The International Soil Moisture Network: serving Earth system science for over a decade

Wouter Dorigo[1], Irene Himmelbauer[1], Daniel Aberer[1], Lukas Schremmer[1], Ivana Petrakovic[1], Luca Zappa[1], Wolfgang Preimesberger[1], Angelika Xaver[1], Frank Annor[2,3], Jonas Ardö[4], Dennis Baldocchi[5], Marco Bitelli[6], Günter Blöschl[7], Heye Bogena[8], Luca Brocca[9], Jean-Christophe Calvet[10], J. Julio Camarero[11], Giorgio Capello[12], Minha Choi[13], Michael C. Cosh[14], Nick van de Giesen[3], Istvan Hajdu[15], Jaakko Ikonen[16], Karsten H. Jensen[17,18], Kasturi Devi Kanniah[19], Ileen de Kat[20], Gottfried Kirchengast[21], Pankaj Kumar Rai[22], Jenni Kyrouac[23], Kristine Larson[24], Suxia Liu[25], Alexander Loew[26,†], Mahta Moghaddam[27], José Martínez Fernández[28], Cristian Mattar Bader[29], Renato Morbidelli[30], Jan P. Musial[31], Elise Osenga[32], Michael A. Palecki[33], Thierry Pellarin[34], George P. Petropoulous[35], Isabella Pfeil[1], Jarrett Powers[36], Alan Robock[37], Christoph Rüdiger[38], Udo Rummel[39], Michael Strobel[40], Zhongbo Su[41], Ryan Sullivan[23], Torbern Tagesson[4,18], Andrej Varlagin[42], Mariette Vreugdenhil[1], Jeffrey Walker[38], Jun Wen[43], Fred Wenger[44], Jean Pierre Wigneron[45], Mel Woods[46], Kun Yang[47], Yijian Zeng[41], Xiang Zhang[48], Marek Zreda[49], Stephan Dietrich[50], Alexander Gruber[51], Peter van Oevelen[52], Wolfgang Wagner[1], Klaus Scipal[53], Matthias Drusch[54], and Roberto Sabia[53]

[1]Department of Geodesy and Geoinformation, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria
[2]Trans-African Hydro-Meteorological Observatory, Delft, The Netherlands
[3]Department of Water Resources, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands
[4]Department of Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
[5]Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA
[6]Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
[7]Institute of Hydraulic Engineering and Water Resources Management, TU Wien, Vienna, Austria
[8]Forschungszentrum Juelich GmbH, Juelich, Germany
[9]Research Institute for Geo-Hydrological Protection, National Research Council of Italy, Perugia, Italy
[10]CNRM, Université de Toulouse, Météo-France, CNRS- Centre national de la recherche scientifique, Toulouse, France
[11]Instituto Pirenaico de Ecología, IPE-CSIC, Zaragoza, Spain
[12]Institute of Sciences and Technologies for Sustainable Energy and Mobility, National Research Council of Italy, Torino, Italy
[13]Environement and Remote Sensing Laboratory, School of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, Sungkyunkawan University, Jangan-gu, Suwon, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea
[14]USDA-Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS), Hydrology and Remote Sensing Laboratory, Beltsville, MD, USA
[15]PlantTech Research Institute, Tauranga, New Zealand
[16]Finnish Meteorological Institute, Space and Earth Observation Centre, Helsinki, Finland
[17]Department of Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden
[18]Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
[19]Assistant Dean, Associate Editor - International Journal of Remote Sensing, Member - TropicalMap Research Group, Member - Centre for Environmental Sustainability and Water Security (IPASA), Faculty of Built Environment and Surveying, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia
[20]VanderSat B.V., Haarlem, Netherland
[21]Wegener Center for Climate and Global Change and Institute of Physics, University of Graz, Austria
[22]Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India

[23]Environmental Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, IL, USA

[24]University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

[25]Key Laboratory of Water Cycle and Related Land Surface Processes, Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China; College of Resources and Environment/Sino-Danish Center, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[26]Department of Geography, Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, Munich, Germany

[27]Ming Hsieh Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

[28]Instituto Hispano Luso de Investigaciones Agrarias, CIALE, Universidad de Salamanca, Villamayor, Spain

[29]Laboratory of Analysis of the Biosphere, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile

[30]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Perugia University, Perugia, Italy

[31]Institute of Geodesy and Cartography, Warsaw, Poland

[32]Aspen Global Change Institute (AGCI), Basalt, CO, USA

[33]NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information, Asheville, NC, United States

[34]CNRS - Centre national de la recherche scientifique, LTHE, University of Grenoble, France

[35]Department of Geopgraphy, Harokopio University of Athens, Athens, Greece

[36]Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada - Science and Technology Branch, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

[37]Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

[38]Department of Civil Engineering, Monash University, Clayton, Australia

[39]DWD, Meteorologisches Observatorium Lindenberg – Richard-Aßmann-Observatorium, Lindenberg, Germany

[40]USDA-NRCS National Water and Climate Center, Portland, OR, USA

[41]University of Twente, Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation, Enschede, the Netherlands

[42]A.N. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

[43]College of Atmospheric Sciences, Plateau Atmosphere and Environment Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China

[44]Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate, Oslo, Norway

[45]MOST, ISPA, INRAE Bordeaux Aquitaine, France

[46]University of Dundee, UK

[47]Department of Earth System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

[48]State Key Laboratory of Information Engineering in Surveying, Mapping and Remote Sensing (LIESMARS), Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

[49]Department of Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

[50]International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change ICWRGC (UNESCO), Federal Institute of Hydrology, Koblenz, Germany

[51]Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Heverlee, Belgium

[52]International GEWEX Project Office, Washington, DC, United States

[53]European Space Agency, ESRIN, Frascati, Italy

[54]European Space Agency, ESTEC, Noordwijk, The Netherlands

[†]Deceased July 02, 2017

Correspondence: Wouter Dorigo (wouter.dorigo@tuwien.ac.at)

Abstract.

In 2009, the International Soil Moisture Network (ISMN) was initiated as a community effort, funded by the European Space Agency, to serve as a centralised data hosting facility for globally available in situ soil moisture measurements (Dorigo et al., 2011b, a). The ISMN brings together in situ soil moisture measurements collected and freely shared by a multitude of organisations, harmonizes them in terms of units and sampling rates, applies advanced quality control, and stores them in a database. Users can freely retrieve the data from this database through an online web portal (ismn.earth). Meanwhile, the

ISMN has evolved into the primary in situ soil moisture reference database worldwide, as evidenced by more than 3000 active users and over 1000 scientific publications referencing the data sets provided by the network. As of July 2021, the ISMN now contains data of 71 networks and 2842 stations located all over the globe, with a time period spanning from 1952 to present. The number of networks and stations covered by the ISMN is still growing and approximately 70% of the data sets contained in the database continue to be updated on a regular or irregular basis. The main scope of this paper is to inform readers about the evolution of the ISMN over the past decade, including a description of network and data set updates and quality control procedures. A comprehensive review of existing literature making use of ISMN data is also provided in order to identify current limitations in functionality and data usage, and to shape priorities for the next decade of operations of this unique community-based data repository.

1 Introduction

Ground-based soil moisture measurements of land surface variables are indispensable in the process of developing, validating, and advancing spatially contiguous data sets derived from satellites or models (Loew et al., 2017; Gruber et al., 2020). Although the first systematic measurements of soil moisture started well before the satellite era in the former Soviet Union to support agricultural decision making (Robock et al., 2000), it was not until the early 2000s that soil moisture monitoring networks started being widely established as part of hydrological and meteorological observing capacities. Particularly, the launch of the Soil Moisture Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission of the European Space Agency (ESA) in 2009 (Kerr et al., 2016), and the launch of the Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) mission of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in 2015 (Entekhabi et al., 2010), boosted the establishment of new research networks (Colliander et al., 2017).

While all networks are a valuable asset for assessing the skill of soil moisture products under various conditions and scales, their usage is hampered by the diversity of sensors, data formats, quality control, and accessibility mechanisms. The need of bringing together and harmonising available soil moisture data was recognised by the international soil moisture community and expedited by the Global Energy and Water cycle Exchanges (GEWEX) project of the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) with support of the Commission on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS), the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS), and the Group on Earth Observation (GEO). In the advent of the SMOS mission, ESA decided to provide the financial impetus to establish a global reference database of in situ soil moisture measurements for the purpose of satellite product development and validation. As a result, the International Soil Moisture Network (ISMN) went online in 2010 (Dorigo et al., 2011b, a).

The primary objective of the ISMN is to collect in situ soil moisture data sets shared by various data organisations on a voluntary basis and make them available in a harmonized format through a centralised free and open web portal (ismn.earth). While 10 years after its launch the core objective of the ISMN remains valid, its functionality has expanded since then. This new functionality includes the integration of advanced quality control methods (Dorigo et al., 2013); Section 3), the provision of additional metadata and ancillary variables (e.g., precipitation, soil and air temperature), ongoing automation, the provision of software code to users, and the implementation of various tools to promote the information exchange between users, the ISMN, and the data providers. Moreover, the ISMN has substantially grown in terms of networks, stations, and data sets.

Data from the ISMN has supported hundreds of scientific papers on soil moisture, satellite product and land surface model validation in particular (e.g., Al-Yaari et al. (2019b); Brocca et al. (2014a); Beck et al. (2020)). Several operational data producing services routinely access the ISMN data for repeated quality assurance, including ESA's Climate Change Initiative (Dorigo et al., 2017), the Copernicus Global Land Service (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018), and the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S; Dorigo et al. (2017)). Other domains have also exploited the ISMN data, e.g. in meteorology, drought monitoring, or land-atmosphere coupling (Section 4).

Despite the valuable contribution of the ISMN to satellite and climate communities, multiple challenges have yet to be mastered, including the heterogeneous availability in space and time (Dorigo et al., 2015), scale differences between in situ measurements and satellite or model sampling (Gruber et al., 2013), full characterisation and traceability of uncertainties, and

50 differences in spatial-temporal support of the observations caused by different measurement techniques and landscape hetero-geneity (Ochsner et al., 2013). New scientific avenues to improve the spatial coverage could be the inclusion of soil moisture data sets from low cost sensors collected by citizens (Section 5.1.4. For climate applications, stable long-term reference data are required, calling for the coordinated establishment and maintenance of Fiducial Reference Measurement (FRM) stations, as outlined by the GEO/CEOS Quality Assurance framework for Earth Observation (QA4EO) (GCOS, 2016; Montzka et al.,

55 2020; Gruber et al., 2020).

The scope of this paper is to inform readers about the evolution of the ISMN over the past decade, including a description of network and data set updates, new quality control procedures, and new functionality of the data portal. We also review scientific literature making use of ISMN data to assess the achievements facilitated by the ISMN and to identify current limitations in data availability and functionality, and challenges in data provision and use. Based on this review, prerequisites and priorities

60 needed to ensure another decade of this unique community-based data repository are defined.

2 The ISMN data hosting facility

Although the ISMN may be considered a mere data repository, there is much more to it: its core functionality includes col-lecting data from participating data providing networks, harmonizing them in terms of units, sampling rates, naming, and metadata, performing automated quality control, storing the data and metadata in a queryable database, and making them

65 available through a web interface. And from a system perspective, it entails even more, e.g., communication with (potential) data providers and users (Appendix B1).

2.1 Data and metadata summary

As of July 2021, the ISMN contains 71 networks providing access to a total of 2842 stations, approximately 10,000 soil moisture data sets, and an additional 10,000 data sets of other meteorological variables (collocated with the soil moisture

70 measurements). Although the ISMN is a global network, most networks and stations are located in North America (15), Europe (28), Australia (3) and Asia (19) (Figure 1). New networks are continuously being added, while many existing networks are still being upgraded with additional stations, soil moisture sensors, and meteorological variables. The diversity of networks is large, ranging from networks with a single station to networks comprising more than 400 stations covering different landscape types as well as periods. The distribution of stations per Koeppen-Geiger climate class is given in Figure 2.

Figure 1. Locations of ISMN networks and sites plotted with the ISMN package described in the *Code and data availability* section [Status July 2021].

Figure 2. Distribution of ISMN-sites per Koeppen-Geiger climate classification, only categories with >20 sites are considered (Status June 2021).

Most of the networks originate from scientific initiatives in various disciplines (e.g., remote sensing, soil sciences, agriculture, meteorology), and only a few are run by operational entities like national weather or environmental services. Consequently, a lack of sustainable project funding has forced several scientific networks to close after some time. 18 out of the 71 networks

contained in the ISMN have become inactive and will no longer provide data set updates (Figure 3). Data go back as far as 1952 but none of the data sets spans the entire ∼70 year period. The longest available time series (∼40 years) is provided by the RUSWET-AGRO network in the former Soviet Union, while the longest operating network still active is SNOTEL in the United States.

Most networks provide data set updates at yearly or irregular intervals. Data sets from six networks (ARM, COSMOS, FMI, SCAN, SNOTEL, USCRN, WEGENERNET), comprising approximately 900 stations, are updated in near-real-time (NRT; status July 2021), which is currently defined as once per day. While the earliest networks were sampled manually at weekly, fortnightly, or even monthly intervals, most current networks take their measurements using electronic devices at daily, hourly or even more frequent sampling rates. For more details on the networks see Appendix A, Dorigo et al. (2011b), Dorigo et al. (2013) or the individual references herein.

Figure 3. Overview of all available networks, the individual time span of the data availability within the ISMN, their operational status and their updating frequency [Status June 2021].

The variables contained in the ISMN (Table 1 and 2) originate from networks that were built for various purposes, which consequently do not all contribute the same information. Since the ISMN was initially founded as a validation database for satellite (surface) soil moisture data, each station in the database provides soil moisture for the upper soil layer (≤ 0.10 meter depth). Soil moisture data sets in the ISMN can go as deep as two metres, but generally with a decreasing number of measurements locations with depth (Table C1). Some stations deploy more than one sensor at a certain depth, either as replacement in case of failure of one of the sensors or to characterise local soil moisture variability. The availability of meteorological data like precipitation, soil and air temperature, is even more heterogeneous, depending on the scope of the network or the data sharing

95 policy of the data providing organisation. It is also quite common that single time series in the database are composed of the consecutive measurements of two or more different sensors, when a sensor is replaced after failure.

Table 1. Overview of all available temporally dynamic variables stored in the ISMN database. *Note that for precipitation and air temperature the measurement height above the ground surface is indicated.

variable name	abbreviation	units	measurement depth* [m]	variable with depth?	number of time series (stations)
soil moisture	sm	$m^3 m^{-3}$	0.00 - 2.10	Y	10610 (2822)
soil suction	su	kPa	0.04 - 0.75	Y	73 (18)
soil temperature	ts	°C	0.00 - 2.03	Y	8113 (1629)
air temperature	ta	°C	2.00 - 12.00	Y	1292 (1234)
surface temperature	tsf	°C	0.00 - 0.00	N	126 (126)
precipitation	p	mm	0.00 - 2.00	N	759 (700)
snow depth	sd	mm	0.00	N	562 (555)
snow water equivalent	sweq	mm	0.00	N	507 (427)

Table 2. Overview of all available temporally static variables stored in the ISMN database.

variable name	abbreviation	units	measurement depth [m]	sensors dependency
climate classification	clcl	none	none	N
land cover classification	lccl	none	on surface and above	N
soil classification	socl	none	none	N
bulk density	bd	$g\ cm^{-3}$	0.00 - 1.50	Y
sand fraction	sa	% weight	0.00 - 1.50	Y
silt fraction	si	% weight	0.00 - 1.50	Y
clay fraction	cl	% weight	0.00 - 1.50	Y
organic carbon	oc	% weight	0.00 - 1.00	Y
saturation	sat	% volume	0.00 - 1.00	Y
field capacity	fc	% volume	0.00 - 2.00	Y
potential plant available water	ppaw	% volume	0.00 - 2.00	Y
permanent wilting point	wp	% volume	0.00 - 2.00	Y

Metadata information can be divided into two categories, i.e., mandatory metadata, which allow for an unambiguous identification of each network, station, and measurement in the ISMN database (Figure D1), and optional metadata, shared by data providers to allow more in-depth analysis of their data sets. To be consistent between sites, the mandatory variables climate, land cover, and soil characteristics are taken from external databases: Climate classification is taken from the Köppen-Geiger

database with a resolution of 0.1° (Peel et al., 2007); Dynamically evolving land cover for 2000, 2005, and 2010 is obtained from ESA's Climate Change Initiative (CCI) land cover v1.6.1 with 300 meter resolution; Soil information is retrieved from the Harmonized World Soil Database (HWSD v1.1; FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISS-CAS/JRC, 2009) with a 30" sampling, although the actual resolution may strongly vary from location to location.

105   If available, data providers can optionally share their own, more detailed, characterisations of land cover, soil, and quality flags with the ISMN. These are stored in addition to the same variables from external sources. All static variables per measurement site and depth are listed in Table 2.

2.2 Data collection and harmonisation

Data collection is done either manually (mostly by email) or automated, depending on the degree of automation at the data
110 provider side. Although standards for in situ soil moisture data collection are available (Colliander et al., 2017; Montzka et al., 2020), there is no general agreement within the community, neither is it prescriptive for participation in the ISMN. Thus, the data being contributed to the ISMN are heterogeneous with regard to units (e.g., volumetric soil moisture, water depth, mass, soil saturation, plant available water), installation depth, integration length, and positioning of the sensors (vertical, horizontal), the metrical system, the sampling interval, and the time zones used for the measurement time stamps.

