comparison done between ISBA and in situ measurements are given in absolute values

• Chapter 3: Time series intercomparison / added value of soil moisture observations: The results shown in in chapter 3 indicate rather high uncertainties of existing surface soil moisture products over the VAS. Beside the RMSE, other statistical measures, like e.g. the model efficiency are widely used for time series intercomparison. It is highly recommended to use the model efficiency as an additional score in the study.

We agree with your comment, the Nash efficiency has been added in the study as an additional score.

• Table 4: The unit for Ksat is wrong!

Sorry for this inconvenience, the unit for Ksat was modified

Minor comments

• numbers in the paper should always come with a unit!

We agree with your comment, a unit was added for all the numbers in the paper.

• The paper contains quite a lot of grammar and spelling errors. A native speaker should correct the proof before resubmission of the paper.

We tried to pay more attention to the grammar and spelling errors.

- *Table 1: change “into” to “in”*

We agree with your comment, the rectification was made.

- *Figure 3,4,5: specify soil depth in the figure caption*

We agree with your comment, the soil depth in the figure caption was added

Modelling soil moisture at SMOS scale by use of a SVAT model over the Valencia Anchor Station

S. Juglea¹, Y. Kerr¹, A. Mialon¹, J.-P. Wigneron², E. Lopez-Baeza³, A. Cano³,
A. Albitar¹, C. Millan-Scheiding^{3,4}, M. Carmen Antolin⁴, and S. Delwart⁵

¹Centre d'Études Spatiales de la BIOSphère, UMR 5126 (CNRS, CNES, IRD, UPS), Toulouse, France

²Ecologie fonctionnelle et PHYSique de l'Environnement (INRA/EPHYSE), Bordeaux, France

³Universitat de Valencia, Departament de Termodinamica i Fisica de la Terra, Valencia, Spain

⁴Center for Desertification Research (CIDE), Dept. of Territorial Planning, Valencia, Spain

⁵European Space Research and Technology Centre (ESA/ESTEC), Noordwijk, The Netherlands

Correspondence to: S. Juglea (silvia.juglea@cesbio.cnes.fr)

Abstract.

The main goal of the SMOS (Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity) mission is to deliver global fields of surface soil moisture and sea surface salinity using L-band (1.4 GHz) radiometry. Within the context of the Science preparation for SMOS, the Valencia Anchor Station (VAS) experimental site, in Spain, was chosen to be one of the main test sites in Europe for Calibration/Validation (Cal/Val) activities. **In this framework, the paper presents an approach consisting in accurately simulating a whole SMOS pixel by representing the spatial and temporal heterogeneity of the soil moisture fields over the wide VAS surface (50×50 km²).** Ground and meteorological measurements over the area are used as the input of a Soil-Vegetation-Atmosphere-Transfer (SVAT) model, SURFEX (Externalized Surface) - module ISBA (Interactions between Soil-Biosphere-Atmosphere) to simulate the spatial and temporal distribution of surface soil moisture. The calibration as well as the validation of the ISBA model are performed using in situ soil moisture measurements. It is shown that a good consistency is reached when point comparisons between simulated and in situ soil moisture measurements are made.

Actually, an important challenge in remote sensing approaches concerns product validation. In order to obtain an representative soil moisture mapping over the Valencia Anchor Station (50×50 km² area), a spatialization method is applied. **For verification, a comparison between the simulated spatialized soil moisture and remote sensing data from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on Earth observing System (AMSR-E) and from the European Remote Sensing Satellites (ERS-SCAT) is performed.** Despite the fact that AMSR-E surface soil moisture product is not reproducing accurately the absolute values, it provides trustworthy information on

surface soil moisture temporal variability. However, during the vegetation growing season the signal is perturbed. By using the polarization ratio a better agreement is obtained. ERS-SCAT soil moisture products are also used to be compared with the simulated spatialized soil moisture. However, the
25 lack of soil moisture data from the ERS-SCAT sensor over the area (45 observations for one year) prevented capturing the soil moisture variability.

1 Introduction

Soil moisture is a key variable controlling the exchanges of water and energy at the surface/atmosphere interface (Betts et al., 1996; Entekhabi et al., 1996). It is highly variable both
30 spatially and temporally as the result of the spatial heterogeneity of soil and vegetation properties, topography, land cover, rainfall and evapo-transpiration (Bosch et al., 2006; Entekhabi and Rodrigues-Iturbe, 1994). Observing the spatial distribution of soil moisture at the catchment scale is a difficult task requiring intensive field instrumentation for accurate spatial and temporal representation.

35 Nowadays, remote sensing technology has matured to the point that surface soil moisture can be estimated at global scale from space (Wigneron et al., 2003; Wagner et al., 2006). Microwave remote sensing at low frequencies have been found to produce the best results (Kerr, 2007; Wagner et al., 2006; Njoku and Entekhabi, 1996; Jones et al., 2004). In spite of the importance of soil moisture observations, the instruments that have been or are currently operating are not adapted to
40 soil moisture monitoring. Nevertheless, there are a number of soil moisture products available from different sensors. The Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer for the Earth Observing System (AMSR-E) (Njoku et al., 2003) on board the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Aqua satellite and the scatterometers (SCAT) on board the European Remote Sensing Satellites 1 and 2 (ERS-1 and ERS-2) (Wagner et al., 1999a) provide soil moisture products. Both
45 instruments use frequencies above 5 GHz.

The SMOS (Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity) (Kerr et al., 2001) mission was designed to measure soil moisture over continental surfaces as well as ocean salinity using a low microwave frequency – L-band (1.4 GHz). At this frequency, microwave observations are sensitive to soil moisture through the effects of moisture (water) on the dielectric constant and hence on the emissivity of
50 the soil. The soil emission is integrated over a soil depth of a few centimeters, giving a more representative measurement of soil moisture conditions over this layer. **Consequently, the SMOS mission benchmark is to provide global maps of soil moisture with an accuracy better than $0.04 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ (Kerr et al., 2001). SMOS will achieve a maximum spatial resolution of 50 km over land (43 km on average over the field of view), providing multi-angular dual polarized**
55 **(or fully polarized) brightness temperatures over the globe (Kerr et al., 2001).** Launched in November 2009, SMOS will deliver, for the first time, global surface soil moisture measurement

global twice a day (06:00 a.m. and 06:00 p.m. local time) in less than 3 days.

L-band passive microwave radiometry is a very useful tool for soil moisture monitoring, allowing nearly all weather observation and surface vegetation cover information. Numerous field exper-
60 iments using ground based and airborne L-band observations indicated a soil moisture retrieval capability of better than $0.04 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ accuracy (Wang et al., 1990a; Schmugge et al., 1992; Jackson et al., 1995, 1999). In this context, the strategy adapted by ESA for its Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity mission was to develop specific land product validation activities over well equipped monitoring sites. The Valencia Anchor Station (Lopez-Baeza et al., 2005a), in eastern Spain, and
65 the Upper Danube Catchment (Delwart et al., 2007), in southern Germany, are chosen as the two main test sites in Europe for the SMOS Calibration/Validation (Cal/Val) activities. This article will focus over the Valencia Anchor Station site which is a large reference area, equipped with ground soil moisture probes and fully characterized so as to contribute to SMOS land product validation.

**Several papers evaluated the soil moisture remote sensing products (Wagner et al., 2007; Albergel et al., 2009; Draper et al., 2009; Rüdiger et al., 2009; Gruhier et al., 2008). Draper et al. (2009) provided a comparison of four soil moisture products all based on AMSR-E sensor over a temperate climate in Australia during 2006. Rüdiger et al. (2009) showed a comparison of several remotely sensed surface soil moisture products and one simulation (land surface model predictions) over the mainland of France from 2003 to 2005, in addition to
75 a ground measurement comparison. Gruhier et al. (2008) provided an inter-comparison and evaluation of five products derived from different active and passive microwaves sensors using local ground station measurements from three different ground sites over a Sahelian area (located in the Gourma-Mali region) during two consecutive years (2005-2006). Validating soil moisture products is a challenge and up to now, in most cases, papers describe how to relate
80 one point measurement, or a value derived from a sparse network to a satellite product.**

**In the framework of SMOS Cal/Val activities, it was decided to select a set of areas scattered around the globe and representative of different types of ecoclimates. These sites are to deliver, continuously, a value representative of a whole pixel which can be compared to a satellite product at any overpass time for Cal/Val purposes. To achieve this goal it is necessary
85 to characterise and monitor an area slightly larger than the actual pixel (3dB footprint) in terms of brightness temperature, so that it is possible to convolute the antenna pattern on it. To acquire such a large field of soil moisture, ground measurements are not tractable so we rely on a limited set of ground sites and spatialize the soil moisture information with use of a SVAT - ISBA(Interactions between Soil-Biosphere-Atmosphere; Noilhan and Planton (1989);
90 Noilhan and Mahfouf (1996)) coupled to a good set of forcings and a very good knowledge of soil types and land use. Once the soil moisture fields are known, it is possible to compute satellite level brightness temperatures (to check calibration for instance) or to compare to satellite products. As the model runs with a reasonably fine time step we can always have**

values at the time of overpass. To check the validity of the approach we did a test with existing
95 sensors (AMSR-E, ERS-SCAT). The paper describes how such approach is validated over
one such site, the Valencia Anchor Station (VAS). The idea is then to extend the approach on
several other sites (arid, temperate, boreal etc) as, such an approach being exhaustive, it can
only be applied to a limited set of sites.

100 2 Valencia Anchor Station – experimental domain and data

The Valencia Anchor Station (VAS) site was established in December 2001 by the University of Va-
lencia (see <http://www.uv.es/anchors> and <http://www.uv.es/elopez>) with the main objective of char-
acterizing a large-scale reference Cal/Val area specifically dedicated to the validation of low spatial
resolution Earth Observation data products. It is located in Spain close to the town of Caudete de las
105 Fuentes (39°33'32" N, 1°16'37" W), at about 80 km West of the city of Valencia (fig. 1).

2.1 Characteristics of the area

The Valencia Anchor Station test site represents a reasonably homogeneous and mostly flat area of
about 50×50 km² (Fig. 2, 3). The main cover type is vineyards, about 56%, followed by trees,
shrubs, forest, industrial and urban. Beside the vineyard growing season, the area remains mostly
110 under bare soil conditions. In spite of its relatively flat topography, the small altitude variations
of the region clearly influence climate. It oscillates between semiarid in the areas of the towns of
Utiel and Caudete de las Fuentes and dry-sub-humid towards Villagordo del Cabriel (about 16 km
from Caudete de las Fuentes). Annual mean temperatures oscillate between 12 °C at Villagordo del
Cabriel and 14.2 °C at Caudete de las Fuentes. Annual precipitation varies between 396 mm in Utiel
115 and 451 mm of Caudete de las Fuentes and Villagordo del Cabriel. The duration of frost free periods
is similar for the three town areas, from May to November. Maximum precipitations occur in spring
and autumn. The spring maximum is generally in May, whereas the autumn maximum is variable,
in October for Caudete de las Fuentes and Utiel, and November for Villagordo del Cabriel.

2.2 Available data over the area

120 **To reproduce and compare the soil moisture fields over the VAS 50×50 km² area, in situ mea-
surements and remotely sensed data products are used. The characteristics of these data are
depicted next.**

2.2.1 In situ measurements

Valencia Anchor Station is characterized by an extensive set of measurements at different levels (in
125 the atmosphere and in the soil) in order to derive surface energy fluxes. Over the 50×50 km² area 22

meteorological stations are available (table 1), 4 fully equipped and 18 rain gauges are not uniformly distributed (Fig. 1). Only the 4 fully equipped stations measures meteorological data: air temperature and humidity at screen level, atmospheric pressure, precipitation, wind speed and direction and solar and atmospheric radiation. In the VAS area the soil texture is a parameter that depends mainly on lithology (Lopez-Baeza et al., 2008). An accurate map representing the spatial distribution of clay and sand (Millan-Scheiding et al., 2008) at 10 m resolution covering all the 50×50 km² area is available (Fig. 3). The division of the texture is made in 23 main classes. Leaf area index (LAI), roughness and fraction of vegetation are accessible during short time periods. However, as the period considered in this study is from 2004 to 2008, remote sensed LAI data are used (see Sect. 2.2.2.).
135 The historical data for the roughness and the fraction of vegetation are obtained from ECOCLIMAP (Fig. 2), a global land use maps database at 1 km resolution (Masson et al., 2003).

Over the 50×50 km² area two major ground measurement campaigns took place. In order to characterize the shrubs and vineyards, in the framework of the Mediterranean Ecosystem L-Band characterization Experiment (Melbex 1 and Melbex 2), ground based L-band radiometry experiments
140 have been developed to fully account for different soil moisture conditions and different vegetation growth development stages.

The first campaign, Melbex 1 (39.553°N, 1.273°W), was carried out between June 2005 and January 2006 to observe the surface emission of Mediterranean shrubs (Cano et al., 2009). The soil was characterized as sandy, with a soil texture composed of 47% sand, 38% silt and 15% clay. The vegetation is well adapted to dry conditions in summer and to freeze conditions in winter. The vegetation biomass is only subject to small variations throughout the year, it does not generally grow over a meter high and its distribution is random. Soil moisture measurements were carried out for the top first 5 cm of the soil, at 12 points every 10 min using capacitive probes. The ground soil moisture measurements were randomly scattered over the study area by placing probes both over bare soil and
150 under shrubs. The probes were calibrated under laboratory conditions at the end of the experiment using the same soil type in order to correctly convert the raw voltage values into volumetric soil moisture content (m³/m³).

The second soil campaign, Melbex 2 (39.526°N, 1.288°W), was carried out from April 2007 to December 2007 to observe the surface emission of vineyards (Cano et al., 2008). The soil is characterized as sandy clay loam, with a texture composed of 45% sand, 29% silt and 26% clay. As in the previous experiment, soil moisture measurements were carried out at different representative points every 10 min using the same capacitive probes. In the area, the soil was ploughed at least 3 times during the growing period of vineyards.

2.2.2 Remote sensing data

160 Satellites data are used in this study. A short description of each of these data is given below.

- AMSR-E data

The Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer (AMSR) of the Earth Observing System (EOS) is a multi-channel passive microwave instrument, launched on the Aqua satellite in May 2002. It operates in polar sun-synchronous orbit with equator crossing at 01:30 p.m. and 01:30 a.m. local solar time. Global coverage is achieved every two days or less depending on the latitude. The AMSR-E instrument measures dual polarized radiation at six frequencies in the range of 6.9 to 89 GHz, with an incidence angle of 55°. The mean spatial resolution at 6.9 GHz is about 56 km with a swath width of 1445 km. In order to minimize the atmospheric effects and to maximize vegetation and soil penetration, the inversion algorithm for the retrieval of soil moisture was designed to use the C-band frequency in preference to the higher ones. However, due to the high level of RFI (Radio Frequency Interference) observed by AMSR-E at 6.9 GHz, the current AMSR-E soil moisture retrievals use only the 10.7 GHz and higher frequencies (Njoku et al., 2003).

The data used in this study are from the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) Level 3 AMSR-E dataset (Njoku, 2004). The daily averages of brightness temperature and soil moisture products are re-sampled to a global cylindrical 25 km Equal-Area Scalable Earth Grid (EASE-Grid) cell spacing (Njoku, 2004). In addition to the soil moisture, the polarization ratio (PR) at 6.9 GHz is used and is defined as:

$$PR = \frac{Tb_v - Tb_h}{Tb_v + Tb_h} \quad (1)$$

It normalizes out the surface temperature and leaves a quantity that depends primarily on soil moisture, vegetation and atmosphere (Kerr and Njoku, 1990; Njoku et al., 2003; Owe et al., 2001). At low microwave frequencies, the polarization ratio has often been used to study soil moisture and vegetation effects. Its dynamic is well related to the soil moisture variations. At increasingly large angles (55° in this case) there is a longer observation path through the vegetation layer, causing greater attenuation of the emission from the underlying soil and reducing the sensitivity to the soil moisture (Njoku et al., 2003). Several studies investigated the validation and evaluation of AMSR-E soil moisture product (Gruhier et al., 2008; Rüdiger et al., 2009; Draper et al., 2009). As the AMSR-E soil moisture product shows biases and very small amplitude, a normalization between [0, 1] is done using:

$$y' = \frac{y - y_{\min}}{y_{\max} - y_{\min}} \quad (2)$$

where y' is the normalized curve and y is the input curve (in this case y is considered as the soil moisture product). Consequently, the discussion of this paper is focus on the normalized dataset.