115   The first harmonisation step for all data and metadata involves the conversion of units to internationally agreed scientific units (e.g., m and °C). Then, following the recommendations of the World Meteorological Organization for weather observation and forecasting (Williams, 2010), all data are resampled to hourly Universal Time Coordinated (UTC) reference time steps. Data that are available at higher sampling rates are thinned by selecting the individual measurements at the hourly UTC reference time step or the ones that are closest in time within a window of +/- 0.5 h. If there is no measurement available within this
120 interval, the respective time step is not stored in the database but can be recreated and filled with a no-data value upon download. The temporal resampling scheme is valid for all included dynamic variables, except precipitation. Since precipitation is a flux and not a state variable, all measurements within the hourly interval are summed to represent the full amount of precipitation within the preceding hour (Dorigo et al., 2011b).

All soil moisture measurements provided to the ISMN are converted to volumetric soil moisture in m^3m^{-3}. Since the
125 majority of networks already shares their measurements in volumetric soil moisture units often no unit conversion is needed. For the other (mostly historical) networks, measurements are converted to volumetric units using metadata on soil properties (in case measurements are provided as saturation level or plant available water) and/or the thickness of the soil layer represented by the measurement (in case measurements are provided as water height or mass) (Dorigo et al., 2011b). Note, that even if all measurements are harmonised in terms of units, differences in sampling volumes related to the sensor design and installation
130 are not accounted for.

The harmonisation of measurement depths is particularly challenging, as different networks adopt different measurement depths, similar sensors are positioned differently (horizontally vs. vertically), or their measurements represent different observation volumes, which may even differ according to the soil wetness (as for cosmic ray probes). Thus, harmonising soil moisture measurements to one or several reference depths would require either assumptions on the measurements and soil

135 properties or supplemental soil modelling. Additionally, since there are lots of potential uses for the data, there is no common agreement on the optimum sampling depths. For example, satellite calibration-validation generally requires observations of the 0-5 cm layer while land surface model evaluation requires reference measurements that are representative for the layers defined in the model (Dorigo et al., 2011b). Consequently, the ISMN does not harmonise measurement depths.

After data harmonisation, the data sets are submitted to extensive quality control procedures (Section 3. After quality control,
140 all data sets of soil moisture and other variables, metadata information on networks, responsible organisations, sites, sensors as and static soil attributes for each station are stored in a relational database.

2.3 Data portal

The ISMN can be accessed at ismn.earth and consists of a project website containing, e.g., information about networks, data, quality control, and partners, and a data interface where users can view, query, and download the data contained in the database.

145 The data interface displays the location and information of networks and single stations, and allows for plotting the available data to gain an impression of data availability and quality. Data can be selected for time period, area, single networks, or entire continents. Alternatively, the data download can be selected via an advanced SQL query, which allows users to make more specific selections (e.g., for sensor brand, or a certain depth range).

The selected data are directly extracted from the database and downloads are organised per network. For each network,
150 the download contains (i) the measurements and their quality flags, (ii) information about the file data organisation, (iii) a description of the ISMN quality flags, (iv) a metadata file compliant with ISO 19115 and INSPIRE (Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community) metadata standards, and (v) information about static site characteristics (e.g., land cover, climate class, soil characteristics).

The extracted data set files are formatted according to either the CEOP (Coordinated Energy and water cycle Observations
155 Project) (Williams, 2010) standard, or a slightly modified version of the CEOP format which improves data usability (Dorigo et al., 2011b). These standards use the ascii format but a NetCDF format is foreseen for the near future.

2.4 Data provider and user involvement

The ISMN is entirely built on the voluntary, free-of-charge contributions from scientific and operational providers. This prevents the ISMN from being too prescriptive towards the data providers in terms of delivery intervals, automation and formatting.
160 Hence, a careful balance is needed between inclusiveness on the one hand and data quality standards on the other. The ISMN facilitates between users and data providers by reporting data quality issues and user feedback to the providers very six months. This is done by means of a report on data usage statistics for each individual network, e.g., on the number of downloads, the usage of their data in scientific publications, and flagging statistics. Together with obtaining visibility and citations, obtaining feedback on data usage and data quality is one of the primary motivations for data providers to join the ISMN.

165 More than 3000 active users have registered since 2009 (status July 2021). Data download is free of charge but user registration (compliant with the latest European Union - EU General Data Protection Regulation - GDPR privacy standards) is

required to prevent illegal redistribution of the data or theft of ground equipment, and to track (undisclosed) statistics on data usage that are fed back to the data providers, e.g., by regular reports.

News feeds on the ISMN web page and a bi-annual newsletter informs the users about new networks, new data sets, data quality issues, important publications, workshops, and more. In addition, a dedicated forum and classical email exchange allow users to raise and get response to issues. Moreover, open source software packages are available for reading and plotting the data (Section 6).

3 Quality control

3.1 Quality flagging methodology

The wide variety of sensors types and installations, measurement protocols, calibration methods, preprocessing, and quality control procedures adopted by the data providers result in data sets with large differences in quality and filtering. In an attempt to harmonise the reliability of the data from different networks and sensors and to allow for marking spurious observations in near-real-time, the ISMN has adopted automated quality procedures, which are applied to all observations feeding into the ISMN (Dorigo et al., 2013). It uses several approaches to detect dubious soil moisture measurements, which can be subdivided into geophysical dynamic range verification, geophysical consistency methods, and spectrum-based methods (Table 3). While the first category of methods applies simple threshold checks directly to the measurements, the geophysical consistency methods make use of ancillary data, either observed in situ at the same site or derived from model data (i.e., GLDAS-Noah). The spectrum-based flags are the result of a series of conditions applied to the soil moisture measurement time series and their first and second derivatives. The geophysical consistency and spectrum-based methods are only applied to the soil moisture observations, while geophysical dynamic range verification is applied to all dynamic variables in the database.

Recently, a few refinements of the original flagging procedures as described and assessed in Dorigo et al. (2013) were implemented to increase the flagging accuracy:

- The outlier detection method (Flag D06) now allows spikes to last two consecutive time steps instead of the initial one hour. This occurs when all conditions of Eq.[4-6] in Dorigo et al. (2013) are met, but the peak value remains unchanged for an additional hour. The overall impact is small (flagging numbers increase from 0.31% to 0.34%) but its impact on extreme values can be significant.

- Flag D07 ("negative breaks (drops)") was extended with an extra possibility, which detects drops from values greater than 0.05 to exactly 0 m^3m^{-3} soil moisture:

$$x_t \geq 0.05 \wedge x_{t+1} = 0 \tag{1}$$

Figure 4. Additionally flagged observations by network shown as fraction of total number of observations. Note that, in principle, the cumulative sum of fractions can be >1 as the occurrence of each flag ranges between 0 and 1.

195   Since a spurious soil moisture drop is precondition for a low plateau (D09; "constant low values following negative break"), also the latter is affected. Adding the extra drop detection increased flagging numbers for D07 from 0.03 to 0.05% and for D09 from 1.1 to 1.4%.

    – In case more than one soil temperature, air temperature, or precipitation sensor is available at a site, a flag is raised for the soil moisture measurement if the conditions of flags D01, D02, and D04, respectively is met at least for one of these 200   sensors. This has led to a small overall increase in flags D01, D02, and D04 (< 0.8%).

    All quality control procedures adopted by the ISMN have been made available under the open source license agreement (see Section 6, https://github.com/TUW-GEO/flagit).

    We assessed the refined flagging procedures by applying them to 10 networks with hourly data that include stations with multiple soil temperature, air temperature, or precipitation sensors. Despite the very low overall impact of the refined flags, for 205 some networks they are substantial (Figure 4).

    Measurements that are detected as erroneous by the quality control procedures are not deleted from the database, but tagged as such (Table 3). The flag is provided as additional attribute ("ISMN Quality Flag") to the observation upon download and can take one of the main categories C (exceeding plausible geophysical range), D (questionable/dubious), M (missing) or G (good). The D flag is raised when either a geophysical-consistency or a spectrum-based check is positive. An additional number 210 indicates the actual cause for flagging (Table 3). A soil moisture observation may receive multiple C- and D-type flags but the good and missing flags are exclusive. Seven networks provide their own soil moisture quality flags, which are added to the ISMN database in addition to the ISMN flags common to all time series. Examples are flags for data quality (without further

Table 3. Occurrence of flags for all variables and measurements contained in the ISMN (Status May 2021). The soil moisture flags are not exclusive, i.e., an observation can be tagged with multiple flags.

Variable	Flag	Type	Description	Occurrence [%]
Soil moisture	C01	range verification	soil moisture < 0 m^3/m^3	0.07
	C02	range verification	soil moisture > 0.60 m^3/m^3	1.17
	C03	range verification	soil moisture > saturation point (based on HWSD)	4.00
	D01	geophysical consistency	negative soil temperature (in situ)	6.71
	D02	geophysical consistency	negative air temperature (in situ)	16.15
	D03	geophysical consistency	negative soil temperature (GLDAS)	5.23
	D04	geophysical consistency	rise in soil moisture without precipitation (in situ)	0.27
	D05	geophysical consistency	rise in soil moisture without precipitation (GLDAS)	0.25
	D06	spectrum based	spikes	0.19
	D07	spectrum based	negative breaks (drops)	0.02
	D08	spectrum based	positive breaks (jumps)	0.01
	D09	spectrum based	constant low values following negative break	0.38
	D10	spectrum based	saturated plateaus	1.92
Soil temperature	C01	range verification	soil temperature < -60°C	0.07
	C02	range verification	soil temperature > 60°C	0.17
Soil surface temperature	C01	range verification	soil surface temperature < -60°C	0.01
	C02	range verification	soil surface temperature > 60°C	0.09
Air temperature	C01	range verification	air temperature < -60°C	0.03
	C02	range verification	air temperature > 60°C	0.04
Precipitation	C01	range verification	precipitation < 0 mmh^{-1}	0.08
	C02	range verification	precipitation > 100 mmh^{-1}	0.24
Soil suction	C01	range verification	soil suction < 0 kPa	0.26
	C02	range verification	soil suction > 2500 kPa	0.00
Snow water equivalent	C01	range verification	snow water equivalent < 0 mm	20.37
	C02	range verification	snow water equivalent > 10000 mm	0.01
Snow depth	C01	range verification	snow depth < 0 mm	19.23
	C02	range verification	snow depth > 10000 mm	0.00

methodological description) or simple thresholds. For instance, RISMA tags soil moisture observations for frozen soils when the average temperature of two adjacent soil layers is below 0°C (Pacheco et al., 2014). By contrast, the ISMN flag D01 "Soil temperature <0°C" only considers the corresponding depth. For RISMA, the frozen soil flags provided by the network and those computed by the ISMN (D01 "soil temperature <0°C") agree for 87.8%.

Figure 5. Fractions of geophysical dynamic range and consistency quality flags per network. Note that, in principle, the cumulative sum of fractions can be >1 as occurrence of each flag ranges between 0 and 1.

3.2 Flagging occurrence

The most commonly raised flag is when one of the ancillary temperature observations, i.e., in situ soil temperature (D01), in situ air temperature (D02), or GLDAS soil temperature (D03) is <0°C (Table 3; Figure 5). Since in situ temperature measurements are not available for all networks and to keep consistency between networks, flags D01 and D02 are not shown in Figure 5. The number of observations flagged as frozen soil are not an indicator of the site in general but show which networks are located in areas with a pronounced cold season, e,g., stations from the FMI, RISMA, MAQU, SCAN, and SNOTEL networks.

The second-most common flag is C03 "soil moisture above the site-specific saturation point", which is computed from the HWSD soil properties. The site-specific saturation point is usually lower than the globally adopted less conservative threshold of 0.6 m^3/m^3 (flag C02) and thus raised more often (Figure 5). However, the HWSD soil properties are uncertain and consequently the C03 flag should be considered as indicative rather than as absolute quality indicator. Values exceeding the saturation point are often an indication of calibration biases or atypical site conditions. For example, the large number of C03 flags obtained for BIEBRZA-S-1 network is because it is installed in a temporarily flooded marshlands with peat porosity exceeding 80%.

Constant values as a result of saturation plateaus (D10) or after a negative break (D09) are the most common spectrum-based flags (Figure 6). The latter are often a sign of sensor drop outs and mostly limited to the GROW, ARM, HYDROL-NET-PERUGIA, and USDA-ARS networks. For example, Xaver et al. (2020) evaluated the sensors used in the GROW network and found occasional drops in soil moisture to zero, which may be the result of corroding contacts. Spikes and breaks are by nature isolated events that do not occur over an extended period of time and thus appear less frequent in the flagging statistics. The relatively large number of spikes for the network SNOTEL of 0.4% is due to some extremely noisy time series.

Figure 6. Fractions of spectrum-based quality flags per network. Notice that, in principle, the cumulative sum of fractions can be >1 as occurrence of each flag ranges between 0 and 1.

3.3 Effect of flagging on applications

For a selected ISMN site (SCAN, Mayday station), Dorigo et al. (2013) showed that masking flagged values has a small but positive impact on the validation of GLDAS-Noah v1 modelled surface soil moisture and the remotely sensed VUA-NASA AMSR-E soil moisture product. Here, we performed a more extensive assessment of the impact of excluding automatically detected spurious observations by the revised flagging methods (Section 3.1) by using ISMN observations available in the period 2001-2019 to validate both ERA5 top layer (0-0.07 m) water content (Hersbach et al., 2020) and ESA CCI Soil Moisture (v5.2; Gruber et al. (2019b), Dorigo et al. (2017), Gruber et al. (2017)). While the impact of flagging is positive for temporal agreement (R Pearson and R Spearman) between the ISMN and ERA5, the effect is negligible for ESA CCI (Table 4). On the other hand, the ISMN flagging reduces the unbiased Root-Mean-Squared Difference (ubRMSD) for both comparisons. The benefit of excluding spurious values is also obvious in Figure F1a where points are located below the 1:1 line. Again, the benefit is less clear for ESA CCI (Figure F1c). Although validations of a satellite and a model-based are not directly comparable, one reason for the different impact is that the ESA CCI retrievals were already flagged in the production process for values outside valid geophysical range, inconsistencies, dense vegetation, freezing and snow-cover, while this is not the case for the ERA5 model data. Consequently, a positive effect of the ISMN flags is more effective for data sets that were not *a priori* masked than for data sets that were already filtered for spurious observations.

3.4 Other quality indicators

The automated quality control algorithms offer insight into the quality of the respective measurement time series but not necessarily of the usability of the data sets for specific applications. Gruber et al. (2013) adopted a triple collocation approach

Table 4. Global validation results of surface soil moisture of ERA and ESA CCI Soil moisture against ISMN (masked and unmasked for quality flags) for the period 2001-2019; the results for ESA CCI were produced with the QA4SM validation service (https://qa4sm.eu/ Results accessible at: doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4288919 (absolute values - no flags); doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4288921 (absolute values - with flags); doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4288915 (anomalies - no flags); doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4288913 (anomalies - with flags).).

Type	Mask	# time series [$\bar{x}$]	R Pearson [$\bar{x}$]	R Spearman [$\bar{x}$]	ubRMSD [$\bar{x}$]
ERA5 absolute values	None	7822	0.53	0.55	2.06
	Flagged values	5878	0.59	0.60	0.08
ERA5 anomalies	None	7822	0.44	0.46	1.21
	Flagged values	5878	0.48	0.49	0.05
CCI absolute values	None	1178	0.46	0.47	2.98
	Flagged values	1115	0.46	0.46	0.09
CCI anomalies	None	1178	0.34	0.34	1.60
	Flagged values	1115	0.36	0.35	0.06

(TCA) to characterise the representativeness errors of ISMN data for coarse-scale (∼25 km) use. TCA is a statistical analysis
255 using a combination of three datasets with independent error structures to estimate the random error variance in each of these
datasets. Here, we apply the TCA to estimate the representativeness errors of the ISMN data of all networks with sufficient
sampling in the period 2001-2019 for application at the coarse scale. ESA CCI SM passive soil moisture (v5.2, Gruber et al.
(2019b), Dorigo et al. (2017)) and top-layer ERA5 volumetric soil water content (Hersbach et al., 2020) are used to complement
the triplets. Spatial collocation is carried out using a nearest neighbor method with a maximum distance of 30 km, while the
260 temporal collocation uses a maximum time difference of 1:20 h between the triplets. An exception was solely made for the
PBO-H2O network because its observations are provided daily at 12:00 UTC, while ESA CCI SM is given at 00:00 UTC
daily. All measurements that cover at least partly the 0.00-0.07 m depth interval are used. Systematic differences between the
datasets, i.e., multiplicative and additive biases, are being removed by scaling ERA5 and ERA CCI SM soil moisture datasets
to the in situ data prior to the TCA.

265 The results for different networks are quite diverse (Figure 7). For example, the spread of errors is relatively large for OR-
ACLE but small for others (e.g., AMMA-CATCH or SKKU). The median errors per network vary between 0.03 and 0.05
$m^3 m^{-3}$ with some outliers in both directions. Note that the triple collocation analysis estimates the combined representative-
ness and sensor errors, although the latter are assumed small comapred to the natural spatial-temporal variability Gruber et al.
(2013).

270 There is a clear trend of decreasing mean errors with increasing sensor depths (Figure 8a), which is likely due to a reduction
of high-frequency signals and sensor perturbations with depth. Note, that this decreasing trend is observed despite the increasing
discrepancy in depth support between the ISMN data and the two surface soil moisture data sets (ERA5 and ESA CCI SM).

Figure 7. Representativeness errors of ISMN networks calculated with triple collocation analysis using top-layer ERA5 volumetric soil water and ESA CCI SM v05.2 passive product. Values in brackets show the average number of triplets per time series and the total number of sensors, respectively, for each network. Following Dorigo et al. (2010) we only used triplets with a Spearman correlation >0.2 between each respective data set pair in the calculation.