– ERS-SCAT data

The ERS (European Remote Sensing Satellites) scatterometer is an active low-resolution microwave sensor flown on the board of the ERS-1 and ERS-2 satellites. ERS-1 was launched in July 1991 followed by the identical ERS-2 in 1995. The first objective of this sensor is to measure wind over

oceans, but its measurements have been shown to be highly suitable for surface soil moisture remote sensing (Magagi and Kerr, 1997; Wagner et al., 1999a). The ERS scatterometer operates at 5.3 GHz (C-band), vertical polarization, collecting backscatter measurements over an incidence angle range from 18° to 57°. It operates in polar sun-synchronous orbit with equator crossing times at 10:30/22:30. The spatial resolution of the ERS-SCAT footprint is about 50 km with a 12.5 km spatial sampling interval. The surface soil moisture data are retrieved from the radar backscattering coefficients, using the change detection method suggested by Dobson and Ulaby (1976). The methodology is described by Wagner et al. (1999a,b) which takes advantage of the information provided by the dual incidence angle measurements acquired by the ERS scatterometer. The backscattering coefficients are normalized to a reference incidence angle of 40°. The relative soil moisture data ranging from 0% to 100% are derived by scaling the normalized backscattering coefficients between the lowest/highest values corresponding to the driest/wettest soil conditions.

– MODIS data

The Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS; <http://modis.gsfc.nasa.gov/>) is an instrument on board of NASA's Terra and Aqua platforms. The MODIS LAI product is globally tiled and is projected on a sinusoidal grid which is an equivalent projection conserving the surface areas. It is at 1 km spatial resolution provided on a daily and 8-day basis and they are used as input to the SVAT model.

– METEOSAT data

The METEOSAT radiometer is a geostationary weather satellite launched by the European Space Agency (ESA). In order to run the SVAT model and so to produce soil moisture maps, an atmospheric forcing is needed. One of the parameters of the atmospheric forcing is the shortwave radiation. As already mentioned, only 4 meteorological stations measuring shortwave radiation are available over the VAS area. **For a better resolution over the entire area, the shortwave radiation flux products developed by Météo-France in the framework of the Satellite Application Facility on Land Surface Analysis (Land-SAF) are used (<http://www.meteo.pt/landsaf/>). The product is based on the 0.6 μm , 0.8 μm and 1.6 μm channels of the Meteosat/SEVIRI instrument and is calculated and distributed in near real time.**

3 The SVAT model

The SVAT model is used to generate, from atmospheric forcing and initial conditions, the temporal behavior of the soil moisture. Spatially distributed fields and forcing enable to simulate soil moisture spatial and temporal behavior and thus averaged soil moisture at any moment for the whole pixel (50×50 km²). The model used is SURFEX (stands for surface externalisée – Le Moigne et al.,

2009) and was developed at the National Center for Meteorological Research (CNRM) at Météo-
 230 France. It gathers all the developments and improvements made in surface schemes, containing
 four different modules: ISBA (Interactions between Soil-Biosphere-Atmosphere), Sea and ocean,
 TEB (Town Energy Balance) and Lake. In this article only the module for the soil and vegetation –
 ISBA (Noilhan and Planton, 1989) is used. ISBA is a SVAT scheme which describes the exchanges
 of heat and water between the low-level atmosphere, the vegetation and the soil. It depends on
 235 the type of soil and of vegetation. It has been widely validated over vegetated and bare ground
 surfaces (Mahfouf and Noilhan, 1991; Calvet et al., 1998). The soil module in ISBA can be run in
 different configurations: 2-layers, 3-layers (ISBA-2L, ISBA-3L – with force-restored discretization)
 and diffusive (ISBA-DIF). New possibilities comparing with ISBA-2 or 3 layers are available by
 using ISBA-DIF: the computation of a vertical profile of the temperature, liquid water and ice content
 240 over as many layers as needed. This scheme has already been applied successfully over a fallow
 site (Boone et al., 2000) and an agricultural site (Boone et al., 1999). In order to select the most
 appropriate configuration, different tests are made. A significant decrease in error is obtained in
 the case of a diffusive scheme so for our study the ISBA-DIF model is used. Soil water transfer
 (infiltration, runoff, diffusion and drainage) in SVAT's is computed by equations which attempt to
 245 characterize the soil through a set of hydrological parameters. The ISBA scheme uses the Clapp and
 Hornberger (1978) soil water model, which is common to a large number of surface parametrization
 schemes. The estimation of the diffusion of water in the soil is based on Darcy's law, where the water
 vertical flux is proportional to the gradient of the matric potential through the hydraulic conductivity.

$$F = -k \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\Psi + z) - D_{v\Psi} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial z} - K_d \quad (3)$$

250 where $D_{v\Psi}$ is the vapor conductivity (Braud et al., 1993), Ψ is the soil water matric potential (m)
 , K_d is an additional linear background drainage term ($m s^{-1}$) and k is the hydraulic conductivity
 ($m s^{-1}$). The hydraulic conductivity k ($m s^{-1}$) and the soil water matric potential Ψ (m) are related
 to the liquid volumetric soil water content through (Brooks and Corey, 1966; Clapp and Hornberger,
 1978):

$$255 \quad k = k_{\text{sat}} \left(\frac{w_l}{w_{\text{sat}}} \right)^{2b+3} \quad (4)$$

$$\Psi = \Psi_{\text{sat}} \left(\frac{w_l}{w_{\text{sat}}} \right)^{-b} \quad (5)$$

where b is the coefficient of the water retention curve.

3.1 SVAT configuration

260 In this section, the different sensitivity studies made as well as the parametrization chosen for
 the soil hydraulic functions are described. The characteristics of the data used for the calibration,
 validation and spatialization of SVAT model are also depicted.

The atmospheric forcing, needed to run the ISBA model, is composed of: air temperature and humidity at screen level, atmospheric pressure, precipitation, wind speed and direction and solar and atmospheric radiation. ISBA can have 12 patch types to characterize land use and related vegetation parametrization. For our case study, as the vegetation on the VAS site is mainly composed of vineyards, almonds trees (groves) and shrubs, the crops case is considered. An important aspect is the soil layer discretization that enables one to compare realistic configurations as a function of the penetration depth, between ground measurements and/or the remote sensing data. A sensitivity study was conducted in order to test the influence of different parameters. The most representative configuration was chosen with 13 layers, with different thickness, from 1 cm at the surface down to 1.50 m of depth (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 30, 50, 80, 100, 150 cm).

– Calibration of the SVAT

The calibration of the SVAT model is done to be applied over the entire test site for any season/year. In order to accurately perform the SVAT model calibration, ground measurements are needed. For this purpose, ground measurements from Melbex 1 campaign are used. The period considered goes from July to December 2005. Soil moisture measurements were carried out for the top first 5 cm of the soil every 10 min using capacitive probes. The atmospheric forcing is established as follows: the precipitation events are from a rain gauge (Caudete de las Fuentes) recording data at an hourly basis; the temperature, pression, wind speed, wind direction and relative humidity are from the nearest complete meteorological station; the shortwave is a Land-SAF product and the longwave is calculated using the formulation from Brutsaert (1975). In order to reproduce the exact condition from the Melbex 1 site, the same texture is considered, 47% sand, 38% silt and 15% clay. The LAI is from MODIS and both the fraction of vegetation and the roughness are from ECOCLIMAP. The SVAT model is run on from 2004 until 2008 in a hourly basis.

The performance of the land-surface schemes and hence the soil moisture simulations are sensitive to the choice of soil hydraulic parameters (Shao and Henderson-Sellers, 1996). Most of these hydrological parameters are site dependent. They are obtained from measurements or they are prescribed. It is difficult to prescribe a value for the wilting point (w_{wilt}), field capacity (w_{fc}), hydraulic conductivity at saturation (k_{sat}), saturated soil moisture (w_{sat}), the coefficient of the water retention curve (b) or for the matric potential at saturation (Ψ_{sat}). To take into account the characteristics of the VAS area, the establishment of new databases for soil hydraulic parameters is necessary to improve the soil moisture simulations. The hydrological parameters of the soil (k_{sat} , w_{sat} , b , Ψ_{sat}) are calculated using empirical equations as a function of the percentages of sand and clay. Using ISBA's default relations (Giordani, 1993; Noilhan and Lacarrère, 1995) to compute the soil parameters (see Table 2), the simulated soil moisture obtained is not in perfect accordance with the ground measurements recorded during the Melbex 1 campaign. In order to minimize this

300 difference, a new set of equations (see Table 2) for the soil hydraulic parameters are established
using Cosby et al. (1984); Boone et al. (1999). These calibrated equations are optimized inside the
confidence interval defined in Cosby et al. (1984); Boone et al. (1999). Both sets of data, the one
used by default by ISBA and the one from the calibrated version, are obtained from the same 11
textural classes and the same dataset. The results of the comparison between ground measurements
305 and the simulated soil moisture using the new set of equations are given in Sect. 4.

– Validation of the SVAT

**In order to validate the calibration of the SVAT over another representative land use and
other season/year, the Melbex 2 data are used. Carried out from April to December 2007 to
310 observe the surface emission of vineyards, the soil moisture measurements were recorded for
the first 5 cm of the soil every 10 min. Due the short distance between Melbex 1 and Melbex
2 campaigns sites (about 3 km), the same atmospheric forcing is used for both cases. The
Caudete de las Fuentes rain gauge is situated about 3 km away from Melbex 2 site. However,
the texture (45% sand, 29% silt and 26% clay), the LAI (MODIS), the fraction of vegetation
315 and the roughness (ECOCLIMAP) are specific to the Melbex 2 site. In this case also the SVAT
model was run on from 2004 until 2008 in a hourly basis (spin up).**

– SVAT distribution over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area

**The distribution of soil moisture patterns throughout a catchment plays a critical role in a
variety of hydrological processes. Observing the spatial distribution of soil moisture at the
320 catchment scale is a difficult task requiring intensive field instrumentation for an accurate
spatial representation. A SVAT model driven with a fine resolution of meteorological forcing
and land surface data can help understanding these processes. For this purpose, a trade off
between the simulation time and the needs in spatial data was found by dividing the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$
area into 25 grid surfaces of $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ each (see fig. 1). The available data sets over the area
325 are in different formats and resolution so they had to be transformed so as to fit the gridded
area. The way these scaling are performed is depicted in the next section.**

3.2 Spatialization method

The $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ is divided into 25 areas of $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ each so as to better reproduce the high
temporal and spatial heterogeneity of soil moisture fields over the entire VAS area. In situ measure-
330 ment (soil moisture), detailed knowledge of the environment (land use, texture) and meteorological
stations are used to characterize VAS. The format and the use of these data as an input to the SVAT
model is presented in this section. The spatialized soil moisture obtained is compared with remote
sensing data from AMSR-E and ERS-SCAT. To reduce the scaling issue, these remote sensing

products are transformed as depicted next.

335

3.2.1 Interpolation

The atmospheric forcing is used as an input to the SVAT model to obtain the surface soil moisture. According to the dataset, in the 4 fully equipped meteorological stations located into the VAS $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area, the measured data are registered on a 30/60 min basis. In addition, among the rain gauges, some of them are recording the weather information daily. In order to run the SVAT models with a suitable temporal resolution, standard diurnal cycles are reconstructed from the daily data.

340

Figure 1 presents the spatial distribution of the available meteorological station over the VAS $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. An irregular distribution of the stations can be noticed, especially in the center of the area where there is no data. So as to obtain a good representation of soil moisture over the entire area, an interpolation of all the available meteorological stations is necessary. In order to choose the most appropriate interpolation method between the inverse distance weighted (IDW) method and kriging, tests are done for different dates and for different meteorological stations/rain gauges. By doing a cross-validation analysis in general both techniques give the same behavior. The differences between the use of IDW or kriging are not significant so the choice of a sophisticated technique like the kriging is not justified. Moreover, the limited number of meteorological station/rain gauges as well as their location over the wide VAS area, was an additional reason for selecting the IDW method as the interpolation technique.

345

350

Inverse distance weighted methods are based on the assumption that the interpolated surface should be influenced mostly by the nearby points and less by the more distanced points. A general form of finding an interpolated value u for a given point x is an interpolated function:

355

$$u(x) = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^N w_k(x) u_k}{\sum_{k=0}^N w_k(x)} \quad (6)$$

where the weight function is:

$$w_k(x) = \frac{1}{d(x, x_k)} \quad (7)$$

defined by Shepard (1968), x denotes an interpolated (arbitrary point), x_k is the interpolated (known) point, d is a given distance from the known point x_k to the unknown point x and N is the total number of known points. **Using IDW method, the temperature, atmospheric pressure, wind speed, wind direction and the relative humidity are interpolated over the $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ grid by using the 4 complete meteorological stations. The shortwave fluxes are extracted over the same grid from the Land-SAF radiation product while the longwave fluxes are calculated using the interpolated data and the formulation from Brutsaert (1975). For the precipitation interpolation, all the 22 stations/rain gauges are considered.**

360

365

Following the interpolation, we have an optimal spatial and temporal distribution of the atmospheric forcing over the VAS $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area.

370 3.2.2 Aggregation

The surface characteristics are also important to be considered in SVAT's input. The LAI (MODIS), the roughness and the fraction of vegetation (ECOCLIMAP) are 1 km resolution products. Due to their different spatial resolutions when compared to the $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ grid, these products are aggregated through a spatial mean. For the texture, as the maps available
375 are at 10 m resolution, the aggregation to the $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ is done. In this case, the majority texture class is considered into the grid area.

The data obtained after spatialization thus the aggregated data used in order to simulate the spatialized soil moisture are depicted in Table 3. This allows to simulate the soil moisture over the chosen grid: in this case 25 points.

380

3.2.3 Mean

Once the soil moisture fields are known over the $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ grid, it is possible to compare to satellite products. To check both the approach presented in this paper and to validate all the aggregation techniques (several parameters are non linear but we rely on the fact
385 that the overall variations are smooth and/or small enough to allow one to consider them as pseudo linear), we compared the spatialized soil moisture to existing products derived from either AMSR-E or from ERS-SCAT. The remote sensing products used are considered so as to correspond to the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. The AMSR-E brightness temperature and soil moisture products are re-sampled to a global cylindrical 25 km Equal-Area Scalable Earth
390 Grid (EASE-Grid) cell spacing (Njoku, 2004). Two AMSR-E soil moisture sampled pixel are covering the VAS area. The average of these two pixels is considered to be representative for the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. For the ERS-SCAT, the footprint is about 50 km with a 12.5 km spatial sampling interval. This gives 16 ERS-SCAT soil moisture products over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. In order to have a maximum temporal and spatial cover, the mean value of the 16 pixels is
395 considered to be representative over the VAS area.

4 Results

An evaluation of the surface soil moisture obtained from ISBA was undertaken so as to quantify the improvement gained from the calibration.

400 In a first step the differences when using the default or calibrated version of ISBA are shown by comparing with in situ measurements registered during the Melbex 1 campaign. Then, the calibrated version of ISBA is tested by comparing with data from Melbex 2 campaign (different place and different period). **Point-like and $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ simulations are compared to ground measurements.** In a second step, the calibrated version of ISBA as well as the spatialization method described in
405 the previous section are used to obtain a spatial distribution of soil moisture over the entire area. The validity of the method was tested and the next paragraph presents a comparison between the spatialized soil moisture and remotely sensed data. As the area was divided into 25 pseudo-pixels ($10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ each), in order to have a representative value over the entire $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$, resulting values were averaged both spatially and over time. The soil moisture simulations were extracted for
410 the time steps close to the overpass times of the satellites. The penetration depth was also taken into account, **2 cm for AMSR-E and for the ERS-SCAT product.**

4.1 Ground measurements versus point-like soil moisture

4.1.1 Calibration of ISBA model using Melbex 1 campaign

Figure 4 compares the soil moisture from the Melbex 1 campaign and the **point-like** soil moisture
415 simulated with ISBA using the parametrization described in Sect. 2.3 (default and the new set of equations). The precipitation recorded at the meteorological station Caudete de las Fuentes are represented in blue. The simulations are done for the period 2004–2008. **Recorded soil moisture estimates are used as initial condition for the SVAT as well as a spin up of more than a year is done.** For graphical convenience, only the period corresponding to Melbex 1 campaign (14 July–31
420 December 2005) is presented.

Using the initial equations, the model tended to overestimate soil moisture in the dry season (from July to September) and to underestimate soil moisture for the rest of the period. In general a good agreement between the two datasets (correlation $R^2=0.793$ [-/-], Nash efficiency $Eff=0.619$ [-/-]) is observed, but the RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error) value equal to $0.042 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$ is higher than the
425 SMOS requirements – $0.04 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$. In order to minimize this error, the SVAT model is calibrated (see Sect. 2.3). Table 4 presents the calculated soil hydraulic values using the default equations and the calibrated ones (Table 2).