Thus, theoretically, in situ representativeness errors are expected to be even lower than computed. A potential explanation for the slight increase in the median error for the deepest layer (100-255 cm) may be small sample size and the poor soil parameterisation of the land surface model at this depth. Similar patterns were observed by Gruber et al. (2013).

Concerning the sensors used, there is a large spread in computed representativeness errors for TDR and capacitance sensors. While the costly hygrometric sensors have the lowest mean error, the mean error of resistance probes is the highest (Figure 8b). Since cosmic ray and GNSS/GPS reflectometry sensors integrate over larger horizontal and vertical domains, one would expect lower representativeness errors for these sensors compared to the point observations. However, this is not confirmed by our triple collocation results. Possibly, the advantage of the larger spatial support of these systems is counteracted by their lower signal-to-noise ratio. Error information at the site-, sensor-, or data set level is currently not routinely available for the stations in the ISMN, but would be required for a proper weighting of individual stations in large-scale validations (Gruber et al., 2018, 2019b).

(a)   (b)

Figure 8. Representativeness errors for different sensor depths (a) and sensor types (b) derived with triple collocation. Summary of triple collocation characterization of random errors per sensor type. Values in brackets show the total number of sensors for each depth interval and type respectively.

4 Impact of the ISMN on Earth system sciences

4.1 User uptake

As mentioned earlier, over 3000 users have registered to the ISMN while 20-30 new users register each month. Most users are based in the US, China, India and Europe (Figure 9). When asked for the intended use of the data, the four main GEO benefit areas are water, disaster, agriculture, and climate sectors, all with a similar share between 16-30%. Most users come from research organisations (41%), higher or secondary education (32%), and non-profit organisations (19%). Only few users come from public bodies (6%) or private companies (2%).

Table 5. Overview of purposes ISMN data are used for in scientific studies (status July 2021; n=317).

Purpose	%
Satellite Validation	55.7
Model development and validation	16.2
Meteorological applications	7.5
Drought monitoring	3.8
Other applications	16.8

Figure 9. Number of users per country (status July 2021).

The large uptake of the ISMN for soil moisture studies is particularly due to the simplicity of accessing and using multiple data sets from a wide variety of networks. Initially, the ISMN was established to facilitate the calibration and validation of SMOS-based soil moisture products (Dorigo et al., 2011b) and still, satellite soil moisture calibration, validation, and algorithm improvement are the primary applications served by the ISMN (Table 5). In the following, we discuss the major purposes the ISMN has been used for, based on a comprehensive review of all studies that used and cited the ISMN in peer-reviewed scientific publications.

4.2 Satellite product evaluation and development

4.2.1 Scientific studies

Soil moisture measurements from the ISMN have been widely used as reference data set for the development and evaluation of satellite soil moisture products, mostly global coarse-scale surface soil moisture products (Table E1; n=212). Although initially the goal was to support algorithm development and validation of the SMOS satellite, which was indeed the case for 85 studies, many other satellite missions profited from the ISMN data, most notably SMAP (n=52), ASCAT (n=50), AMSR-E (n=46), and ESA CCI (n=34). Fortuitously, the data have also been discovered for the evaluation of soil moisture products from less used sensors, including the Chinese Feng-Yun 3B, HY-2 and Gaofen-1 satellites (Parinussa et al., 2014a, 2018; Zhao et al., 2014; Xing et al., 2017), MSG SIVIRI (Leng et al., 2015, 2017), MODIS (Gumbricht et al., 2017; Gumbricht, 2018), Aquarius (González-Zamora et al., 2016), and Landsat (Zhao et al., 2017; Pradhan, 2019).

Recently, the ISMN was recognised as validation source for testing algorithms to derive soil moisture from Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS; e.g., Kim and Lakshmi (2018); Chew and Small (2020). Similarly, there is an increasing trend in the use of ISMN data for the validation of novel high-resolution satellite soil moisture products, which either downscale coarse-resolution products through the use of other finer resolution satellite or ancillary data (e.g., Sheng et al. (2019); Helgert and Khodayar (2020)), or directly derive soil moisture from high-resolution Synthetic Aperture Aperture satellites like Sentinel-1 (e.g., Rodionova (2019b); Foucras et al. (2020)). It should be noted that the ISMN and its contributing networks are mostly designed for analysing time series, thus lacking reference data to assess spatial patterns in the data, particularly in high-resolution products (de Jeu and Dorigo, 2016).

Soil moisture measurements from the ISMN have been used as training set for various data-driven approaches. In situ observations were ingested into machine learning frameworks together with several ancillary predictor variables, either to simulate soil moisture at very high spatial resolution (Zappa et al., 2019) or to create long-term records (O and Orth, 2021). Greifeneder et al. (2021) developed a machine learning approach to estimate surface soil moisture from Landsat optical and thermal, and Sentinel-1 SAR imagery in the Google Earth Engine, using ISMN soil moisture as target variable. Large-scale monitoring networks are necessary to build reliable models for spatially-wide analysis, while dense networks are ideal for accurate localized models (Senanayake et al., 2019; Abbaszadeh et al., 2019).

Usage-oriented evaluation studies have focussed on the intercomparison of multiple coarse-scale satellite products, using the ISMN data as a reference, either to select the best performing sensor for a specific application or geographic region (e.g., Beck et al. (2020); Karthikeyan et al. (2017)) or to combine them in an optimal way to build a superior product (e.g., Liu et al. (2011); Hagan et al. (2020)).

Since direct satellite observations of soil moisture are only possible for the surface layer, most studies concentrate on the evaluation of surface soil moisture. Yet, various studies also focus on products derived from surface soil moisture that represent moisture in deeper (root-zone) layers, either through exponential filtering (e.g., Paulik et al. (2014); Tobin et al. (2017)), empirical models (Pradhan, 2019), or by assimilating them in land surface models (e.g., Pablos et al. (2018); Blyverket et al.

330 (2019a)). Occasionally, the ISMN is used for the evaluation of other satellite data sets, e.g. soil temperature data to validate freeze/thaw state (Rautiainen et al., 2016; Hu et al., 2019).

4.2.2 ISMN as part of operational services

Because of its operational nature and advanced quality control procedures, the ISMN has been identified as the primary reference data source for future operational validation systems for global satellite-based soil moisture products (Bayat et al., 2021). 335 But already today, the ISMN is integrative part of several operational satellite soil moisture production chains:

- In 2005, the **Satellite Application Facility on support to operational Hydrology and water management (H SAF)** started to operationally produce and validate precipitation, soil moisture, and snow products from satellites operated by EUMETSAT (Rinollo et al., 2013). ISMN data are used for calibration and validation of various soil moisture products produced in H SAF from the Metop Advanced Scatterometers, including global climate data records and near-real-time 340 products of surface soil moisture, and a root-zone soil moisture product over Europe.

- The **Climate Change Initiative of the European Space Agency (ESA CCI)** uses data from the ISMN to assess each year the quality of new soil moisture climate data record releases and their improvements with respect to forerunner versions (Gruber et al., 2019b; Dorigo et al., 2015). Within ESA CCI, ISMN data were also used to quantify the spatial representativeness of ESA CCI satellite and climate model data sets (Nicolai-Shaw et al., 2015b). The validation is 345 systematically performed through the use of QA4SM (see hereafter) and the results and validation settings published (e.g., https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4120205).

- **C3S** produces authoritative, quality-assured climate data records of soil moisture and other essential climate variables (ECVs). The satellite soil moisture products produced within C3S are routinely updated every 10 days with the latest available satellite observations. C3S uses the ISMN soil moisture data in combination with the metadata provided to cat- 350 egorise product performance per land cover and climate type (Scanlon et al., 2019). The validation is systematically performed through the use of QA4SM and the results transparently published (e.g. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4736927).

- **Copernicus Global Land Service (CGLS)** produces within 1-2 days after satellite overpass soil moisture data sets from Sentinel-1 and from a combination of Sentinel-1 and ASCAT (SCATSAR) (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018, 2019). The latter propagates the surface observations to deeper layers by means of the so-called soil water index (SWI). Both 355 products are provided at 1 km resolution for Europe. ISMN data are used for validating moisture in surface and deeper soil layers.

Recently, the **Quality Assurance for Soil Moisture (QA4SM)** service (https://qa4sm.eu) was initiated to bring together validation methodologies, community protocols, reference data, and satellite observations to evaluate and intercompare soil moisture data products in a coherent, standardised, and transparent way. In situ data sourced from the ISMN are integral part 360 of this validation system (Scanlon et al., 2019; Gruber et al., 2020). The combination of ISMN, QA4SM, and enhanced quality

control protocols and selection procedures to establish a set of fiducial reference measurements, is expected to become the standard for satellite soil moisture validation in the next years Bayat et al. (2021).

4.3 Model development and validation

In situ measurements are the most important reference source when assessing the performance of land surface models, reanalyses products, and hydrological models. Although also satellite observations are a valuable validation source (e.g., Szczypta et al. (2014)), these measure only the upper 5 cm of the soil, and hence do not allow for the validation of deeper layers. Besides, state-of-the-art reanalysis products like ERA5 (Hersbach et al., 2020)) assimilate satellite soil moisture observations, so that for these products in situ data remain the only truly independent validation reference. Since the sampling rate (hourly) of the ISMN observations is generally higher, and their spatial support lower than that of most models (Reichle et al., 2004), model evaluation is in principle not limited by the spatial and temporal resolution of the in situ data, although representativeness issues often remain.

In particular for global assessments, the availability of harmonised data over multiple networks makes the ISMN a preferred reference source over data from individual networks (Xia et al., 2019). Table E2 shows that many well-established state-of-the-art land surface model and reanalysis products have been evaluated against data from the ISMN, not only by users of these products (e.g. (Li et al., 2020b), but also by the developer teams themselves, e.g., Reichle et al. (2017) for MERRA2, Albergel et al. (2020) for LDAS-Monde, and Balsamo et al. (2015); Fairbairn et al. (2019) for various European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) products.

Also a suite of new products have been assessed against the ISMN, including multi-model ensembles (Schellekens et al., 2017; Cammalleri et al., 2015), data-driven evaporation models (Martens et al., 2017; Lievens et al., 2017) and statistical infiltration models Pal and Maity (2019). As for remote sensing products, a trend towards higher-resolution regional to global model-based products can be observed. Among others, ISMN data have been used to validate new high-resolution reanalysis products over the United States (McDonough et al., 2018) and Europe (Naz et al., 2020). Apart from soil moisture also soil temperature data have been drawn from the ISMN for model validation purposes (e.g., Wang et al. (2016); Albergel et al. (2015)).

Besides the evaluation of hydrological or land surface model improvements, the ISMN has also frequently served model development in a more fundamental way. For example, Hartmann et al. (2015) developed a large-scale karstic groundwater recharge model over Europe and the Mediterranean and calibrated and evaluated this model with observations of actual evapotranspiration from FLUXNET (Baldocchi et al., 2001) and soil water content data from the ISMN. Martínez-Fernández et al. (2021) used data from the ISMN to assess the fraction of precipitation that is stored in the soil profile. Calvet et al. (2016) used soil moisture and temperature data from the SMOSMANIA network contained in the ISMN to derive pedotransfer functions for soil quartz fraction in southern France. Pal et al. (2016) developed a statistical model to estimate vertical soil moisture profile using SCAN data of the ISMN as source, while on a similar note, Shin et al. (2018) developed a non-parametric evolutionary algorithm to predict soil moisture dynamics using ISMN data over Oklahoma and Illinois. Similarly, Jalilvand et al. (2018) estimated the drainage rate from surface soil moisture drydowns from ISMN data. A bridge between soil moisture and

vegetation dynamics was made by Sawada (2018), who used ISMN data to validate a new ecohydrological land reanalysis to better simulate the link between sub-surface soil moisture and vegetation dynamics. Finally, Brocca et al. (2015) developed a water-balance approach to estimate rainfall from soil moisture observations based on reverse modelling and evaluated this at several ISMN sites in Europe. Later refinements of this approach were also evaluated against data from the ISMN (Hoang and Lu, 2019).

4.4 Meteorological applications

Soil moisture from the ISMN has often been used to validate the land surface representations of meteorological forecasting models. However, as meteorological forecasts often rely on the latest generation of land surface models, in practice there is often no strict distinction between meteorological and land surface model development as described in the previous section. Notable examples are the various generations of TESSEL models used both in the Integrated Forecasting Systems and reanalysis products of ECMWF, the development of which greatly profited from soil moisture and temperature data from the ISMN (Albergel et al., 2012a, 2015). Dirmeyer et al. (2016) assessed the skill and soil moisture memory effects of various weather and climate models with ISMN data over the United States. Similarly, Angevine et al. (2014) assessed the soil moisture skill of the Weather Research and Forcasting Model (WRF) (Table E2).

Several studies have used the ISMN data to assess the forecast skill or new implementations of numerical weather prediction models. For example, de Rosnay et al. (2019) and Rodriguez-Fernandez et al. (2019) used in situ soil moisture observations from several ISMN networks to validate the impact of assimilating SMOS brightness temperatures and soil moisture, respectively, to predict soil moisture up to 5 days ahead. Similarly, Lin and Pu (2019, 2020) used ISMN data to examine the impact of MAP soil moisture assimilation in WRF for near-surface short-range weather forecasts. Boussetta et al. (2015) used over 500 ISMN sites to assess the impact of assimilating surface albedo and vegetation states from satellite observations on numerical weather prediction.

From a more methodological, land-atmosphere perspective, Lee (2018) used the ISMN data to study the role of soil moisture in triggering rainfall over West Africa. Vice versa, Zhang et al. (2019c) studied the role of rainfall on soil cooling using data from the SMOSMANIA network in southern France.

4.5 Drought monitoring

In a drought monitoring context, ISMN data have frequently been used in a "convergence of evidence" approach in combination with other drought-related variables or indicators. For example, Scaini et al. (2015) compared the variability of in situ soil moisture measurements from the ISMN, SMOS surface soil moisture, and two drought indices based on climatic information to study droughts in Spain. Mu et al. (2019) used VNIR satellite data and soil moisture distributed by the ISMN to monitor drought in the southern United States. On a more technical level, Gruber et al. (2018), assessed the use of spatially sparse ISMN in combination with a continuous model for operational agricultural drought monitoring over the United States.

ISMN data have also been used to classify new and more "traditional" drought indices, such as the Standardized Precipitation (Evaporation) Index and the Palmer Drought Severity Index (Vicente-Serrano et al., 2012; Krueger et al., 2019). Sadri et al.

(2020) used the ISMN data from the RISMA network to assess a global near-real-time soil moisture index monitor for food security using SMOS and SMAP data. Likewise, Fang et al. (2021a) used ISMN data to evaluate a new drought monitoring approach based on high spatial resolution soil moisture data from downscaled SMOS and SMAP data over Australia. Chen et al. (2019) used precipitation distributed through the ISMN to evaluate a drought index derived from Sentinel-2 in Spain. Due to relatively good coverage over Europe, Cammalleri et al. (2015) used ISMN data to assess various model soil moisture products as input to the European Drought Observatory (EDO, http://edo.jrc.ec.europa.eu). Also Mishra et al. (2018) used data from the ISMN to assess a suite of land surface models used to reconstruct drought events in India since the mid 1900s.

4.6   Other applications

ISMN data have been used for various other purposes, going beyond what the ISMN was originally developed for. In addition to supporting satellite and land surface model soil moisture product development, the ISMN has played a fundamental role in the validation of a wide range of hybrid observation-based products, including a Soil Moisture Saturation Index (Campo et al., 2011), apparent thermal inertia surface estimates (Notarnicola et al., 2012), an improved Antecedent Precipitation Index (API) formulation (Ramsauer et al., 2021), data-driven surface and root-zone soil moisture predictions (Kornelsen and Coulibaly, 2014; Manfreda et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2020a; O and Orth, 2021), improved satellite albedo products (Liu et al., 2014), and estimates of effective permittivity and brightness temperature of organic soils Park et al. (2019).

The ISMN has frequently been used to asses the impact of assimilating satellite observations into hydrological models (Khaki et al., 2019; Nair et al., 2020a; Gruber et al., 2015; Shin et al., 2016; Li et al., 2020b; Wang et al., 2020b), land surface models (Nair and Indu, 2016; Zhao and Yang, 2018; Nair et al., 2020b) and carbon models (Scholze et al., 2016). On a more methodological level, Zhang et al. (2019a) assessed a new data assimilation scheme against ISMN observations. Gruber et al. (2018) even assimilated spatially sparse ISMN observations directly into a spatially continuous land surface model over the Continental US, and tested the preconditions (e.g., requirements on signal-to-noise ratio and number of sites) for having a significant positive impact.

The wealth of data covering a wide range of surface and climate conditions has been frequently exploited to study soil water dynamics at various spatial and temporal scales and their (climatic) drivers (Brocca et al., 2014b; Hirschi et al., 2014; Ojha et al., 2014; Qin et al., 2018; Kumar et al., 2019a; Tian et al., 2019a; Nicolai-Shaw et al., 2015b; Dong et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2017; Verrier, 2020; Deng et al., 2020a), flood dynamics (Esposito et al., 2018), or the impact of soil moisture on plant growth (Hottenstein et al., 2015).