Using the default equations (see Table 2), the SVAT model is not able to represent faithfully the dynamics of the first layer of soil during the dry season, keeping it at high soil moisture values (more
430 than $0.10 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$). In order to enable lower values of soil moisture into the dry season, the wilting point equation is modified as follows. The value obtained for the wilting point using the default equation is about $0.140 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$, whereas the minimum observed value of soil moisture during the campaign is $0.040 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$. This behavior was also observed by Pellarin et al. (2009), where a value of wilting point of $0.040 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3]$ was used for the simulation in Niger. The default SVAT

435 equation is modified so as to retrieve a more representative value to simulate the dry period. The default equation for volumetric water content at saturation (w_{sat}) is also optimized. The goal is to reach a more representative value over a sandy soil as in Melbex 1 case (47% sand, 38% silt and 15% clay) at least for the first centimeters of soil.

The simulated soil moisture is driven mostly by the weather patterns and especially by the precipitation. The temporal evolution of surface soil moisture has a sharp increase and exponential decline 440 which are caused, respectively by rainfall events and consecutive drying periods. By increasing the coefficient of the retention curve and reducing the hydraulic conductivity at saturation by the use of the calibrated equations, the drainage dynamics are slowed down in order to encounter the same behavior as for the measured soil moisture.

445 Using the calibrated version of ISBA a significant improvement is obtained for the modelled soil moisture at the first 5 cm ($R^2=0.908[-/-]$, $Eff=0.895[-/-]$ – see Table 5). A good quantitative agreement is found (RMSE=0.022[m³/m³]) between the two soil moisture data: the same variability, the same drying slope, same low levels and amplitudes. At the beginning of November a higher level of modelled surface soil moisture dynamics is observed compared with in situ data. This can be due to 450 the high value of w_{sat} .

4.1.2 Validation of ISBA new parametrization using Melbex 2 campaign

The first step of our study was to find a parametrization of the surface model which minimizes the error compared with in situ measurements. In order to evaluate the validity of the chosen optimization, the same equations (see Table 2) as described in Sect. 2.3 are used for Melbex 2 area. Figure 5 455 presents a comparison between Melbex 2 data (in black) and simulated soil moisture (in red). A good agreement is retrieved between the two soil moisture data RMSE=0.024[m³/m³], $R^2=0.910[-/-]$. Some differences can be observed on 10 August and also on 15 September. These differences can be mostly associated to the fact that the meteorological station used is situated at almost 3 km from the place where the campaign took place. The precipitations between the different location can easily 460 differ showing, incidentally, that the spatial distribution of rain is a key factor.

4.2 Ground measurements versus 10×10 km² soil moisture

In order to address the uncertainties associated with the spatial averaging, comparison between point like and 10×10 km² simulations against ground measurements are done (Fig. 6). The 10×10 km² area used is the one covering both Melbex 1 and Melbex 2 campaigns. The point like and 10×10 km² soil moisture data are extracted within Melbex 1 or Melbex 2 period. When comparing in situ soil moisture with 10×10 km² simulations, similar results are observed. All the scores obtained are in the required range (less than 0.04[m³/m³]). A slight overestimation of soil moisture within high values is observed in all cases. This may be due to the volumetric water content at saturation which gives after calibration higher values than the

465

470 recorded ones (see sect. 4.1.1).

Using the SVAT for the spatialization as well as a linear interpolation method we can obtain for instance a soil moisture map over the entire $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ like in Fig. 7. The map represents the averaged soil moisture from January until the end of April 2005. A representation of soil moisture heterogeneity within the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ is showed, with two marked zones of drier soil
475 moisture. For this case a mean soil moisture value of $0.1642 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3\text{)]}$ is obtained.

4.3 Comparison with remote sensing data

4.3.1 Comparison with AMSR-E data

A comparison between spatialized soil moisture and the AMSR-E soil moisture product (Njoku L3) is made. The simulated soil moisture as well as the AMSR-E soil moisture product used are
480 representative for the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. The penetration depth of AMSR-E sensor is considered to be 2 cm so the soil moisture for the first two simulated layers is considered. The comparison is done from 2005 to 2007. Here are presented results from 2005 as the same evolution is observed for the other years. In a first step, the absolute values of the AMSR-E soil moisture product are compared with the simulated spatialized data. A severe lack of soil moisture dynamics and also a
485 big difference between the absolute value of the two dataset are observed ($\text{RMSE}=0.066 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3\text{)]}$, $\text{MBIAS}=0.015 \text{ [m}^3/\text{m}^3\text{)]}$, $R^2=0.051 \text{ [-/-]}$). Because of the different soil moisture dynamics and biases, it is difficult to compare the various datasets in detail. Consequently, all next comparison are undertaken with normalized data, leading to the loss of the absolute aspects.

The results of this normalization can be seen in Fig. 8. The dynamics of the soil moisture are very
490 well captured at the beginning and also at the end of the year, from January to March we observed an $\text{RMSE}=0.146 \text{ [-/-]}$ ($R^2=0.470 \text{ [-/-]}$, $\text{MBIAS}=-0.100 \text{ [-/-]}$, $\text{Eff}=-0.610 \text{ [-/-]}$) and at the end of the year, from October to December $\text{RMSE}=0.150 \text{ [-/-]}$ ($R^2=0.444 \text{ [-/-]}$, $\text{MBIAS}=0.041 \text{ [-/-]}$, $\text{Eff}=0.207 \text{ [-/-]}$). In the winter season, the signal of AMSR-E soil moisture shows a small difference when compared to the spatialized soil moisture. This may be explained by the sensitivity of the microwave signal to soil
495 freezing and by the reduced dynamics of the surface soil moisture during winter. In the middle of the year, from April to September, the opposite trend is observed between both datasets. From April to September no correlation is observed ($R^2=0.150 \text{ [-/-]}$) and the RMSE is twice that of the rest of the year (0.348 [-/-]). The inversion algorithm for the AMSR-E soil moisture uses the 10.7 GHz and 18.7 GHz brightness temperature data (Njoku et al., 2003). The increased attenuation by vegetation
500 and the superficial sensing depth (on the order of 1 cm for bare soil) for higher frequencies is a limit in the soil moisture retrieval from AMSR-E data. This can be seen by plotting the leaf area index (MODIS) corresponding to the site. When the growing season begins, the AMSR-E signal follows the vegetation signal (Fig. 8).

The polarization ratio provides a better agreement (than the soil moisture product from AMSR-E)

505 with simulated soil moisture even in the vegetation growing period. This is shown by the scores
obtained: at the beginning of the year, from January to March we observed an $RMSE=0.165[-/-]$
($R^2=0.655[-/-]$, $MBIAS=-0.142[-/-]$, $Eff=-0.872[-/-]$), at the end of the year, from October to De-
cember $RMSE=0.163[-/-]$ ($R^2=0.604[-/-]$, $MBIAS=-0.115[-/-]$, $Eff=-0.116[-/-]$) and in the middle
of the year, from April to September $R^2=0.466[-/-]$ and the $RMSE=0.206[-/-]$ ($MBIAS=-0.178[-/-]$
510], $Eff=-1.402[-/-]$). If the entire year is considered, better scores are obtained: $RMSE=0.186[-/-]$,
 $R^2=0.627[-/-]$, $MBIAS=-0.153[-/-]$, $Eff=-0.553[-/-]$. It shows that its dynamics is well correlated to
the soil moisture variations.

4.3.2 Comparison with ERS-SCAT data

A comparison is also performed between spatialized soil moisture and the ERS-SCAT soil wetness
515 product (Wagner SSM). The derived product represents the relative wetness of the first centimeters
between totally dry conditions (0%) and total water capacity (100%).

In order to compare the two data sets, the absolute values of the simulated soil moisture are normal-
ized between [0, 1]. The penetration depth of ERS-SCAT sensor is considered to be at about 2 cm so
the mean of the first two simulated layers from ISBA is considered. Figure 9 presents the comparison
520 between simulated and observed surface soil moisture during a one year period. At the beginning
of the year, from January to end of March $RMSE=0.195[-/-]$, $R^2=0.339[-/-]$, $MBIAS=-0.085[-/-]$,
 $Eff=-0.472[-/-]$ and at the end of the year, from the end of September to December $RMSE=0.149[-/-]$,
 $R^2=0.330[-/-]$, $MBIAS=0.036[-/-]$, $Eff=-0.735[-/-]$. An underestimation of the soil moisture
level by the ERS-SCAT product is observed. In the middle of the year, from April to September
525 ($R^2=0.222[-/-]$, $RMSE=0.206[-/-]$, $MBIAS=0.102[-/-]$, $Eff=-1.014[-/-]$), as for the AMSR-E soil
moisture product, the vegetation influence the ERS-SCAT signal. This leads to an overestimation of
the soil moisture estimates during the vegetation growing period.

For 2005 only 45 observations are available over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area. This is a limit in completely
understanding the soil moisture variability. A frequent revisit time is important for hydrologic appli-
530 cations, especially to obtain adequate sampling of surface wetting and drying between precipitation
events.

5 Conclusions

**In the framework of ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission, this paper in-
vestigates the ability to reproduce the high temporal and spatial heterogeneity of soil moisture
535 fields at SMOS pixel scale. This is the first step in the process of Calibration and Validation
(Cal/Val) activities of the SMOS data. The study was performed for 2004–2008 over the Valen-
cia Anchor Station (VAS), which was selected to be one of the main key test sites for the SMOS
Cal/Val activities. In this purpose, in situ measurement including two main campaigns (Melbex**

1 and Melbex 2), detailed knowledge of the environment (land use, texture) and meteorological stations are used to describe VAS. The hydrological process as well as the spatialization of the soil moisture fields are performed by the use of the SVAT model, SURFEX (Externalized Surface) - module ISBA (Interactions between Soil-Biosphere-Atmosphere) from Météo-France. In order to minimize the error with respect to SMOS mission requirements, both the calibration and the validation of the SVAT model were done using in situ soil moisture data from two campaigns: Melbex 1 and Melbex 2. Based on local atmospheric and surface observations from Valencia Anchor Station, it was found that the calibrated ISBA was able to faithfully reproduce the hydrological processes at the surface level. The RMSE decreases from $0.042[\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3]$ when using the default ISBA to $0.022[\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3]$ using the calibrated version. A new database for soil hydraulic parameters was established so as to improve the soil moisture simulations. The new parametrization was validated by the use of other dataset of soil moisture ground measurements recorded during Melbex 2 campaign. The value of $0.024[\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3]$ obtained for the RMSE when comparing the simulated soil moisture with data from Melbex II campaign is adequate for assessing the SMOS validation with an accuracy better than $0.04[\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3]$. **A comparison between point like and $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ simulations against ground measurements was also done to address the issue related to the spatial averaging. A slight overestimation of soil moisture is observed at high values but the scores obtained are within the required range (less than $0.04[\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3]$).**

The validation of soil moisture remote sensing products is an important issue and in most cases until now, papers describe how to associate point/network measurement to remote sensing products. None of these studies characterize the entire pixel as viewed by a satellite. The detailed knowledge of the area as well as the use of a interpolation method for the distribution of the atmospheric forcing allowed the obtaining of a spatial distribution of the soil moisture fields over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ area.

Comparisons of this spatialized soil moisture with three kinds of remote sensing information is done in order to test the approach. AMSR-E's soil moisture and polarization ratio as well as ERS-SCAT soil moisture products are used in this study. The penetration depth and the re-sampling grid of the soil moisture products used for each satellite are also considered. Although AMSR-E surface soil moisture product is not able to capture the absolute value, it provides reliable information on surface soil moisture temporal variability, at seasonal and rainy events scale. In the middle of the year, from April to September, the vegetation has an important influence on the measured signal. During the growing season the AMSR-E signal is very perturbed. The polarization ratio 6.9 GHz provides a better agreement with simulated soil moisture even in the vegetation growing period. A comparison is done between spatialized soil moisture and the ERS-SCAT soil moisture product (Wagner SSM). In this case also the seasons are well marked but the lack of a higher temporal resolution (45 observations were available over the area for 2005) prevented capturing the soil moisture variability over the VAS area.

Radiometer signals received in L and C band are susceptible to man-made radio frequency interferences (Le Vine and Haken, 2003; Njoku et al., 2005). SMOS, now launched, has detected a significant amount of RFI sources over the globe. Among these RFI sources, some of them are over Spain, affecting also the VAS test site. The Spanish authorities concentrate their efforts and managed already to stop most of these sources. The actual brightness temperature values over VAS are within the range of expected values. As the soil moisture simulation process is now validated, future works will imply simulating the SMOS brightness temperature as part of the Cal/Val activities.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to thank the European Space Agency (ESA), the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES), the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique – Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers (CNRS- INSU SIC) and the French National Programme TOSCA (Terre, Océans, Surfaces Continentales et Atmosphère) for supporting this work. We also wish to thank the NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) for providing AMSR-E data as well as the Institute for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria for providing the ERS-SCAT data. We thank also the Centre national de Recherches Météorologiques and Jean Christophe Calvet (CNRM) - Météo-France for the SURFEX model. The authors wish to thank also the Spanish Agency for Meteorology (AEMet) and to the Jucar River Basin Authority (CHJ) for the meteorological data.

References

- 595 Albergel, C., Rüdiger, C., Carrer, D., Calvet, J.-C., Fritz, N., Naeimi, V., Bartalis, Z., and Hasenauer, S.: An evaluation of ASCAT surface soil moisture products with in-situ observations in Southwestern France., *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 13, 115–124, 2009.
- Betts, A., Ball, J., Beljaars, A., Miller, M., and Viterbo, P.: The land surface-atmosphere interaction : A review based on observational and global modeling perspectives, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101(D3), 7209–7225, 1996.
- 600 Boone, A.: Modelisation des processus hydrologiques dans le schema de surface ISBA: Inclusion d'un reservoir hydrologique, du gel et modelisation de la neige., PhD thesis, University Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France, 252 pp., 2000.
- Boone, A., Calvet, J.-C., and Noilhan, J.: The inclusion of a third soil layer in a Land Surface Scheme using the Force-Restore method., *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 38, 1611–1630, 1999.
- 605 Boone, A., Masson, V., Meyers, T., and Noilhan, J.: The influence of the inclusion of soil freezing on simulations by a soil-vegetation-atmosphere transfer scheme., *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 39, 1544–1569, 2000.
- Bosch, D. D., Lakshmi, V., Jackson, T. J., Choi, M., and Jacobs, J. M.: Large scale measurements of soil moisture for validation of remotely sensed data: Georgia soil moisture experiment of 2003, *J. Hydrol.*, 323, 120–137, 2006.
- 610 Braud, I., Noilhan, J., Bessemoulin, P., Mascart, P., Haverkamp, R., and Vauclin, M.: Bareground surface heat and water exchanges under dry conditions: Observations and parameterization., *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.*, 66, 173–200, 1993.
- Brooks, R. H. and Corey, A. T.: Properties of porous media affecting fluid flow, *J. Irrig. Drain. American Soc. Civil Eng.*, IR 2, 61–88, 1966.
- 615 Brutsaert, W. H.: On a derivable formula for long-wave radiation from clear skies, *Water Resour. Res.*, 11(2), 742–744, 1975.
- Calvet, J.-C., Noilhan, J., and Bessemoulin, P.: Retriving the root-zone soil moisture from surface soil moisture or temperature estimates : a feasibility study based on field measurements., *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 37, 371–386, 1998.
- 620 Cano, A., Millan-Scheiding, C., Wigneron, J.-P., Antolin, C., Balling, J., Grant, J., Kruszewski, A., Saleh, K., Sobjaerg, S., Skou, N., and Lopez-Baeza, E.: The Mediterranean Ecosystem L-Band EXperiment over vineyards (Melbex-2)., 10th Specialist Meeting on Microwave Radiometry and Remote Sensing for the Environment, Italy, 2008.
- Cano, A., Saleh, K., Wigneron, J. P., Antolín, C., Balling, J., Kerr, Y. H., Kruszewski, A., Millán-Scheiding, C., 625 Sobjaerg, S. S., Skou, N., and López-Baeza, E.: The SMOS Medierranean Ecosystem L-band experiment (Melbex-1) over natural shrubs, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.11.019>, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2009.11.019, 2009.
- Clapp, R. B. and Hornberger, G. M.: Empirical Equation for some soil hydraulic properties, *Water Resour. Res.*, 14, 601–604, 1978.
- 630 Cosby, B. J., Hornberger, G. M., Clapp, R. B., and Ginn, T. R.: A Statistical exploration of the relationships of soil moisture characteristics to the physical properties of soils, *Water Resour. Res.*, 20, 682–690, 1984.
- Draper, C., Walker, J., Steinle, P., de Jeu, R., and Holmes, T.: An evaluation of AMSR-E derived soil moisture over Australia., *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 113 (4), 703–710, 2009.