The ISMN has been used to develop and test new statistical validation approaches (Zwieback et al. (2013), (Gruber et al., 2016), Afshar et al. (2019). Finally, the standards and quality control procedures adopted by the ISMN have served as a guideline for establishing and benchmarking new networks (Kim et al., 2019; Skierucha et al., 2012b, a; Petropoulos and McCalmont, 2017), soil moisture metadatabases (Liao et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2015), or validation services (Kumar et al., 2012), and to assess or improve alternative sensing techniques and constellations (Xaver et al., 2020; Kapilaratne and Lu, 2017; Nguyen et al., 2017; Mahecha et al., 2017).

4.7 Added scientific value of ISMN over other data sources

Although the ISMN has facilitated hundreds of scientific studies, it is impossible to quantify precisely to what degree the ISMN has contributed to product improvements and new insights that could not have obtained otherwise. Admittedly, data from several networks are also distributed through other portals, typically providing access to a single network (e.g., SNOTEL data through https://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/snow/). The major contribution of the ISMN to scientific advances is primarily given by the access to the many networks and datasets that are uniquely distributed through the ISMN, and in the easy access to thousands of harmonised datasets with a single click.

The tracked download statistics reveal that approximately one third (34%) of the studies making use of the ISMN use multiple networks, the choice of which depends on the scope of the study, the geographical region, and period of interest, and the year the study was performed (with more networks becoming available over time). Examples of such studies using data from more than 20 different networks are Paulik et al. (2014) (23 ISMN networks used), Dorigo et al. (2015) (28), Beck et al. (2020) (27), Grillakis et al. (2021) (27), O and Orth (2021) (51), van der Schalie et al. (2021) (46), Li et al. (2021) (20), and Wu et al. (2021) (20).

Although it is impossible to pin down exact contribution of the ISMN to process understanding and product improvements, it is very likely that mainly studies have discovered flaws in satellite products that would not have been detected without the use of the ISMN. The main reason is that the large number of networks give insight in product skill in a large variety of climate zones, land cover types and so on, which no single network could have provided. This allows for the development of globally more robust models and products. Secondly, the data harmonisation and unified quality control minimise the chance that differences in skill potentially observed between locations with different environmental characteristics is an artefact of a different treatment of the data.

Several studies were identified that did not only use the multitude of ISMN data to expose flaws in existing products, but also to directly improve data products and models, e.g., by calibrating hydrological model parameters for local site conditions (Beck et al., 2020; Kang et al., 2019; Moradizadeh and Srivastava, 2021; Grillakis et al., 2021), by merging them with other observations and models (Gruber et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2018), or as training data in machine learning approaches Pan et al. (2017); Eroglu et al. (2019); O and Orth (2021); Greifeneder et al. (2021).

5 Challenges and opportunities

5.1 Scientific challenges

5.1.1 Diversity of measurements

The in situ measurements of soil moisture data in the ISMN have been collected by a large variety of sampling techniques. The early networks contained in the ISMN (e.g., RUSWET, CHINA and MONGOLIA) are based on gravimetric sampling, which is still considered the most accurate approach (Romano, 2014). However, it is labor-intensive and invasive and thus

measurements are infrequent (weekly or even coarser sampling), every time being taken from a slightly different location, may contain systematic errors between sampling dates.

Nowadays, the most commonly used techniques for systematic in situ sampling are based on the contrasting dielectric properties of soil and water and comprise time domain reflectometry (TDR) and frequency domain reflectometry (FDR) (Robinson et al., 2008), e.g., AMMA-CATCH, BNZ-LTER, CARBOAFRICA, FMI, GTK, HYDROL-NET-PERUGIA, IPE, LAB-net, ORACLE, OZNET, SASMAS, SWEX-POLAND, UDC-SMOS, WSMN, UMSOL networks). In particular, capacitance sensors based on FDR are becoming more and more widespread because of their lower cost compared to TDR sensors, despite their lower accuracy (Romano, 2014; Brocca et al., 2017). However, great technical improvements are being achieved with capacitance sensors, thus improving their reliability. Yet, TDR and FDR techniques only provide point measurements, i.e. they are representative of small volumes of soil.

Slightly larger soil volumes (diameter of 15 to 60 cm) are observed with the neutron scattering method, where the density of thermal neutrons produced by scattering of fast neutrons on soil hydrogen can be related can be related to soil moisture through a calibration curve (Gardner and Kirkham, 1952; Romano, 2014) (e.g., IOWA network). The cosmic-ray method has been developed based on similar principles of neutron scattering, (Zreda et al., 2012, 2008). Cosmic-ray neutron sensors (CRNS) are located on or above the soil surface and measure and count the number of cosmogenic neutrons in air above the land surface and that are in equilibrium with the soil. CRNS measurements are representative of significantly larger volumes compared to neutron probes (i.e., radius of a few 100 metres and depths between 0.12-0.70 m, depending on the soil wetness), and thus can be used to bridge the scales between point observations and coarse resolutions of satellite observations and models. CRNS measurements, which are used in the COSMOS network, are sensitive to vegetation and have relatively high noise levels. To reduce this noise, the data are resampled to daily mean values.

Also the measurements of the PBO_H2O network, which uses Global Positioning System (GPS) receivers, can be used to bridge the scales between point and satellite sensors. GPS sensors, initially used for geophysical and geodetic applications, have been found well suited to measure soil moisture (Larson et al., 2008). The GPS signals are representative for an area of approximately 300 m^2 and are L-band, hence making them ideal for comparison against satellite missions like SMAP and SMOS (Larson et al., 2008).

As shown, all measurement techniques have their strengths and limitations Bogena et al. (2015); Dorigo et al. (2011b), which complicates their combined, bulk use. Depending on the application and process scales, the user needs to carefully consider which networks to use or exclude and how to interpret the results obtained. A task of the ISMN could be to translate community-based guidelines (Gruber et al., 2020; Montzka et al., 2020) to recommendations for the use of individual datasets.

5.1.2 Spatial and temporal representativeness and scaling

Soil moisture is highly variable in space as a result of complex interactions between soil characteristics, topography, vegetation, and meteorological conditions. Depending on the spatial scale considered, the dominant controlling factor(s) can be different (Crow et al., 2012; Western et al., 2002). Hence, validation of satellite-derived products is hindered by the spatial mismatch between ground observations and satellite footprints (Gruber et al., 2020; Molero et al., 2018; Gruber et al., 2013). Ideally,

to reduce the representativeness error of in situ references, enough stations should be deployed within a satellite footprint to develop robust areal soil moisture estimates (Brocca et al., 2007; Famiglietti et al., 2008; Colliander et al., 2017). However, this is a costly solution and therefore only a limited number of sites provide such setup (Crow et al., 2012; Colliander et al., 2017). In the ISMN, the networks VDS, BIEBRZA_S-1, RSMN, UDC_SMOS, LAB-net, FMI, USDA-ARS have been set up in this way. When available, in situ stations within the same satellite pixel should be averaged, either through arithmetic mean or weighted average. Higher weights should be given to stations expected to be more representative of the satellite grid average, e.g., by using Voronoi diagrams (Colliander et al., 2017), the inverse footprint method (Nicolai-Shaw et al., 2015a), the time stability concept (Vachaud et al., 1985), or landscape properties such as land cover and/or soil texture (Bircher et al., 2012). Alternatively, triple collocation analysis can be used to quantify and correct for spatial sampling errors of in situ stations (Miralles et al., 2010; Gruber et al., 2013). The resulting pixel-scale soil moisture ground reference, i.e., the averaged value from dense networks with several stations per satellite grid or the original time series in the case of sparse networks with a single station per pixel, should undergo a statistical rescaling (Gruber et al., 2020). Indeed, a direct comparison of in situ and satellite products would be subject to representativeness errors, which may dominate the total soil moisture retrieval errors (Chen et al., 2017; Gruber et al., 2013; Molero et al., 2018). Rescaling accounts for systematic representativeness errors arising from different spatial resolution and different vertical measurement support, i.e., penetration depths of microwave sensors and in situ sensor placement depths (Gruber et al., 2013, 2020) but does not correct for random representativeness errors. One way to address this is the triple collocation described above. Also, systematic representation errors may have a time-varying (e.g., seasonal) component, which, unless explicitly accounted for, may lead to temporally aliased results. In any case, even though differences in spatial representativeness between ground and satellite measurements impact the evaluation metrics, single stations are still a valuable source for assessing the relative skill of soil moisture products with a similar footprint (Dong et al., 2020).

Also temporal representativeness issues may exist, but due to the hourly sampling of most datasets the ISMN usually have a denser sampling than most remote sensing or model data sets. Thus, for most applications the ISMN can be downsampled to the process or observation timescale of interest. However, some of the older, manually sampled datasets have sampling intervals of about two weeks, and thus may miss many higher frequency wet or dry spells. On a similar note, datasets with a daily sampling or averaging (e.g., Cosmic ray or GPS reflectometry observations) may miss rainfall peaks and are unsuitable to study sub-daily variability.

5.1.3 Integration of low-cost sensors

The development and use of low-cost sensing technologies, especially in the environmental sciences, has seen a pronounced increase during the last decade. Such a rise is driven by several factors, e.g., the reduced cost of micro-controllers, electric components, and sensors (Mao et al., 2019). Even though a rich variety of low-cost soil moisture sensors based on different measurement principles has been developed (Chawla et al., 2019; González-Teruel et al., 2019; Kumar et al., 2016), capacitance

sensors gained most popularity because they are relatively inexpensive, easy to operate, and provide reliable observations (Kojima et al., 2016).

The considerably lower cost of these sensors compared to traditional probes makes them suitable for high-density and/or large-scale monitoring of soil moisture. The possibility to map soil moisture (as well as other environmental variables) with an unprecedented spatial coverage can generate new insights into its dynamics and create new opportunities. For instance, high-density networks of low-cost sensors can be used to reduce spatial representativeness errors by providing numerous observations within a satellite footprint (Teuling et al., 2006). Similarly, one can deploy a temporary low-cost sensors network to identify the most suitable location(s) for long-term monitoring. Such locations could then be equipped with professional sensors, while moving the low-cost network to other sites (Zappa et al., 2019). Another exciting opportunity offered by low-cost sensors is the deployment of networks in low-income countries.

The ISMN has integrated low-cost sensor measurements from the GROW observatory (see next section 5.1.4), but a number of practical challenges arise when integrating such data. A key aspect to consider is the lifetime: depending on the robustness of the sensor (both of electronic components, such as micro controllers, and sensor housing), reliable measurements can be recorded for a period ranging from a few months to years (Xaver et al., 2020) but even be shorter in extreme environments. Another aspect, particularly affecting automation, is data storage and transmission. Some low-cost sensors allow for wireless communication with a main server ((Bogena et al., 2007), (Majone et al., 2013)), while other sensors have a limited internal storage and data should be collected persistently over time (e.g., every 80 days, Xaver et al. (2020)). Furthermore, it is necessary to assess their accuracy and robustness (Castell et al., 2017). Therefore, low-cost sensors should always undergo thorough evaluation to i) quantify the agreement of low-cost sensor measurements with gravimetric samples and/or professional probes, ideally considering a wide range of soil and climatic conditions, ii) assess the inter-sensor variability, and iii) test the suitability for usage in field conditions (Domínguez-Niño et al., 2019; Kizito et al., 2008; Mittelbach et al., 2012; Adla et al., 2020).

5.1.4 Integration of citizen observations

Citizen science is defined as the involvement of non-experts in collecting data (Bonney et al., 2009). Crowd-sourced measurements of soil moisture are now possible because of the development of low-cost sensors (Section 5.1.3). Crowd-sourcing has the potential to overcome some of the most challenging issues of soil moisture monitoring, such as the use of many sensors to address scaling issues, and the fact that the observations can be carried out anywhere, as long as there are citizens willing to collect the data.

An outstanding example of a citizen science project focusing on soil moisture is the GROW Observatory (growobservatory.org), from which datasets spanning at least a full year of observations have been added to the ISMN. Within GROW, thousands of low-cost sensors have been distributed to farmers, gardeners, and growers across Europe (Kovács et al., 2019). Focus areas have been identified based on a number of scientific criteria and the presence of active and engaged communities. Within each focus area, covering spatial scales from 20 to 200 km, hundreds of sensors have been distributed. Some sensors served as back-up for potential failures, so that malfunctioning sensors could be promptly replaced enabling long-term continuity of observations. In order to ensure high standards of the measurements, citizens have been trained in the selection of

the correct locations where to install sensors, how to properly install and maintain them through field manuals, online courses, meet-ups and remote support (Kovács et al., 2019). Overall, more than 6000 sensors were deployed and provided soil moisture measurements across 13 European countries, demonstrating that citizen observatories can be integrated in EO activities and contribute to validation of remotely sensed products (Zappa et al., 2020).

The integration of citizen observations in the ISMN is challenging for multiple reasons. Crucial is the long-term engagement of citizens, which needs to be thoroughly addressed from the early stages of designing a citizen observatory. It is necessary to create long-lasting communities that go beyond the duration of the contributory projects (Grainger, 2017). Successful citizen observatories have been those where citizens were able to benefit directly from the data collected by others (Fritz et al., 2017). Additionally, education and resources are essential to boost individual motivation to continuous participation and to sustain renewal of membership as natural participation cycles change (Zappa et al., 2020). Even if proper training is provided to citizens, uncertainty in the quality of the data is the main limitation for the use of crowd-sourced observations in science (Lukyanenko et al., 2020). The reliability of measurements from individual sensors is unknown, because of, e.g., the selection of unsuitable locations, incorrect sensor installation, and existence of defective sensors. However, increasing the number of sensors within the same satellite pixel reduces this uncertainty. Additionally, visual inspection of time series, as well as application of automated quality flagging controls, such as those developed within the ISMN, could be used to mask suspicious observations (Xaver et al., 2020). Overall, it has been shown that well-organized citizen science projects can provide trustworthy contributions to the scientific community (Kosmala et al., 2016; Palmer et al., 2017).

5.2 Operational challenges

5.2.1 Automation

Part of the contributions to the ISMN (7 networks with around 900 stations) are inserted into the ISMN in NRT. This process is fully automated, including data downloaded from data providers, harmonisation, flagging, insertion into the database, and updating metadata tables. However, because of different data recording and handling mechanisms at the provider side and differences in data sharing mechanisms and policies the ISMN is also partially manually operated and will probably also have to continue in this way in the future. The differences between the fully automated and the manual approach is confined to data download and data ingestion into the processing chain. Data harmonisation and quality control is automated for all data sets (see Figure B1).

A major challenge in the automation process is the enormous heterogeneity of input data formats. Moreover, these change over time for individual networks, stations, and even sensors, as sensors may fail or the method for data logging is changed. Thus, error detection and handling is of utmost importance and frequent adaptation of the system required to cover changes in input data.

A potential way to promote the automated insertion of new data is to allow only data that comply with a strict, yet to be defined, data standard. At the same time, this may be bear the risk of raising the barrier to contribute to the ISMN too high for several scientists.

5.2.2 Including new networks

Since data sharing with the ISMN is entirely built upon a voluntary basis and data usage is open and free, new networks may be reluctant to join. The ISMN is in contact with several network providers who are happy to collaborate but are restrained by data sharing policies, which does not allow data sharing at all or only after a certain time. Furthermore, for governmentally
630 operated networks it is often not allowed to share data as open-access or it is unclear who can make these decisions.

Solving such issues can be supported by collaborative data hosting facilities like the Global Terrestrial Network - Hydrology (GTN-H; gtn-h.info), who have a strong connection to governmental bodies like the International Centre for Water Resources and Global Change under the auspices of UNESCO, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Science Council, and WMO.

635 ### 5.2.3 Appropriate recognition of data providers

Not all users correctly cite the ISMN and the involved networks, as stated in the terms and conditions for ISMN data use (ISMN). Proper citation of single networks is important for giving data providers the recognition that is required to convince funding agencies to continue supporting the maintenance and operation of these networks. In the end this does not only affect the networks themselves but also the open-access availability of data through the ISMN as a whole. Some network providers
640 have raised their concerns in this matter and, hence, continuous efforts are needed to maintain a strong visibility of network data providers towards users.

5.2.4 Transparency and traceability

The ISMN data collection is constantly evolving: New data records are added and existing ones are extended or, if necessary, reprocessed and corrected. Not only the data, but also the underlying code changes. These updates and any retroactive changes
645 made to the data archive are tracked within the ISMN but not yet readily passed on to the users. The updates can lead to differences in analyses on the user side, e.g., when considering obvious changes such as temporal extensions or new stations, and lead to non-reproducible results. Therefore, any update must be traceable and clearly communicated, requiring a system to track and store these changes. Version tracking and digital object identifiers (DOIs) are ways to identify each database access and therefore allow tracing back to past states of the ISMN. Such a mechanism is required to make the ISMN compliant with
650 the FAIR Data Principles (Wilkinson et al., 2016).

6 Conclusions

In this study we reviewed the first decade of operations of the ISMN. Besides satisfactorily fulfilling its initial target, i.e., supporting satellite soil moisture product validation and calibration, many additional more or less foreseen uses have emerged. In addition, an increasing number of services and product development chains have routinely included the use of ISMN data in
655 their operational structure. The ISMN started as research activity funded by ESA, and ever since ESA have provided continu-

ous financial support for ongoing research, development, and operations. In Spring 2021, a milestone was achieved when the German Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure announced that it will commit to permanently fund the ISMN operations and development from late 2021. The execution will be with the German Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG) and the International Center for Water Resources and Global Change (ICWRGC) based in Koblenz. At the same time, all network data

660   sets have always been freely contributed by dedicated researchers. To guarantee the availability of these resources for climate and environmental monitoring also for the next decade, we plead with governments and international bodies for systematic funding also of its participating data-providing networks.