- Delwart, S., Bouzinac, C., and Wursteisen, P.: Overall SMOS Cal/Val Plan and Requirements, SMOS 7th
635 WORKSHOP, ESRIN, 2007.
- Entekhabi, D. and Rodrigues-Iturbe, I.: An analytic framework for the characterization of the space-time variability of soil moisture., *Adv. Water Res.*, 17 (1-2), 35–45, 1994.
- Entekhabi, D., Rodrigues-IturbeNakamura, I., and Castelli, F.: Mutual Interaction of Soil Moisture state and atmospheric processes., *J. Hydrol.*, 183, 3–17, 1996.
- 640 Giordani, H., Expériences de validation unidimensionnelles du schéma de surface NP89 aux normes Arpge sur trois sites de la campagne EFEDA 91, Note de travail 24 GMME/Météo-France, 1993
- Gruhler, C., de Rosnay, P., Kerr, Y. H., Mougin, E., Ceschia, E., Calvet, J.-C., and Richaume, P.: Evaluation of AMSR-E soil moisture product based on ground measurements over temperate and semi-arid regions, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L10405, doi:10.1029/2008GL033330, 2008.
- 645 Gruhier, C., de Rosnay, P., Hasenauer, S., Holmes, T., de Jeu, R., Kerr, Y., Mougin, E., Njoku, E., Timouk, F., Wagner, W., and Zribi, M.: Soil moisture active and passive microwave products: intercomparison and evaluation over a Sahelian site, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 14, 141–156, 2010.
- Jackson, T. J., LeVine, D., Swift, C., Schmugge, T. J., and Schiebe, F.: Large area mapping of soil moisture using the ESTAR passive microwave radiometer., *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 54(1), 27–37, 1995.
- 650 Jackson, T. J., Le Vine, D. M., Hsu, A., Oldack, A., Starks, P., Swift, C., Isham, J., and Haken, M.: Soil moisture Mapping at regional scales using microwave radiometry: The southern great plains hydrology experiment, *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, 37(5), 2136–2151, 1999.
- Jones, A., Vukićević, T., and Vonder Haar, T.: A microwave satellite observational operator for variational data assimilation of soil moisture, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 5, 213–229, 2004.
- 655 Kerr, Y. H.: Soil Moisture from space: Where we are ?, *Hydrogeol. J.*, 15, 117–120, 2007.
- Kerr, Y. H., Waldteufel, P., Wigneron, J.-P., Martinuzzi, J.-M., Font, J., and Berger, M.: Soil moisture retrieval from Space: The soil moisture and ocean salinity (SMOS) mission, *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, 39 (8), 1729–1735, 2001.
- Le Moigne, P., Boone, A., Calvet, J.-C., Decharme, B., Faroux, S., Gibelin, A.-L., Lebeaupin, C., Mahfouf, 660 J.-F., Martin, E., Masson, V., Mironov, D., Noilhan, J., Tulet, P., and Van Den Hurk, B.: SURFEX scientific documentation, 2009.
- Lopez-Baeza, E., Alonso, S., Comerón, A., Diaz-Pabon, R., Domenech, C., Gimeno-Ferrer, J., Jorge, J., Labajo, A., Pineda, N., Pino, D., Rius, A., Rocadenbosch, F., Saleh, K., Sicard, M., Tarruella, R., Torrobella, J., and Velazquez, A.: A High-Quality Dataset of Land-Surface and Atmospheric Measurements for the Comparison/Crosscalibration of Data From Large Scale Optical Earth Observation Sensors in Space. The Valencia Anchor Station, Proceedings of the Workshop on Inter-Comparison of Large Scale Optical and Infrared 665 Sensors, ESA/ESTEC 12–14 October 2004, ESA-WPP-244, 2005a.
- Lopez-Baeza, E., SVRC, and team: Validation of SMOS Products over Mediterranean Ecosystem Vegetation at the Valencia Anchor Station Reference Area, Experimental Plan SMOS Validation Rehearsal Campaign, 670 SMOS Cal/Val AO I.D, 2008.
- Le Vine, D. M. and Haken, M.: RFI at L-band in synthetic aperture radiometers, *Proc. IEEE Int. Geosci. and Remote Sens. Symposium*, Toulouse, France, vol. 3, 1742–1744, 2003.
- Magagi, R. and Kerr, Y.: Retrieval of soil moisture and vegetation characteristics by use of ERS-1 wind scat-

- terometer over arid and semi-arid areas, *J. Hydrol.*, 188–189, 361–384, 1997.
- 675 Mahfouf, J.-F. and Noilhan, J.: Comparative study of various formulations of evaporation from bare soil using in situ data, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 30, 351–362, 1991.
- Masson, V., Champeaux, J.-L., Chauvin, F., Meriguet, C., and Lacaze, R.: A global database of land surface parameters at 1-km resolution in meteorological and climate models, *J. Climate*, 16(9), 1261–1282, 2003.
- Millan-Scheiding, C., Marco, J., Soriano, M., Torre, E., Torregrosa, G., Abalos, B., Requena, F., Cano, A.,
680 Antolin, C., and Lopez-Baeza, E.: VAS Soil and Vegetation Characterization, SMOS meeting in Bordeaux. INRA, 30–31 October 2008, 2008.
- Njoku, E. G., Ashcroft, P., Chan, T. K., and Li, L.: Global survey and statistics of radio-frequency interference in AMSR-E land observations., *IEEE Geosc. Remote Sens. Let.*, 43(5), 938–947, 2005.
- Njoku, E. G.: AMSR-E/AQUA daily L3 surface soil moisture, interpretive parms, & QC EASE-Grids, Boulder,
685 CO, USA: National Snow and Ice Data Center, Digital Media, 2004.
- Njoku, E. G. and Entekhabi, D.: Passive microwave remote sensing of soil moisture, *J. Hydrol.*, 184, 101–129, 1996.
- Njoku, E. G., Jackson, T., Lakshmi, V., Chan, T., and Nghiem, S.: Soil moisture retrieval from AMSR-E, *IEEE Geosc. Remote Sens. Let.*, 41(2), 215–229, 2003.
- 690 Noilhan, J. and Lacarrère, P.: GCM Grid-Scale Evaporation from Mesoscale Modeling, *J. Climate.*, 8, 206–223, 1995.
- Noilhan, J. and Mahfouf, J.-F.: The ISBA land surface parameterization scheme, *Global Planet Change*, 13, 145–159, 1996.
- Noilhan, J. and Planton, S.: A simple parameterization of land surface fluxes processes for meteorological
695 models, *Mon. Weather. Rev.*, 117, 536–549, 1989.
- Pellarin, T., Laurent, J., Cappelaere, B., Decharme, B., Descroix, L., and Ramier, D.: Hydrological modelling and associated microwave emission of a semi-arid region in South-western Niger, *J. Hydrol.*, *J. Hydrol.*, 2009, 375 (1–2), 262–272, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.12.003, 2009.
- Rüdiger, C., Calvet, J.-C., Gruhier, C., Holmes, T. R. H., de Jeu, R. A. M., and Wagner, W.: An Intercomparison
700 of ERS-SCAT and AMSR-E Soil Moisture Observations with Model Simulations over France, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 10(2), 431–447, doi:10.1175/2008JHM997.1, 2009.
- Schmugge, T., Jackson, T., Kustas, T. J., and Schmugge, T., Jackson, T., Kustas, T. J., and Wang, J. R. : Passive microwave remote sensing of soil moisture: results from HAPEX, FIFE and MONSOON’90, *ISPRS J. Photogramm.*, 47, 127–143, 1992.
- 705 Shao, Y. and Henderson-Sellers, A.: Validation of soil moisture simulation in land surface parameterisation schemes with HAPEX data, *Global Planet. Change*, 13, 11–46, 1996.
- Shepard, D.: A two-dimensional interpolation function for irregularly-spaced data, *Proceedings of the 1968 ACM National Conference*, 517–524, 1968.
- Wagner, W., Lemoine, G., and Rott, H.: A Method for Estimating Soil Moisture from ERS Scatterometer and
710 Soil Data, *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, 70(2), 191–207, 1999a.
- Wagner, W., Noll, J., Borgeaud, M., and Rott, H.: Monitoring soil moisture over the Canadian prairies with the ERS scatterometer, *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, 37, 206–216, 1999b.
- Wagner, W., Blöschl, G., Pampaloni, P., Calvet, J.-C., Bizzarri, B., Wigneron, J.-P., and Kerr, Y.: Operational

- readiness of microwave remote sensing of soil moisture for hydrologic applications, *Nord. Hydrol.*, 38(1), 1–20, 2006.
- 715 Wagner, W., Naeimi, V., Scipal, K., de Jeu, R., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Soil moisture from operational meteorological satellites, *Hydrogeol. J.*, 15(1), 121-131, doi:10.1007/s10040-006-0104-6, 2007.
- Wang, J. R., Shiue, J. C., Schmugge, T. J. and Engman, E. T.: The L-band PBMR measurements of surface soil moisture in FIFE, *IEEE Trans. Geosc. Remote Sens.*, 28, 906–914, 1990a.
- 720 Wigneron, J.-P., Calvet, J.-C., Pellarin, T., Van de Gried, A., Berger, M., and Ferrazzoli, P.: Retrieving near-surface soil moisture from microwave radiometric observations: current status and future plans, *rse*, 85(4), 489–506, 2003.

Table 1. Coordinates of the meteorological stations located in the 50×50 km² area.

Station Name	Longitude	Latitude	Characteristics
VAS	1.288° W	39.571° N	Fully equipped station
CASAS DE VES	1.330° W	39.262° N	Rain gauge
CASAS IBANEZ	1.465° W	39.288° N	Rain gauge
VILLAMALEA	1.598° W	39.363° N	Rain gauge
REQUENA LA PORTERA COOP.	1.101° W	39.405° N	Rain gauge
REQUENA CAMPO ARCIS	1.165° W	39.436° N	Rain gauge
DEL MORO C H JUCAR	1.355° W	39.484° N	Rain gauge
REQUENA	1.096° W	39.484° N	Rain gauge
CAUDETE DE LAS FUENTES	1.317° W	39.523° N	Rain gauge
MINGLANILLA	1.595° W	39.538° N	Rain gauge
PRESA DE CONTRERAS	1.505° W	39.542° N	Rain gauge
UTIEL C.H. JUCAR	1.206° W	39.568° N	Rain gauge
UTIEL	1.205° W	39.575° N	Rain gauge
UTIEL (LA CUBERA – AUTOMATICA)	1.249° W	39.580° N	Fully equipped station
CAMPORROBLES COOPERATIVA	1.402° W	39.649° N	Rain gauge
CAMPO ARCIS	1.168° W	39.433° N	Fully equipped station
CERRITO REQUENA	1.107° W	39.480° N	Fully equipped station
GRAJA DE INIESTA	1.674° W	39.516° N	Rain gauge
CONTRERAS	1.498° W	39.540° N	Rain gauge
CAUDETE DE LAS FUENTES I	1.280° W	39.547° N	Rain gauge
VILLAMALEA I	1.602° W	39.365° N	Rain gauge
CERRO	1.512° W	39.259° N	Rain gauge

Table 2. Equation of hydrological parameters used in default (DEFAULT ISBA (1) see Giordani, 1993; Noilhan and Lacarrère, 1995) and calibrated (CALIBRATED ISBA (2) see Cosby et al. (1984) and Boone et al., 1999) version of ISBA.

VARIABLE	DEFAULT ISBA (1)	CALIBRATED ISBA (2)
$b(-/-)$	$b=13.7*CLAY+ 3.501$	$b_mean=3.10+0.157*CLAY*100+(-0.003)*SAND*100$ $b_st_dev = 0.92+0.049*CLAY*100+(100-CLAY*100-SAND*100)*0.014$ $b=b_mean+b_st_dev$
Ψ_{sat} (m)	$\Psi_{sat}=-10^{(1.85-0.88*SAND)*0.01}$	$\Psi_{sat_mean}=(1.54+(-0.010)*SAND*100+0.006*(100-CLAY*100-SAND*100))$ $\Psi_{sat_st_dev}=(0.72+(-0.0026)*(100-CLAY*100-SAND*100)+0.001*CLAY*100)$ $\Psi_{sat} = -(10^{\Psi_{sat_mean}-\Psi_{sat_st_dev}}/100)$
k_{sat} (ms ⁻¹)	$k_{sat}=sec$ (*)	$k_{sat_mean} = (-0.60+0.013*SAND*100+(-0.0064)*CLAY*100)$ $k_{sat_st_dev} = (0.43+0.003*(100-CLAY*100-SAND*100)+0.001*CLAY*100)$ $k_{sat} = 10^{k_{sat_mean}-k_{sat_st_dev}} * (2.54/360000)$
w_{sat} (m ³ m ⁻³)	$w_{sat}=0.001* (-108*SAND+494.305)$	$w_{sat_mean} = (50.5 + (-0.142)*SAND*100 + (-0.037)*CLAY*100)/100$ $w_{sat_st_dev}=(8.23+(-0.081)*CLAY*100+(-0.007)*SAND*100)/100$ $w_{1sat} = w_{sat_mean} + w_{sat_st_dev}$
w_{wilt} (m ³ m ⁻³)	$w_{wilt}=37.134 E-3*CLAY^{0.5}$	$w_{wilt} = 17.134 E-3*CLAY^{0.5}$
w_{fc} (m ³ m ⁻³)	$w_{fc}=89.047 E-3*CLAY^{0.349}$	$w_{fc}=89.047 E-3*CLAY^{0.349}$

*: $1.0e-6*10(0.162E+01-0.582E+01*CLAY-0.907E-01*SAND+0.529E+01*CLAY^2+0.120E+01*SAND^2)$

Table 3. Resolution and data used as input of the SVAT model in order to obtain the spatialized soil moisture.

VARIABLE	INPUT sources	OUTPUT resolution
LAI	MODIS – 1 km resolution	aggregated to $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
ROUGHNESS	ECOCLIMAP – 1 km resolution	aggregated to $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
FRACTION OF VEGETATION	ECOCLIMAP – 1 km resolution	aggregated to $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
TEXTURE	clay and sand map at 10 m resolution	aggregated to $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
TEMPERATURE	4 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
PRESSURE	4 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
WIND SPEED	4 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
WIND DIRECTION	4 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
RELATIVE HUMIDITY	4 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
SHORTWAVE fluxes	METEOSAT	extracted at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$
LONGWAVE fluxes	calculated using interpolated atmospheric data	
PRECIPITATION	22 meteorological stations	interpolated at $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$

Table 4. Soil hydraulic values for Melbex 1 site calculated using the default and the calibrated set of equations.

	b (-/-)	Ψ_{sat} (m)	k_{sat} (m s^{-1})	w_{sat} ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$)	w_{wilt} ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$)	w_{fc} ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$)
DEFAULT ISBA	5.556	-0.172	1.225E-05	0.444	0.144	0.230
CALIBRATED ISBA	7.519	-0.049	1.502E-06	0.499	0.066	0.230

Table 5. Statistics obtained by comparing the in situ measurements from Melbex 1 campaign with the default/calibrated simulated soil moisture using ISBA.

	$R^2[-/-]$	RMSE[m ³ m ⁻³]	MEAN BIAS[m ³ m ⁻³]	NASH EFFICIENCY[-/-]
DEFAULT ISBA	0.793	0.042	0.015	0.619
CALIBRATED ISBA	0.907	0.022	0.001	0.895




Fig. 1. Location and distribution of the meteorological stations over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ VAS area.




Fig. 2. ECOCLIMAP land cover over the $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$.




Fig. 3. Topography (up left side), clay (down left side) and sand (down right side) maps over the VAS 50×50 km² area. The soil moisture measurements sites and meteorological station/rain gauges are also represented here.




Fig. 4. Comparison between observed (black line) and simulated soil moisture using the default ISBA (clear grey line) and the calibrated ISBA (red line) at 5 cm depth. The precipitation corresponding to the meteorological station Caudete de las Fuentes are represented in blue.




Fig. 5. Comparison between observed (black line) and simulated soil moisture using the calibrated ISBA (red line) at 5 cm depth. The precipitation corresponding to the meteorological station Caudete de las Fuentes are represented in blue.




Fig. 6. Comparison between point like (left side) and $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ simulations (right side) against ground measurements from Melbex 1 (up side) and Melbex 2 (down side) campaigns. The $10 \times 10 \text{ km}^2$ area is the one covering both Melbex 1 and Melbex 2 campaigns and data are extracted to correspond to both campaign periods.




Fig. 7. Distributed soil moisture over the VAS 50×50 km² area. Data represents the mean of soil moisture from 01 January to 30 April 2005.




Fig. 8. Comparison between surface soil moisture AMSR-E (black line), spatialized soil moisture from ISBA (red line) and the polarization ratio at 6.9 GHz AMSR-E (blue line). The soil moisture data are representative over 2 cm depth. All values are normalized between [0, 1]. The leaf area index from MODIS is also represented here (green stars).




Fig. 9. Comparison between surface soil moisture ERS-SCAT (black stars) and spatialized soil moisture mean from ISBA (red line). The soil moisture data are representative over 2 cm depth.