To maximise geographic coverage and data usage, the policy of the ISMN has always been to integrate datasets without strict requirements on sensors, sampling protocol, or data quality. The resulting strongly heterogeneous data set characteristics call

665   for far-going quantification and traceability of errors, from sensor calibration to data download and from the point measurement to the spatial-temporal support of the application. Thus, besides expanding its coverage to data-poor regions and landscapes, the ISMN shall focus the next years on developing methodologies to fully characterise the uncertainties and usability associated with the individual datasets. An important step in this direction will be made within the ESA-funded Fiducial Reference Measurements for Soil Moisture initiative. With the foreseen developments, the ISMN will reach a new level of maturity in the

670   coming decade.

Code and data availability.

Upon registration, all data and metadata described in this paper can be downloaded for free from https://ismn.earth. A python package to read and plot the data and metadata ((TUW-GEO/ismn: v1.1) can be accessed on https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.855308.

675   An example of output of this package is shown in Figure 1. A python package containing the ISMN quality control procedures for in situ soil moisture is available on GitHub (https://github.com/TUW-GEO/flagit).

Author contributions. Wouter Dorigo conceived the manuscript and wrote it together with Irene Himmelbauer, Daniel Aberer, Lukas Schremmer, Ivana Petrakovic, Luca Zappa, and Wolfgang Preimesberger. All others contributed data to the ISMN and provided feedback on the manuscript

680   *Competing interests.* No competing interests

Acknowledgements. The authors greatly acknowledge the financial support provided by ESA through various projects: SMOSnet International Soil Moisture Network (contract No. 4000102722/10/NL/FF/fk and operations contract No. 3-13185/NL/FF/fk); IDEAS+ (contract

No. TVUK/AG/18/02082); QA4EO (contract No. TPZV/UK/AG/19/02321); QA4SM (contract No. 4000135204/21//I-BG). Additional funding for methodological advances has been received from the EU FP7 EartH2Observe project (Contract No. 603608), the EU H2020 GROW project (Contract No. 690199), and the QA4SM project funded by the Austrian Space Applications Programme 14 (Contract No. 866004). Network funding has been provided by TWIGA (Contract No. 776691). Andrej Varlagin was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project 19-04-01234-a. Alexander Gruber is funded through FWO-1224320N and FWO-1530019N grants. We acknowledge the endorsement of various international bodies, including CEOS, WCRP GEWEX, GCOS, GTN-H, and GEO. We greatly thank all staff members from the participating networks for their continued technical support. The authors acknowledge TU Wien Bibliothek for financial support through its Open Access Funding Program.

Appendix A: Network overview

A summary of each network is given in Table A1 while more details are given in the subsequent paragraphs.

Table A1. Main properties of networks and data contained in the ISMN.

Network abbreviation	Location	Number of stations	Start date	End date	Status
AACES	Australia	49	2005-05-09	2010-09-24	inactive
AMMA-CATCH	Benin, Niger, Mali	7	2006-01-01	2018-12-31	running
ARM	USA	35	1993-06-29	2021-05-20	running
AWDN	USA	50	1997-12-31	2010-12-30	running
BIEBRZA_S-1	Poland	30	2015-04-23	2018-12-01	running
BNZ-LTER	Alaska	12	1988-06-01	2013-01-01	running
CALABRIA	Italy	5	2001-01-01	2012-12-31	running
CAMPANIA	Italy	2	2000-07-27	2012-12-31	inactive
CARBOAFRICA	Sudan	1	2002-02-08	2020-11-12	running
CHINA	China	40	1981-01-08	1999-12-28	inactive
COSMOS	Worldwide	108	2008-04-28	2020-03-29	running
CTP_SMTMN	China	57	2010-08-01	2016-09-19	running
DAHRA	Senegal	1	2002-07-04	2016-01-01	running
FLUXNET-AMERIFLUX	USA	8	2000-01-01	2020-07-21	running
FMI	Finland	27	2007-01-25	2021-06-05	running
FR_Aqui	France	5	2012-01-01	2021-01-01	running
GROW	Europe	150	2017-02-08	2019-10-08	inactive
GTK	Finland	7	2001-05-16	2012-05-29	running
HiWATER_EHWSN	China	174	2012-05-04	2012-09-20	inactive
HOAL	Austria	33	2013-07-11	2020-12-31	running
HOBE	Denmark	32	2009-09-08	2019-03-13	inactive
HSC_SEOLMACHEON	Korea	1	2008-01-01	2009-01-01	inactive
HYDROL-NET_PERUGIA	Italy	2	2010-01-01	2013-12-31	running
ICN	USA	19	1983-01-03	2010-11-21	inactive
IIT_KANPUR	India	1	2011-06-16	2012-11-22	running
IMA_CAN1	Italy	12	2011-08-23	2015-12-03	inactive
IOWA	USA	6	1972-04-04	1994-11-15	inactive
IPE	Spain	2	2008-04-03	2020-03-25	running
iRON	USA	9	2012-08-21	2021-01-01	running

Network abbreviation	Location	Number of stations	Start date	End date	Status
KHOREZM	Uzbekistan	7	2010-04-17	2011-09-10	inactive
KIHS_CMC	South Korea	18	2019-03-20	2019-12-10	running
KIHS_SMC	South Korea	19	2019-03-21	2019-12-05	running
LAB-net	Chile	4	2014-07-18	2020-07-14	running
MAQU	China	20	2008-06-30	2019-06-01	running
METEROBS	Italy	1	2011-10-23	2012-05-09	inactive
MOL-RAO	Germany	2	2003-01-01	2020-06-30	running
MONGOLIA	Mongolia	43	1964-04-08	2002-10-18	inactive
MySMNet	Malaysia	7	2014-05-31	2015-12-31	running
NAQU	China	11	2010-06-15	2019-09-12	running
NGARI	China	23	2010-07-21	2019-09-10	running
NVE	Norway	3	2012-01-01	2019-12-31	running
ORACLE	France	6	1985-10-18	2013-09-09	running
OZNET	Australia	38	2001-09-12	2018-08-27	running
PBO_H2O	America, Africa, Asia	158	2004-09-27	2017-12-16	inactive
PTSMN	New Zealand	20	2016-10-30	2018-11-15	running
REMEDHUS	Spain	24	2005-03-15	2021-01-01	running
RISMA	Canada	23	2013-04-24	2020-03-25	running
RSMN	Romania	20	2014-04-09	2021-06-15	running
Ru_CFR	Russia	2	2015-05-25	2020-12-13	running
RUSWET-AGRO	Former Soviet Union	212	1958-04-08	2002-06-28	inactive
RUSWET-GRASS	Former Soviet Union	121	1952-06-08	1985-12-28	inactive
RUSWET-VALDAI	Former Soviet Union	3	1960-01-15	1990-12-15	inactive
SASMAS	Australia	14	2005-12-31	2007-12-31	running
SCAN	USA	239	1996-01-01	2021-06-05	running
SKKU	South Korea	15	2014-05-08	2017-11-29	running
SMOSMANIA	France	22	2007-01-01	2020-01-01	running
SNOTEL	USA	441	1980-10-01	2021-06-03	running
SOILSCAPE	USA	171	2011-08-03	2017-03-29	running
SWEX_POLAND	Poland	6	2000-01-01	2013-05-06	inactive
SW-WHU	China	7	2014-01-12	2015-06-03	running

Network abbreviation	Location	Number of stations	Start date	End date	Status
TAHMO	Sub-Saharan Africa	70	2015-01-01	2021-07-15	running
TERENO	Germany	5	2009-12-31	2021-01-22	running
UDC_SMOS	Germany	11	2007-11-08	2011-11-18	inactive
UMBRIA	Italy	13	2002-10-09	2017-12-31	running
UMSUOL	Italy	1	2009-06-12	2010-09-30	running
USCRN	USA	115	2000-11-15	2021-06-02	running
USDA-ARS	USA	4	2002-06-01	2009-07-31	inactive
VAS	Spain	3	2010-01-01	2012-01-01	running
VDS	Myanmar	4	2017-06-01	2021-02-13	running
WEGENERNET	Austria	12	2007-01-01	2021-05-21	running
WSMN	UK	8	2011-09-02	2016-02-29	running

A1 AACES

AACES stands for the Australian Airborne Cal/val Experiments for SMOS. This campaign network covers a 500×100 km2
study area located in South-East Australia, covering a variety of topography, vegetation- and climate classes (Rüdiger et al.,
2007; Peischl et al., 2012). Measurements of soil moisture, soil temperature, and precipitation were taken between May 2009
and September 2010. The AACES calibration and validation campaigns were a temporary project therefore no further data sets
will be available.

A2 AMMA-CATCH

The AMMA-CATCH observatory gathered data from densely instrumented mesoscale sites in West Africa (Benin, Niger,
Mali). The network is devoted to long-term regional monitoring of global change impacts on the critical zone. Height stations
in Benin and four stations in Niger of the network are included in the ISMN from 2006 to present, including surface soil
moisture and root-zone soil moisture until one-meter depth. For more information, see Galle et al. (2018).

A3 ARM

The Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Program has three soil sensor networks across north-central Oklahoma
and southern Kansas in the U.S.: The Soil Water and Temperature System (SWATS) through 2016, and presently the Soil
Temperature and Moisture Profile (STAMP) and Surface Energy Balance System (SEBS). The SWATS and STAMP have

profiles at 5-8 depths up to 175 cm, while the SEBS measure at 2.5 cm. All sites are co-located with a suite of meteorological and radiative measurements available from ARM.gov (Cook, 2016a, b; Cook and Sullivan, 2018).

A4   AWDN

The AWDN network is located in Nebraska, United States, and consists of 50 stations. The data sets were collected by the High Plains Regional Climate Center", Data availability is from 1998 to 2010 but varies per station.

A5   BIEBRZA_S-1

Two dense soil moisture sites suited for the validation of high-resolution Sentinel-1 soil moisture products were established in the Biebrza Wetlands in Northeastern Poland in May 2015 (Musial et al., 2016). One site is located across drained grassland and the second one across natural temporarily flooded marshland. They are located within 7 km distance, therefore weather conditions are similar but soil moisture regimes differ. Both sites are equipped with 9 soil moisture stations with 5 soil probes each and a weather station. The sites are homogeneous regarding vegetation cover. The organic peat soils feature porosity values up to 82%. The sites are maintained by the Remote Sensing Centre of the Institute of Geodesy and Cartography (IGiK).

A6   BNZ-LTER

The Bonanza Creek Long Term Ecological Research (BNZ-LTER) network consists of 12 stations located in the boreal forest near Fairbanks, Alaska (Van Cleve et al., 2015). Soil moisture measurements start around the year 2000 for each station. In addition to soil moisture in several depths, observations are available of soil temperature, air temperature, precipitation, snow depth and snow water equivalent.

A7   CALABRIA

The Calabria network operates 5 TDR stations measuring volumetric soil moisture at 30, 60 and 90 cm depth. The stations were installed in 2000 by the "Centro Funzionale Decentrato" of the Calabria Region for hydrometeorological monitoring for flood and landslide risk mitigation. For more information on the performance of the network see (Brocca et al., 2011).

A8   CAMPANIA

The CAMPANIA network consisted of two stations located near the city of Naples, southern Italy. It was managed by the "Centro Funzionale per la Previsione Meteorologica e il Monitoraggio Meteo-Pluvio-Idrometrico e delle Frane". The ISMN contains data from the operational start in 2000 until the end of 2008. The data sets include soil moisture measured at a depth of 0.30 m, precipitation, and air temperature. For more information on the performance of the network, see (Brocca et al., 2011).

A9 CARBOAFRICA (recently renamed to SD_DEM)

735 CARBOAFRICA / SD_DEM is located outside El Obeid in Kordofan in Sudan and has been active since February 2002. It is operated by the Department of Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science of the Lund University, Sweden, in cooperation with the Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC) in El Obeid, Sudan. From 2007-2009, eddy covariance measurements were undertaken, Which are available from FLUXNET(https://fluxnet.org/). For more information, see Ardö (2013).

A10 CHINA

740 This agricultural monitoring campaign from 1981 to 1999 includes 40 stations with soil moisture measurements until one meter depth and was hosted by the Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research of the Chinese Academy of Sciences in Beijing (Liu et al., 2001). The data set were transferred to the ISMN from the Global Soil Moisture Data Bank (Robock et al., 2000) and contain measurements amde at the 8th, 18th and 28th of each month.

A11 COSMOS

745 The Cosmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System (COSMOS; Zreda et al., 2012) started in 2009 with a grant from the US National Science Foundation as a four-year project for demonstration of the then new technology of sensing soil moisture with cosmogenic neutrons (Zreda et al., 2008). On the completion of the project the network had 60 sites, most of them in the USA, and a few in South America, Europe and Africa. The network produces hourly soil moisture data available in real time to all without restrictions. After the project funding ended in 2013, the network operations continued with the support by Quaesta

750 Instruments, a private company. The current status is active, but the sensors are being relocated and repurposed.

A12 CTP_SMTMN

CTP-SMTMN is a multiscale Soil Moisture and Temperature Monitoring Network on the central Tibetan Plateau (Yang et al., 2013). The network, with an average elevation of 4650 m a.s.l., consists of 56 stations that measure soil moisture and soil freeze/thaw status at three spatial scales (100, 25, and 9 km). The terrain is relatively flat and covered by sparse and short

755 grasses; the annual precipitation is about 400-50 0mm. The network has been in operation since 2010.

A13 DAHRA

The Dahra field site is located in a typical low tree and shrub savanna environment in Senegal. To limit the uncertainty in the comparison of remote sensing products and models, the site was selected to be flat with homogeneous vegetation cover within a radius of at least three km. The site is equipped with two towers: a meteorological tower with meteorological, hydrological

760 and radiation sensors, and an eddy covariance flux tower. More info can be found at (Tagesson et al., 2014).

A14 FLUXNET-AMERIFLUX

AMERIFLUX is the North-American contribution to the global FLUXNET. At this moment two sites close to Sacramento, CA, i.e., Tonzi and Vaira Ranch, are distributed through the ISMN. Both stations provide soil moisture measurements at eight different depths down to 0.60 m. Additionally, soil temperature, air temperature, and precipitation are provided.

 ## A15 FMI

This distributed network of in situ measurement stations gathering information on soil moisture and soil temperature has been set up in recent years at the Finnish Meteorological Institute's (FMI) Sodankylä Arctic research station in Northern Finland. Between 2010 and 2017, 16 stations were installed around Sodankylä and 3 further north at Saariselkä. Each station covers a vertical measuring profile and two additional horizontal measuring points. The vertical profiles have five sensors placed close to the station at the following depths: 5, 10, 20, 40, and 80 cm in mineral and semi-organic soils, and at 5, 10, 20, 30, 40 cm in organic soils. The two additional horizontal measuring points, at depths of 5 and 10 cm, have been installed approximately ten meters from the station in opposing directions to catch small-scale variations in top soil moisture. A more detailed description is provided in (Ikonen et al., 2015, 2018).

A16 FR_Aqui

The FR-AQUI network has been set up by INRAE in the Bordeaux–Aquitaine region (southwestern France) in 2012 (Wigneron et al., 2018; Al-Yaari et al., 2018a). Measurements taken at this five-station network (plus the nearby ICOS Bilos site), include soil moisture and temperature at various depths, and the height of the groundwater table. Four sites are installed in the Les Landes forest, which is one of the largest coniferous forests in Europe, and one site is installed close to vineyards of the Bordeaux Graves region.

A17 GROW

GROW gathered crowd sourced observations to assess the temporal and spatial consistency of various satellite-derived soil moisture products. 6,500 low cost sensors were deployed in 24 GROW places in 13 Countries across Europe. A subset of 150 sensors were transferred to the ISMN (Zappa et al., 2019, 2020) and contain measurements of soil moisture and air temperature. The complete data set is licensed and available at https://doi.org/10.15132/10000156. More information on the quality of the data can be found in Xaver et al. (2020).

A18 GTK

The GTK network is operated by the Geological Survey of Finland and contains 7 stations throughout the country with one station north of the polar circle. Measurements are taken from the upper soil layer until 0.9 meter depth (soil moisture and soil temperature as well as air temperature). The data are available from the years 2001 to 2012 but the availability varies per station.

A19 HiWATER_EHWSN

The HiWATER EHWSN network is located in an irrigated farmland in the middle stream of the Heihe River Basin close to Gobi desert, China. It consists of short time series between April and September 2012 collected at 174 stations by the Cold and Arid Regions Environmental and Engineering Research Institute (CAREERI) of the Chinese Academy of Science (Kang et al., 2014; Jin et al., 2014).

A20 HOAL

The Hydrological Open Air Laboratory - Soil Network (HOAL-Soilnet) has been set up in Petzenkirchen, Austria, as part of a concerted effort to advance the understanding of water-related flow and transport processes in a 66 ha agricultural catchment (Blöschl et al., 2016). Soil moisture has been monitored since 2013 at about 30 locations at four depths at time intervals of 30 minutes using Time Domain Transmission sensors. Measurements are taken from permanent stations, located in grassland, forest or at field boundaries, as well as from stations that are temporarily installed in cropland (Vreugdenhil et al., 2013).

A21 HOBE

HOBE is a hydrological observatory established in the western part of Denmark in the Skjern River catchment Jensen and Refsgaard (2018). Within the sub-catchment Ahlergaarde data have been collected from a network 30 soil moisture stations distributed within the sub-catchment according to respective fractions of classes representing mainly land cover and soil type (Bircher et al., 2012). At each station Decagon 5TE capacitance sensors have been installed at 2.5, 22.5 and 52.5 cm depths. The sensors are logged every 30 minutes.

A22 HSC_SEOLMACHEON

HSC_SELMACHEON was a single station located in South Korea. Data were collected by the Hydrological Survey Center (HSC) and WRRSL and are available for the period August - September 2011.

A23 HYDROL-Net Perugia

The HYDROL-Net Perugia network Morbidelli et al. (2014a, 2017); Flammini et al. (2018a, b); Morbidelli et al. (2014b, 2011) consists of 1 station (called WEEF: Water Engineering Experimental Field) located near the city of Perugia, Central Italy. Measurements of soil moisture at 4 different depths (0.05, 0.15, 0.25 and 0.35 m), soil temperature at 2 depths (0.05 and 0.30 m), precipitation and air temperature from January 2010 to December 2013 are included in the ISMN. HYDROL-Net Perugia is operated by the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering of the Perugia University.

A24   ICN

The former Illinois Climate Network was operated by the Water and Atmospheric Resources Program of the Illinois State Water Survey and formerly integrated in the Global Soil Moisture Data Bank (Hollinger and Isard, 1994). Between 1983 and 2010, ICN covered 19 stations measuring soil moisture and soil temperature down to two metres depth, as well as precipitation.

A25   IIT_KANPUR

The network IIT_KANPUR network consisted of a single station and was managed by Hydraulics and Water Resources Laboratory, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India. Soil moisture measurements were made at four depths (10, 25, 50 and 80 cm) between from June 2011 to November 2012. The station was situated in the Ganga river basin, which is the largest river basin in India and the soil type at the observation site is clayey silt.

A26   IMA_CAN1

The IMA_CAN1 network is operated by the Institute for Agricultural and Earthmoving Machines (IMAMOTER) of the Italian National Research Council (CNR), now part of STEMS-CNR. It is located in an experimental vineyard in Carpeneto, in the "Alto Monferrato" hilly region, which is a valuable vine-growing and wine production area in the Piedmont Region in northwestern Italy. The monitored vineyards are part of the "Experimental Vine and Wine Centre of Agrion Foundation". The stations in the network provide measurements of soil moisture, precipitation, air temperature and humidity, hourly runoff and event soil losses. Hourly volumetric soil moisture was measured by 12 5TM sensors in the period 2011 - 2015, both in grassed and tilled vineyards, in correspondence of the track and no-track position, down and up the hill (Biddoccu et al., 2016; Capello et al., 2019; Raffelli et al., 2018).

A27   IOWA

The IOWA network was located in two catchments in the southwestern part of Iowa, USA. Soil moisture observations from 6 stations, until 2.6 meter depth, with an interval of twice a month during 1972 to 1994 (April to October) are included in the ISMN (Robock et al., 2000). This network was formerly included in the Global Soil Moisture Data Bank.

A28   IPE

The Instituto Pirenaico de Ecologia (IPE) network runs two stations located in Aragón, north-eastern Spain. The stations have been collecting meteorological data with at least hourly time resolution (air and soil temperatures, soil moisture, relative humidity, radiation, wind speed) since 2008 in a Mediterranean oak forest (Agüero) and a semi-arid pine forest (Peñaflor). These measurements are related to dendrometer hourly records of changes in root and stem (Agüero; see (Alday et al., 2020)) or stem (Peñaflor) increment of the main tree species.

A29 iRON

The interactive Roaring Fork Observation Network (iRON) is a series of 10 stations operated by the Aspen Global Change Institute spread across the elevations of the Roaring Fork Watershed, located in the Southern Rocky Mountains of the United States. This data set includes soil moisture at 5, 20, and 50cm, soil temperature at 20cm, and additional weather measurements variable by station. Further information can be found in Osenga et al. (2019) or on agci.org/iron/about.

A30 KHOREZM

The KHOREZM network in Uzbekistan is located between the Amudarya river and the border to Turkmenistan and was part of a project conducted by Uni Würzburg, Germany (Patrick Knöfel). Seven stations with soil moisture, soi temperature, air temperature and surface temperature measurements from 2010 April to 2011 September are included in the ISMN. Although soil moisture was not observed continuously, the measurements are still a valuable contribution since no other recent observations are available in this region.

A31 KIHS_CMC

The Korea Institute of Hydrological Survey has been running the Cheongmicheon (CMC) network since 2009 with annually returning measurements from March till December. It comprises 56 TDR Buriable Waveguide soil moisture sensors at 18 stations located on an area the size of a football field. All stations have a sensor installed at 0.1 m and additional sensors at varying depths, i.e., at 0.3, 0.4, 0.6 and 0.9 m.

A32 KIHS_SMC

KIHS_SMC is operated by the Enivronmental and Remote Sensing Lab of the Korea Institute of Hydrological Survey. The 51 soil moisture sensors (depths from 0.1 to 0.6 m) are located on a mountain slope distributed over 19 stations in close proximity to each other.

A33 LAB-net

LAB-net was created as the first soil moisture network in Chile to support remote sensing research on drought and water use conflicts (Mattar et al., 2016, 2014). Three stations measuring soil moisture, soil temperature, precipitation, and air temperature between 2014 until 2017 over various land cover types have been included in the ISMN.

A34 MAQU

The Maqu monitoring network (Su et al., 2011; Dente et al., 2012) is situated on the north-eastern fringe of the Tibetan Plateau, covering an area of approximately 40×80 km with the elevation varying from 3200 m to 4200 m above sea level. The network provides access to soil moisture and temperature profiles (5 cm, 10 cm, 20 cm, 40 cm, and 80 cm) measured at a 15-min interval. Soil moisture and temperature data from 2008 to 2018 are included in the ISMN.

A35 METEROBS

The METEROBS (MET European Research OBServations) network measured soil moisture at a single site between October 2011 October and May 2012. It was located in the Apennines mountains in the rural area of Benevento, Southern Italy. Soil Moisture measurements from five layers until 0.5 meter depth have been included in the ISMN.

A36 MOL-RAO

The MOL-RAO network is operated by the German Meteorological Service (DWD) and part of the operational measuring program of the MOL-RAO (Meteorological Observatory Lindenberg – Richard-Aßmann-Observatory). The network is situated in the north-east of Germany and consists of two stations. While the Station Falkenberg has a grass type vegetation, Kehrigk is situated in a pine forest (Beyrich and Adam, 2007). Volumetric soil moisture, soil temperature, air temperature and precipitation are provided in half hour resolution since 2003.

A37 MONGOLIA

Soil moisture data sets for 44 stations were collected by the National Agency of Meterology, Hydrology and Environment Monitoring in Ulaanbaatar. All observations were taken using the gravimetric technique and initially provided as volumetric plant-available water [%]. Volumetric soil moisture [m^3/m^3] was calculated by first extracting texture properties of all sites from the Harmonized World Soil Database and subsequently calculating the wilting levels for all stations using the equations of Saxton and Rawls (2006). Soil moisture measurements are provided three times a month (on the $8^t h$, $18^t h$ and $28^t h$)from 1964 to 2002 during the warm period of the year, which runs from April until the end of October (e.g., Robock et al. (2000)).

A38 MySMNet

The Malaysian Soil Moisture Network (MySMNet) is operational since 2014. It deploys seven stations (four on oil palm plantation, two on shrubland and one on orchard) that collect soil moisture at 5, 50, and 100 cm depth, soil temperature at 5 cm, air temperature, and relative humidity, all on an hourly basis. The soil moisture sensors used are the WaterScout SM100 (Kang et al., 2019).

A39 NAQU

The NAQU network is part of the Tibetan Plateau observatory of plateau scale soil moisture and soil temperature (Tibet-obs) and consists of 11 stations located in a cold semiarid climate in Tibet at elevations over 4500 m. Soil moisture and soil temperature have been measured at five different depths: 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 cm from 2010 onwards. (Su et al., 2011).

A40 NGARI

The NGARI network is part of the Tibetan Plateau observatory of plateau scale soil moisture and soil temperature (Tibet-obs) and consists of 23 stations located in a cold arid climate in Tibet at elevations between 4200 – 4700 m. Soil moisture and soil

temperature have been measured at five different depths: 5 cm, 10 cm, 20 cm, 40 cm, and 80 cm from 2010 onwards. (Su et al., 2011).

A41 NVE

This is a network of monitoring stations of the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE). Soil moisture, soil temperature and air temperature are measured. Currently, 3 out of 8 stations are accessible through the ISMN. The stations are situated in the Trøndelag region in Eastern Norway. Data are available from 2012 to 2019 at more than 5 different depth layers and down to 1.5 to 2 m depth.

A42 ORACLE

The network ORACLE network includes 6 stations. The datasets reach back to the year 1985 and are available until 2013. ORACLE is a research observatory east of Paris to study of the "Grand Morin" and "Petit Morin" river catchments, particularly floods, low water periods, water quality, and the impact of human activities on the environment.

A43 OZNET

OzNet was established in 2001 with 8 sites across the Murrumbidgee catachment and a cluster of a further 5 sites in the Adelong and Kyeamba catchments. This was further extended in 2003 to include a total of 11 sites at Kyeamba for a GRACE validation experiment and 13 sites at Yanco for SMOS pre-launch algorithm development and post-launch calibration-validation. The Yanco site was further extended to have clusters of stations across 9 km and 3 km grids in crop and grasslands areas for SMAP algorithm development, calibration, and validation (Smith et al., 2012; Young et al., 2008).

A44 PBO_H2O

The PBO_H2O network is a former near real time network of the ISMN hosted by the University of Colorado, USA. It consisted of 159 stations distributed in the west of the USA, Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Colombia, South Africa and Saudi Arabia. Soil moisture (measured using GPS reflections), precipitation, air temperature and snow depth from 2004 to 2017 is stored in the ISMN database (Larson et al., 2008). The network was discontinued in 2018 because of lacking financial support.

A45 PTSMN

The Patitapu Soil Moisture Network (PTSMN) was established in 2016 on the hill country landscapes of the East Coast of New Zealand's North Island. PTSMN was deployed to capture spatiotemporal soil moisture trends on various topographical positions distributed over a 13.8 km2 area. The network is composed of twenty multi-sensor probes that were calibrated to the site-specific soils (Hajdu et al., 2019). The sensors provide readings at four consecutive depths down to 0.43 m.

A46   REMEDHUS

REMEDHUS is the University of Salamanca Soil Moisture Measurement Stations Network and was installed in March 1999, with a set of old TDR stations and manual measurements. It is one of the first soil moisture networks in Europe. The network was automated and upgraded with capacitance probes in 2005. The REMEDHUS data available in the ISMN cover the period since the automation. REMEDHUS is located in an agricultural area in the central part of the Duero basin (Spain). The network currently has 20 stations that hourly measure soil moisture and soil temperature in the 0-5 cm layer (González-Zamora et al., 2018).

A47   RISMA

The Real-time in situ Soil Monitoring for Agriculture (RISMA) network was established in 2011 by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada at agricultural locations in Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan(Ojo et al., 2015; J., 2011; Canisius, 2011). There are currently 23 RISMA stations collecting hourly soil moisture/temperature data at depths to 1 – 1.5 metres in combination with meteorological data. Calibrated, quality controlled soil moisture and weather data are provided to the ISMN on an annual basis.

A48   RSMN

The Romanian Soil Moisture Network (RSMN) consists of 19 stations homogeneously distributed over Romania. The network is managed by the Romanian National Meteorological Administration and is part of the ASSIMO project, which aims to create a framework for the evaluation of current and future satellite microwave-derived soil moisture products.

A49   Ru_CFR

The Ru_CFR network includes two stations located on the territory of the Central Forest Reserve, Tver region, Russia. Since 2015, half- hourly continuous measurements of soil moisture have been carried out. Both stations provide measurements of soil moisture at four different depths, as well as measurements of soil temperature, air temperature and precipitation.

A50   RUSWET-AGRO, RUSWET-GRASS, RUSWET-VALDAI

The three historical RUSWET networks were agricultural prediction campaigns conducted by the State Hydrological Institute of the Former Soviet Union within the area of present Russia. Measurements were taken from 1952 until 2002 and initially distributed through the Global Soil Moisture Data Bank. Altogether, the networks operated 337 sites at which soil moisture was measured three times per month via gravimetric sampling. At RUSWET-VALDAI also soil temperature, precipitation, and air temperature were collected. RUSWET contributes both the northernmost (on Mc-Clintock Island) and the earliest (June 8th 1952) observations to the ISMN (Robock et al., 2000).

A51 SASMAS

The Scaling and Assimilation of Soil Moisture and Streamflow (SASMAS) monitoring network commenced commissioning in late 2002 with a total of 26 stations in operation by 2003 across a 6,500 km2 catchment (Rüdiger et al., 2007). Soil moisture is observed up to a depth of 90 cm (where possible) at depth intervals of 0-30, 30-60, and 60-90 cm. The network was developed as a nested catchment with three different types of scales (low-resolution across the entire catchment, medium density across to smaller subcatchment, and very high density across a 175 ha single reach. This site also hosted the second NAFE campaign for which additional data was collected.

A52 SCAN

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) operates the comprehensive, US-wide Soil Climate Analysis Network. SCAN supports natural resource assessments and conservation activities through its network of automated climate monitoring and data collection sites. SCAN focuses primarily on agricultural areas of the U.S., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The network consists of 216 stations located across the United States and reports soil moisture, soil temperature, precipitation, temperature and other climatic variables hourly. Soil sensors are situated at 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 cm depth (Schaefer et al., 2007).

A53 SKKU

The SKKU network was located at the evenly and moderately vegetated botanical garden in South Korea. It was operated by Sungkyunkwan University from 2014 to 2016 as part of a project for evaluating Cosmic-Ray Neutron Probe (CRNP) soil moisture (Nguyen et al., 2017). The network consisted of 10 stations, and soil moisture measurements were taken from 4 different depths (i.e., 10, 20, 30, and 40 cm).

A54 SMOSMANIA

The SMOSMANIA network was installed in southern France by Météo-France, the French national meteorological service, in order to monitor in situ soil moisture and soil temperature in contrasting soil and climatic conditions at operational automatic weather stations (Calvet et al., 2007). The SMOSMANIA network is composed of 21 stations forming an Atlantic–Mediterranean transect over a large variety of mineral soils ranging from sand to clay and silt loam (Calvet et al., 2016).

A55 SNOTEL

NRCS installs, operates, and maintains an extensive, automated data collection network called SNOTEL (short for Snow Telemetry) (Leavesley et al., 2008; Leavesley, 2010). SNOTEL is part of the Snow Survey and Water Supply Forecasting (SSWSF) Program and is designed to collect snowpack and related climatic data in the western U.S. and Alaska. The Program operates under technical guidance from the NRCS National Water and Climate Center (NWCC). With the majority of the water supply in the West arriving in the form of snow, data on snowpack provide critical information to decision-makers and water

managers. SNOTEL currently consists of a network of over 860 automated SNOTEL stations of which 463 stations have soil moisture and soil temperature sensors.

 ## A56   SOILSCAPE

The Soil moisture Sensing Controller And oPtimal Estimator (SoilSCAPE) is a wireless soil moisture sensor network for measurements of surface-to-root-zone profiles of soil moisture (Moghaddam et al., 2011; MOGHADDAM et al., 2016; Shuman et al., 2010). It is designed for long-term, ultra-efficient, unattended field operations. Several networks are deployed in the US, including in the states of California, Arizona, Colorado, Alaska, and New York. Additional deployments are planned in New Mexico, US, and in New Zealand. The SoilSCAPE architecture includes a local coordinator (LC) and multiple end devices (EDs). The LC is the central command center of the network, receiving data from the several soil moisture and temperature sensors connected to each ED. The sensors include 5TM and Teros-12, depending on how recently they were deployed.

A57   SWEX_POLAND

The oSil Water and Energy exchange - Poland (SWEX_POLAND) network was operated between 2000 and 2013 by the Institutes of Agrophysics PAS in Lublin. The network consisted of 6 stations located in the wetlands of Poleski Park Krajobrazowy to support SMOS product calibration and validaton. Soil moisture and temperature measurements were taken down to 1 meter depth, along with precipitation observations (Marczewski et al., 2010).

A58   SW-WHU

The SW-WHU network was hosted by Wuhan University (Chen et al., 2015a, b). SW-WHU is a high-density network, with nearly 100 soil moisture and temperature sensors within 1 km2. It adopts an NB-IOT technique for data transmission at low power consumption. Therefore, the data of SW-WHU is particularly valuable for soil moisture validation, monitoring, and application at a very high spatio-temporal resolution (Zhang et al., 2018b).

A59   TAHMO

The Trans-African Hydro-Meteorological Observatory (TAHMO; tahmo.org) presently runs a network of over 600 meteorological weather stations in more than twenty African countries. The stations measure all standard weather parameters, such as barometric pressure, wind speed, rainfall, and radiation. Each station also has five open ports that can be used for additional sensors, such as soil moisture sensors. Presently, 70 stations have soil moisture sensors, some of them at several depths. Ideally, many stations will be upgraded by soil moisture sensors in the near future.

A60   TERENO

TERENO consists of four terrestrial observatories that represent typical landscapes in Germany and Central Europe and are considered to be highly vulnerable to the effects of global and climate change (Zacharias et al., 2011; Bogena et al., 2012).

TERENO combines observations with comprehensive large-scale experiments, integrated modeling, remote sensing and novel measurement technologies to increase our understanding of the functioning and feedbacks of terrestrial ecosystems (Bogena, 2016). The long-term observation platform of TERENO is composed of various measurement systems, including networks of climate and lysimeter stations, eddy-covariance towers, and networks of soil, surface water and groundwater sensors. Almost all online measurements are freely accessible via the TERENO data portal (http://www.tereno.net/ddp/).

A61 UDC_SMOS

The former German UDC_SMOS network was hosted by the University of Munich, Department of Geography in cooperation with the Bavarian Sate Research Center for Agriculture and funded by the German Aerospace Centre (DLR). It was located in grassland in the Bavarian region around Munich city, as an official European SMOS cal/val test site. Eleven stations provided soil moisture data from 2007 until 2011 until 40 cm depth measured by several types of sensors (Loew et al., 2009; Schlenz et al., 2012).

A62 UMBRIA

This soil moisture monitoring network in the north of the Umbria region, in the upper Tiber River basin operates three stations in real-time: Torre dell'Olmo, Petrelle, Cerbara. Each station measures at 10 cm, 20 cm, and 40 cm depth. Additional stations of the network have not been operational since 2015 due to a lack of resources for their maintenance. Provided financial resources become available, the stations that are no longer functioning will be restored (Brocca et al., 2011, 2009, 2008).

A63 UMSUOL

UMSUOL ("Umidita del Suolo") is a one-station network located close to Bologna, northern Italy. Soil moisture measurements at seven different depths are provided by the Agenzia Regionale Prevenione Ambiente (ARPA). The ISMN contains data from the years 2009 and 2010.

A64 USCRN

The U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN) contains 114 stations sparsely distributed across the contiguous United States. Each station has three sets of soil moisture/temperature probes at 5 depths: 5, 10, 20, 50, and 100 cm in addition to air and surface temperature, precipitation, relative humidity, and solar radiation (Bell et al., 2013). The stations were installed between 2009 and 2011 and are still in operation in 2021. The stations are maintained by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Atmospheric Turbulence and Diffusion Division (NOAA ATDD) and their data are maintained by NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NOAA NCEI).

A65 USDA-ARS

The United States Department of Agriculture-Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS) operates a number of Long Term Agroecosystem Research (LTAR) sites, some of which have spatial coverage of soil moisture and soil temperature. As experimental sites, the locations and configuration of the stations can change depending on the current scientific questions being addressed. A description of the sites can be found in Jackson et al. (2011).

A66 VAS

The "Valencia Anchor Station" networis operated by the Climatology from Satellites Group and Jucar River Basin Authority of the University of Valencia, Spain. The network is located in Spain and consists 3 stations. The datasets are available for the years 2010 and 2011.

A67 VDS

The VDS network is run by VanderSat, a dutch company specialised in providing global satellite-observed data and services over land. The VDS network consists of four stations located near the city of Bago in Myanmar. The network was installed to validate satellite soil moisture products in the tropics. The network has two measurement periods, one from June 2017 to July 2018 and one from March 2020 onwards.

A68 WEGENERNET

The WegenerNet, located in the foreland of the southeastern Austrian Alps, is a long-term weather and climate monitoring facility comprising 155 hydrometeorological stations in a dense grid with one station every about 2 km^2 Kirchengast et al. (2014); Fuchsberger et al. (2020). Together with a range of meteorological variables such as temperature, humidity, precipitation and wind, it also measures soil moisture and temperature at 12 stations. These variables are measured at 0.2-0.3 m depth in diverse soil types representative for the region.

A69 WSMN

The Wales Soil Moisture Network was founded in July 2011. It consists of a total of 9 monitoring sites located in Mid-Wales representing a range of conditions typical of the Welsh environment, with climate ranging from oceanic to temperate and the most typical land use/cover types. The data set acquired in the network are composed of 0-5 (or 0-10) cm soil moisture, soil temperature, precipitation as well as other ancillary data (Petropoulos and McCalmont, 2017).

Appendix B: Detailed system overview

Figure B1. Detailed system overview of the ISMN (Status July 2021).

Appendix C: Soil moisture sensor availability per soil depth interval

Table C1. Overview of data availability per depth layers showing the total number of individual sensor brands, data sets and stations integrated in the ISMN database. The calculations have been made in respect to horizontally and vertically placed sensors for each depth layer.

depth from - to [m]	sensors	data sets	stations
0.00 - 0.05	131	2116	1696
0.05 - 0.10	123	2482	1459
0.10 - 0.20	138	2690	1523
0.20 - 0.30	104	1899	1463
0.30 - 0.40	43	562	483
0.40 - 0.50	73	1463	1207
0.50 - 0.60	65	1389	1125
0.60 - 0.70	25	210	185
0.70 - 0.80	20	113	106
0.80 - 0.90	24	183	159
0.90 - 1.00	25	346	302
1.00 - 1.10	42	571	450
1.10 - 1.20	5	7	5
1.20 - 1.30	7	44	24
1.30 - 1.40	4	8	6
1.40 - 1.50	8	13	9
1.50 - 1.60	12	21	15
1.60 - 1.70	0	0	0
1.70 - 1.80	3	35	18
1.80 - 1.90	1	1	1
1.90 - 2.00	8	20	20
2.00 - 2.10	13	10	8

Appendix D: Metadata structure

Figure D1. Overview of all mandatory metadata information available for each station within the ISMN database.

Appendix E: Scientific studies using ISMN data for satellite and model product evaluation and development.

Table E1. Overview of scientific studies using ISMN data for satellite product evaluation and development.

Sensor	Publications
SMOS	Albergel et al. (2012c), Mecklenburg et al. (2012), Parrens et al. (2012), Sanchez et al. (2012), Schlenz et al. (2012), Wanders et al. (2012), Pellarin et al. (2013), Fascetti et al. (2014), Petropoulos et al. (2014), Pierdicca et al. (2014), Zeng et al. (2014), Rodriguez-Fernandez et al. (2015), Gruber et al. (2015), Hottenstein et al. (2015), Kornelsen and Coulibaly (2015), Lee and Im (2015), Parinussa et al. (2015), Pierdicca et al. (2015a), Pierdicca et al. (2015b), Scaini et al. (2015), González-Zamora et al. (2015), Fascetti et al. (2016), Fascetti et al. (2016), Kędzior and Zawadzki (2016), Kerr et al. (2016), Pablos et al. (2016), Piles et al. (2016), Rautiainen et al. (2016), Scholze et al. (2016), van der Schalie et al. (2016), González-Zamora et al. (2016), Ángel González-Zamora et al. (2016), Al-Yaari et al. (2017), Cui et al. (2017), Fascetti et al. (2017), Fernandez-Moran et al. (2017b), Fernandez-Moran et al. (2017a), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Lievens et al. (2017), Martens et al. (2017), Mohanty et al. (2017), Montzka et al. (2017), Muñoz Sabater et al. (2017), Pan et al. (2017), Peng et al. (2017), Pierdicca et al. (2017), Rains et al. (2017), van der Schalie et al. (2017), Yao et al. (2017), Al-Yaari et al. (2018b), Ebrahimi et al. (2018), Ebrahimi-Khusfi et al. (2018), Lee (2018), Liu et al. (2018), Pablos et al. (2018), Tagesson et al. (2018), Tian (2018), van der Schalie et al. (2018), Wu et al. (2018), Al-Yaari et al. (2019b), Al-Yaari et al. (2019a), Blyverket et al. (2019a), Blyverket et al. (2019b), de Rosnay et al. (2019), Kang et al. (2019), Ma et al. (2019), Piles et al. (2019), Rodriguez-Fernandez et al. (2019), Tian et al. (2019b), González-Zamora et al. (2019), Beck et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2020), Helgert and Khodayar (2020), Herbert et al. (2020), Link et al. (2020), Moreno-Martínez et al. (2020), Portal et al. (2020), Sadri et al. (2020),Dong et al. (2020),Li et al. (2020c),Wigneron et al. (2021), Balenzano et al. (2021), Chen et al. (2021), van der Schalie et al. (2021), Xu et al. (2021), Yao et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2021b)
ASCAT	Brocca et al. (2011), Liu et al. (2011), Albergel et al. (2012c), Liu et al. (2012b), Parrens et al. (2012), Wanders et al. (2012), Albergel et al. (2013b), Pellarin et al. (2013), Zwieback et al. (2013), Fascetti et al. (2014), Gruber et al. (2014), Parinussa et al. (2014b), Paulik et al. (2014), Pierdicca et al. (2014), Gruber et al. (2015), Parinussa et al. (2015), Pierdicca et al. (2015a), Pierdicca et al. (2015b), Su et al. (2015), Zwieback et al. (2015), Fascetti et al. (2016), Fascetti et al. (2016), Zwieback et al. (2016), Fascetti et al. (2017), Gruber et al. (2017), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Kolassa et al. (2017), Lievens et al. (2017), Massari et al. (2017), Mohanty et al. (2017), Montzka et al. (2017), Pierdicca et al. (2017), Sure et al. (2017), Al-Yaari et al. (2018b), Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2018), Kim et al. (2018), Afshar et al. (2019), Al-Yaari et al. (2019b), Fairbairn et al. (2019), Gruber et al. (2019a), Beck et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2020), Link et al. (2020), Moreno-Martínez et al. (2020), Zappa et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021), Kim et al. (2021), Steele-Dunne et al. (2021), Wu et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2021b)
AMSR-E	Brocca et al. (2011), Liu et al. (2011), Liu et al. (2012b), Parinussa et al. (2012), Wanders et al. (2012), Albergel et al. (2013b), Dente et al. (2013), Dorigo et al. (2013), Zhao and Li (2013), de Jeu et al. (2014), Parinussa et al. (2014b), Zeng et al. (2014), Coopersmith et al. (2015), Parinussa et al. (2015), Su et al. (2015), Zhao and Li (2015), Al-Yaari et al. (2016), Du et al. (2016), Han et al. (2016), Parinussa et al. (2016), Santi et al. (2016), Zhao et al. (2016), Gruber et al. (2017), Han et al. (2017), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Kolassa et al. (2017), Massari et al. (2017), Mohanty et al. (2017), Su et al. (2017), Sure et al. (2017), Tobin et al. (2017), van der Schalie et al. (2017), WANG et al. (2017), Yao et al. (2017), Lei et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2018), van der Schalie et al. (2018), Afshar et al. (2019), Hu et al. (2019), Xie et al. (2019), Chen et al. (2020), Deng et al. (2020c), Hagan et al. (2020),Dong et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021), Yao et al. (2021)

Sensor	Publications
SMAP	Fascetti et al. (2016), Zeng et al. (2016), Al-Yaari et al. (2017), Cui et al. (2017), Fascetti et al. (2017), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Mohanty et al. (2017), Montzka et al. (2017), Pierdicca et al. (2017), Alemohammad et al. (2018), Ebrahimi et al. (2018), Ebrahimi-Khusfi et al. (2018), Kim et al. (2018), Kim and Lakshmi (2018), Kolassa et al. (2018), Pablos et al. (2018), Santi et al. (2018), Xu et al. (2018), Zhao et al. (2018), Al-Yaari et al. (2019b), Bai et al. (2019), Blyverket et al. (2019a), Blyverket et al. (2019b), Ebtehaj and Bras (2019), Fang et al. (2019), Ma et al. (2019), Park et al. (2019), Zhang et al. (2019b), Beck et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2020), Fang et al. (2020), Gao et al. (2020), Gao et al. (2020), Link et al. (2020), Park et al. (2020), Portal et al. (2020), Sadri et al. (2020), Suman et al. (2020), Sun et al. (2020), Zappa et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021), Fang et al. (2021b), Fang et al. (2021a), Gupta et al. (2021), He et al. (2021), Kim et al. (2021), Ojha et al. (2021), van der Schalie et al. (2021), Sun and Cui (2021), Wu et al. (2021), Xu et al. (2021), Yao et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2021b)
ESA CCI	Gruber et al. (2013), Enenkel et al. (2016), Su et al. (2016), Cui et al. (2017), Dorigo et al. (2017), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Martens et al. (2017), Tobin et al. (2017), Al-Yaari et al. (2018b), Al-Yaari et al. (2019b), Al-Yaari et al. (2019a), Blyverket et al. (2019a), Blyverket et al. (2019b), Gruber et al. (2019b), Guevara and Vargas (2019), Ma et al. (2019), González-Zamora et al. (2019), Zhu et al. (2019), Beck et al. (2020), Deng et al. (2020c), Kovačević et al. (2020), Zappa et al. (2020), Dorigo et al. (2015), Pratola et al. (2015), Nicolai-Shaw et al. (2015b), An et al. (2016), Liu et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2020),Chen et al. (2016), Almendra-Martín et al. (2021), Grillakis et al. (2021), Guevara et al. (2021), Wang et al. (2021), Yao et al. (2021)
AMSR2	Kim et al. (2015a), Kim et al. (2015b), Parinussa et al. (2015), Kim et al. (2016), Wu et al. (2016), Anoop et al. (2017), Cui et al. (2017), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Montzka et al. (2017), Yao et al. (2017), Fang et al. (2018), Kim et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2018), Santi et al. (2018), Hu et al. (2019), Ma et al. (2019), Beck et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2020), Hagan et al. (2020), Link et al. (2020), Moreno-Martínez et al. (2020), Anoop et al. (2017), Chen et al. (2021), Moradizadeh and Srivastava (2021), Yao et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2021a)
MODIS	Liu et al. (2014), Boussetta et al. (2015), Zhao and Li (2015), Pablos et al. (2016), Przeździecki et al. (2017), Alemohammad et al. (2018), Gumbricht (2018), Pablos et al. (2018), Kumar et al. (2019b), Park et al. (2019), Han et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021), Ojha et al. (2021), Sun and Cui (2021)
Sentinel-1	Paloscia et al. (2013), Liu et al. (2017), Bao et al. (2018), Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2018), Dabrowska-Zielinska et al. (2018), Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2019), Greifeneder et al. (2019), Rodionova (2019b), Rodionova (2019a), Wang et al. (2019a), Foucras et al. (2020), Han et al. (2020), Ma et al. (2020), Zappa et al. (2020), Ojha et al. (2021)
SEVIRI	Zhao and Li (2013), Liu et al. (2014), Leng et al. (2015),Leng et al. (2016), Piles et al. (2016), Leng et al. (2017), Tagesson et al. (2018), Ghilain et al. (2019)
FY-3B	Parinussa et al. (2014a), Cui et al. (2017), Parinussa et al. (2018), Sheng et al. (2019), Chen et al. (2020), Hagan et al. (2020), Liu et al. (2021)
TMI	Liu et al. (2012b), Albergel et al. (2013b), Gruber et al. (2015), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Chen et al. (2020), Hagan et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021)
ERS	Liu et al. (2012b), Albergel et al. (2013b), Dente et al. (2013), Kolassa et al. (2013), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Chen et al. (2021)
GNSS-IR (CYGNSS)	Zhang et al. (2018a), Kim and Lakshmi (2018), Xu et al. (2018), Eroglu et al. (2019), Chew and Small (2020), Senyurek et al. (2020)
SSM/I	Liu et al. (2012b), Albergel et al. (2013b), Kolassa et al. (2013), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Hagan et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021)
WindSat	Parinussa et al. (2012), Karthikeyan et al. (2017), Chen et al. (2020), Hagan et al. (2020)
ERS-2	Reimer et al. (2012), Pierdicca et al. (2014)
Landsat	Zhao et al. (2017), Bao et al. (2018), Pradhan (2019)
GRACE	Khaki et al. (2019), Sadeghi et al. (2020)

Sensor	Publications
Aquarius/SAC-D	González-Zamora et al. (2016)
FY-3C	Liu et al. (2021)
GF-1 WFV	Xing et al. (2017)
HY-2	Zhao et al. (2014)
MEaSUREs Chen et al. (2021)	
MeMo	Beck et al. (2020)
Sentinel-3 Ojha et al. (2021)	
SMmodel	Mimeau et al. (2020)
SMOPS Wang et al. (2021)	
SMMR	Chen et al. (2021)

Table E2. Overview of scientific studies using ISMN data for model evaluation and development.

Model	Publications
ERA-Interim, ERA-Interim\Land	Albergel et al. (2012b), Albergel et al. (2012a),Albergel et al. (2013a), Albergel et al. (2013b), Gruber et al. (2013),Pierdicca et al. (2015a), Zwieback et al. (2013), Angevine et al. (2014), Balsamo et al. (2015),Cammalleri et al. (2015), Zwieback et al. (2015), Kim et al. (2016), Deng et al. (2020c), Deng et al. (2020b), Li et al. (2020a), Pierdicca et al. (2015b), Nicolai-Shaw et al. (2015b), Beck et al. (2020)
ECMWF IFS	Albergel et al. (2012c), Mecklenburg et al. (2012), Pellarin et al. (2013), Albergel et al. (2015), Rodriguez-Fernandez et al. (2015)
ERA-40	Liu et al. (2012a)
ERA-5	Li et al. (2020a), Xu et al. (2021)
H-TESSEL	Albergel et al. (2010), Albergel et al. (2015), Dirmeyer et al. (2016)
ISBA	Albergel et al. (2010), Parrens et al. (2012), Barbu et al. (2014)
GLDAS Noah	Liu et al. (2011), Dorigo et al. (2013), Angevine et al. (2014), Bi et al. (2016), Dirmeyer et al. (2016), Zawadzki and Kędzior (2016), Pan et al. (2017), Lee (2018), McDonough et al. (2018), Mishra et al. (2018), Afshar et al. (2019), Kędzior and Zawadzki (2016), Beck et al. (2020), Deng et al. (2020c), Solander et al. (2020), Xu et al. (2021)
GLDAS Mosaic	Bi et al. (2016), Solander et al. (2020)
MERRA, MERRA\Land, MERRA-2	Albergel et al. (2013b), Pellarin et al. (2013), Kim et al. (2016), Reichle et al. (2017), Draper and Reichle (2019), Wang et al. (2019c), Li et al. (2020a), Xu et al. (2021)
CLM	Cammalleri et al. (2015), Bi et al. (2016), Dirmeyer et al. (2016), Mishra et al. (2018), Zhao and Yang (2018)
VIC	Mishra et al. (2014), Bi et al. (2016), Mishra et al. (2018), Beck et al. (2020), Solander et al. (2020), Erlingis et al. (2021)
GLEAM	Lievens et al. (2017), Martens et al. (2017), Martens et al. (2018)
LDAS	Fairbairn et al. (2015), Albergel et al. (2018), Xia et al. (2019), Albergel et al. (2020)
BEACH	Van doninck et al. (2012)
BEPS	He et al. (2021)
CAS-LSM	Wang et al. (2019b)
CFSR	Li et al. (2020a)
CLSM	Dong et al. (2020), Erlingis et al. (2021)
CPC	Liu et al. (2012a)
CSSP	Ji et al. (2017)
ESSMRA	Naz et al. (2020)
GLDAS2	Wu et al. (2021)
GSFC	Dirmeyer et al. (2016)
HadGEM3-GC3.05	Li et al. (2021)
HBV	Beck et al. (2020)
JRA-5	Li et al. (2020a), Xu et al. (2021)
LISFLOOD	Cammalleri et al. (2015)
NLDAS Noah	Dong et al. (2020), Erlingis et al. (2021)
NLDAS Mosaic	Dong et al. (2020), Erlingis et al. (2021)
NCEP/NCAR	Pierdicca et al. (2015b), Xu et al. (2021)
Noah-MP	Dong et al. (2020), Erlingis et al. (2021)

Model	Publications
SAC	Erlingis et al. (2021)
SSA	Fairbairn et al. (2019)
SSMP	Pal and Maity (2019)
WCDA, SCDA, OPNL	Lin and Pu (2019)
WLDAS	Erlingis et al. (2021)
WRF, WRF3.3-CLM4crop	Angevine et al. (2014), Lu et al. (2015)
ORCHIDEE-MICT	Yin et al. (2018), Raoult et al. (2021)

Appendix F: Effect of quality flagging on validation of ERA5 and ESA CCI soil moisture

(a) ERA5 absolute values

(b) ERA5 anomalies

(c) ESA CCI absolute values

(d) ESA CCI anomalies

Figure F1. Scatterplots of R Spearman between ISMN and ERA5 and ISMN and ESA CCI v05.2 combined for absolute values and anomalies. A 35-day moving average window was used to calculate anomalies. Each dot represents a single time series.

References

1075   Abbaszadeh, P., Moradkhani, H., and Zhan, X.: Downscaling SMAP Radiometer Soil Moisture Over the CONUS Using an Ensemble
         Learning Method, Water Resources Research, 55, 324–344, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023354, 2019.

         Adla, S., Rai, N. K., Karumanchi, S. H., Tripathi, S., Disse, M., and Pande, S.: Laboratory Calibration and Performance Evaluation of
         Low-Cost Capacitive and Very Low-Cost Resistive Soil Moisture Sensors, Sensors, 20, 363, https://doi.org/10.3390/s20020363, 2020.

         Afshar, M., Yilmaz, M., and Crow, W.: Impact of rescaling approaches in simple fusion of soil moisture products, Water Resources Research,
1080   55, 7804–7825, 2019.

         Al-Yaari, A., Wigneron, J., Kerr, Y., de Jeu, R., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., van der Schalie, R., Al Bitar, A., Mialon, A., Richaume, P., Dolman,
         A., and Ducharne, A.: Testing regression equations to derive long-term global soil moisture datasets from passive microwave observations,
         Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 453–464, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.11.022, special Issue: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean
         Salinity Mission - Achievements and Applications, 2016.

1085   Al-Yaari, A., Wigneron, J.-P., Kerr, Y., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., O'Neill, P., Jackson, T., De Lannoy, G., Al Bitar, A., Mialon, A., Richaume,
         P., Walker, J., Mahmoodi, A., and Yueh, S.: Evaluating soil moisture retrievals from ESA's SMOS and NASA's SMAP brightness temper-
         ature datasets, Remote Sensing of Environment, 193, 257–273, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.03.010, 2017.

         Al-Yaari, A., Dayau, S., Chipeaux, C., Aluome, C., Kruszewski, A., Loustau, D., and Wigneron, J.-P.: The AQUI Soil Moisture Network
         for Satellite Microwave Remote Sensing Validation in South-Western France, Remote Sensing, 10, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10111839,
1090   2018a.

         Al-Yaari, A., Dayau, S., Chipeaux, C., Aluome, C., Kruszewski, A., Loustau, D., and Wigneron, J.-P.: The AQUI Soil Moisture Network for
         Satellite Microwave Remote Sensing Validation in South-Western France, Remote Sensing, 10, 1839, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10111839,
         2018b.

         Al-Yaari, A., Ducharne, A., Cheruy, F., Crow, W. T., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Satellite-based soil moisture provides missing link between
1095   summertime precipitation and surface temperature biases in CMIP5 simulations over conterminous United States, Scientific Reports, 9,
         1657, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-38309-5, 2019a.

         Al-Yaari, A., Wigneron, J.-P., Dorigo, W., Colliander, A., Pellarin, T., Hahn, S., Mialon, A., Richaume, P., Fernandez-Moran, R., Fan, L.,
         Kerr, Y., and Lannoy, G. D.: Assessment and inter-comparison of recently developed/reprocessed microwave satellite soil moisture prod-
         ucts using ISMN ground-based measurements, Remote Sensing of Environment, 224, 289–303, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.02.008,
1100   2019b.

         Albergel, C., Calvet, J.-C., Rosnay, P., Balsamo, G., W, W., Hasenauer, S., V, N., Martin, E., Bazile, E., F, B., and Mahfouf, J.-F.: Cross-
         evaluation of modelled and remotely sensed surface soil moisture with in situ data in Southwestern France, Hydrology and Earth System
         Sciences Discussions, 14, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-14-2177-2010, 2010.

         Albergel, C., Balsamo, G., de Rosnay, P., Muñoz Sabater, J., and Boussetta, S.: A bare ground evaporation revision in the ECMWF land-
1105   surface scheme: evaluation of its impact using ground soil moisture and satellite microwave data, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences,
         16, 3607–3620, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-3607-2012, 2012a.

         Albergel, C., de Rosnay, P., Balsamo, G., Isaksen, L., and Muñoz-Sabater, J.: Soil Moisture Analyses at ECMWF: Evaluation Using Global
         Ground-Based In Situ Observations, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 13, 1442–1460, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-11-0107.1, 2012b.

Albergel, C., de Rosnay, P., Gruhier, C., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Hasenauer, S., Isaksen, L., Kerr, Y., and Wagner, W.: Evaluation of remotely sensed and modelled soil moisture products using global ground-based in situ observations, Remote Sensing of Environment, 118, 215–226, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.11.017, 2012c.

Albergel, C., Dorigo, W., Balsamo, G., Muñoz-Sabater, J., de Rosnay, P., Isaksen, L., Brocca, L., de Jeu, R., and Wagner, W.: Monitoring multi-decadal satellite earth observation of soil moisture products through land surface reanalyses, Remote Sensing of Environment, 138, 77–89, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.07.009, 2013a.

Albergel, C., Dorigo, W., Reichle, R. H., Balsamo, G., de Rosnay, P., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Isaksen, L., de Jeu, R., and Wagner, W.: Skill and Global Trend Analysis of Soil Moisture from Reanalyses and Microwave Remote Sensing, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 14, 1259–1277, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-12-0161.1, 2013b.

Albergel, C., Dutra, E., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Haiden, T., Balsamo, G., Beljaars, A., Isaksen, L., de Rosnay, P., Sandu, I., and Wedi, N.: Soil temperature at ECMWF: An assessment using ground-based observations, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 120, 1361–1373, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022505, 2015.

Albergel, C., Munier, S., Bocher, A., Bonan, B., Zheng, Y., Draper, C., Leroux, D., and Calvet, J.-C.: LDAS-Monde Sequential Assimilation of Satellite Derived Observations Applied to the Contiguous US: An ERA-5 Driven Reanalysis of the Land Surface Variables, Remote Sensing, 10, 1627, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10101627, 2018.

Albergel, C., Zheng, Y., Bonan, B., Dutra, E., Rodríguez-Fernández, N., Munier, S., Draper, C., de Rosnay, P., Muñoz Sabater, J., Balsamo, G., Fairbairn, D., Meurey, C., and Calvet, J.-C.: Data assimilation for continuous global assessment of severe conditions over terrestrial surfaces, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 24, 4291–4316, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-4291-2020, 2020.

Alday, J. G., Camarero, J. J., Revilla, J., and Dios, V. R.: Similar diurnal, seasonal and annual rhythms in radial root expansion across two coexisting Mediterranean oak species, Tree Physiology, 2020.

Alemohammad, S. H., Kolassa, J., Prigent, C., Aires, F., and Gentine, P.: Global downscaling of remotely sensed soil moisture using neural networks, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 5341–5356, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-5341-2018, 2018.

Almendra-Martín, L., Martínez-Fernández, J., Piles, M., and González-Zamora, Á.: Comparison of gap-filling techniques applied to the CCI soil moisture database in Southern Europe, Remote Sensing of Environment, 258, 112 377, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112377, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S003442572100095X, 2021.

An, R., Zhang, L., Wang, Z., Quaye-Ballard, J. A., You, J., Shen, X., Gao, W., Huang, L., Zhao, Y., and Ke, Z.: Validation of the ESA CCI soil moisture product in China, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 48, 28–36, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.09.009, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture - Part 2, 2016.

Ángel González-Zamora, Sánchez, N., Martínez-Fernández, J., and Wagner, W.: Root-zone plant available water estimation using the SMOS-derived soil water index, Advances in Water Resources, 96, 339–353, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.08.001, 2016.

Angevine, W. M., Bazile, E., Legain, D., and Pino, D.: Land surface spinup for episodic modeling, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 8165–8172, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-8165-2014, 2014.

Anoop, S., Maurya, D. K., Rao, P. V. N., and Sekhar, M.: Validation and Comparison of LPRM Retrieved Soil Moisture Using AMSR2 Brightness Temperature at Two Spatial Resolutions in the Indian Region, IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters, 14, 1561–1564, https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2017.2722542, 2017.

Ardö, J.: A 10-Year Dataset of Basic Meteorology and Soil Properties in Central Sudan, Dataset Papers in Geosciences, 2013, https://doi.org/10.7167/2013/297973/dataset, 2013.

Bai, L., Lv, X., and Li, X.: Evaluation of Two SMAP Soil Moisture Retrievals Using Modeled- and Ground-Based Measurements, Remote Sensing, 11, 2891, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11242891, 2019.

Baldocchi, D., Falge, E., Gu, L., Olson, R., Hollinger, D., Running, S., Anthoni, P., Bernhofer, C., Davis, K., Evans, R., Fuentes, J., Goldstein, A., Katul, G., Law, B., Lee, X., Malhi, Y., Meyers, T., Munger, J., Oechel, W., and Richardson, F.: FLUXNET: A New Tool to Study the Temporal and Spatial Variability of Ecosystem–Scale Carbon Dioxide, Water Vapor, and Energy Flux Densities, ©2001 American Meteorological Society, 82, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2001)082<2415:FANTTS>2.3.CO;2, 2001.

Balenzano, A., Mattia, F., Satalino, G., Lovergine, F. P., Palmisano, D., Peng, J., Marzahn, P., Wegmüller, U., Cartus, O., Dąbrowska-Zielińska, K., Musial, J. P., Davidson, M. W., Pauwels, V. R., Cosh, M. H., McNairn, H., Johnson, J. T., Walker, J. P., Yueh, S. H., Entekhabi, D., Kerr, Y. H., and Jackson, T. J.: Sentinel-1 soil moisture at 1 km resolution: a validation study, Remote Sensing of Environment, 263, 112 554, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112554, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425721002741, 2021.

Balsamo, G., Albergel, C., Beljaars, A., Boussetta, S., Brun, E., Cloke, H., Dee, D., Dutra, E., Muñoz Sabater, J., Pappenberger, F., de Rosnay, P., Stockdale, T., and Vitart, F.: ERA-Interim/Land: a global land surface reanalysis data set, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 19, 389–407, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-389-2015, 2015.

Bao, Y., Lin, L., Wu, S., Deng, K. A. K., and Petropoulos, G. P.: Surface soil moisture retrievals over partially vegetated areas from the synergy of Sentinel-1 and Landsat 8 data using a modified water-cloud model, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 72, 76–85, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2018.05.026, 2018.

Barbu, A. L., Calvet, J.-C., Mahfouf, J.-F., and Lafont, S.: Integrating ASCAT surface soil moisture and GEOV1 leaf area index into the SURFEX modelling platform: a land data assimilation application over France, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 18, 173–192, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-18-173-2014, 2014.

Bauer-Marschallinger, B., Paulik, C., Hochstöger, S., Mistelbauer, T., Modanesi, S., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., Brocca, L., and Wagner, W.: Soil Moisture from Fusion of Scatterometer and SAR: Closing the Scale Gap with Temporal Filtering, Remote Sensing, 10, 1030, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10071030, 2018.

Bauer-Marschallinger, B., Freeman, V., Cao, S., Paulik, C., Schaufler, S., Stachl, T., Modanesi, S., Massari, C., Ciabatta, L., Brocca, L., and Wagner, W.: Toward Global Soil Moisture Monitoring With Sentinel-1: Harnessing Assets and Overcoming Obstacles, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 57, 520–539, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2018.2858004, 2019.

Bayat, B., Camacho, F., Nickeson, J., Cosh, M., Bolten, J., Vereecken, H., and Montzka, C.: Toward operational validation systems for global satellite-based terrestrial essential climate variables, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 95, 102 240, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2020.102240, 2021.

Beck, H. E., Pan, M., Miralles, D. G., Reichle, R. H., Dorigo, W. A., Hahn, S., Sheffield, J., Karthikeyan, L., Balsamo, G., Parinussa, R. M., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., Du, J., Kimball, J. S., Vergopolan, N., and Wood, E. F.: Evaluation of 18 satellite- and model-based soil moisture products using in situ measurements from 826 sensors, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 2020, 1–35, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-184, 2020.

Bell, J., Palecki, M., Baker, B., Collins, W., Lawrimore, J., Leeper, R., Hall, M., Kochendorfer, J., Meyers, T., Wilson, T., and Diamond, H.: U.S. Climate Reference Network Soil Moisture and Temperature Observations, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 14, 977–988, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-12-0146.1, 2013.

Beyrich, F. and Adam, W.: Site and Data Report for the Lindenberg Reference Site in CEOP - Phase 1, Berichte des Deutschen Wetterdienstes, 230, Offenbach am Main, 2007, 2007.

Bi, H., Ma, J., Zheng, W., and Zeng, J.: Comparison of soil moisture in GLDAS model simulations and in situ observations over the Tibetan Plateau, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 121, 2658–2678, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024131, 2016.

1185 Biddoccu, M., Ferraris, S., Opsi, F., and Cavallo, E.: Long-term monitoring of soil management effects on runoff and soil erosion in sloping vineyards in Alto Monferrato (North West Italy), Soil and Tillage Research, 155, 176–189, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.07.005, 2016.

Bircher, S., Skou, N., Jensen, K., Walker, J., and Rasmussen, L.: A soil moisture and temperature network for SMOS validation in Western Denmark, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-1445-2012, 2012.

1190 Blöschl, G., Blaschke, A. P., Broer, M., Bucher, C., Carr, G., Chen, X., Eder, A., Exner-Kittridge, M., Farnleitner, A., Flores-Orozco, A., Haas, P., Hogan, P., Kazemi Amiri, A., Oismüller, M., Parajka, J., Silasari, R., Stadler, P., Strauss, P., Vreugdenhil, M., Wagner, W., and Zessner, M.: The Hydrological Open Air Laboratory (HOAL) in Petzenkirchen: a hypothesis-driven observatory, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 20, 227–255, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-227-2016, 2016.

Blyverket, J., Hamer, P., Bertino, L., Albergel, C., Fairbairn, D., and Lahoz, W.: An Evaluation of the EnKF vs. EnOI and the Assimilation of
1195 SMAP, SMOS and ESA CCI Soil Moisture Data over the Contiguous US, Remote Sensing, 11, 478, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11050478, 2019a.

Blyverket, J., Hamer, P., Bertino, L., Albergel, C., Fairbairn, D., and Lahoz, W.: An Evaluation of the EnKF vs. EnOI and the Assimilation of SMAP, SMOS and ESA CCI Soil Moisture Data over the Contiguous US., Remote Sens., 11, 012 046, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11050478, 2019b.

1200 Bogena, H., Huisman, J., Oberdörster, C., and Vereecken, H.: Evaluation of a low-cost soil water content sensor for wireless network applications, Journal of Hydrology, 344, 32–42, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.06.032, 2007.

Bogena, H., Kunkel, R., Pütz, T., Vereecken, H., Kruger, E., Zacharias, S., Dietrich, P., Wollschläger, U., Kunstmann, H., Papen, H., Schmid, H., Munch, J., Priesack, E., Schwank, M., Bens, O., Brauer, A., Borg, E., and Hajnsek, I.: TERENO - Long-term monitoring network for terrestrial environmental research, Hydrologie und Wasserbewirtschaftung, 56, 138–143, 2012.

1205 Bogena, H. R.: TERENO: German network of terrestrial environmental observatories, Journal of large-scale research facilities JLSRF, 2, 52, 2016.

Bogena, H. R., Huisman, J. A., Güntner, A., Hübner, C., Kusche, J., Jonard, F., Vey, S., and Vereecken, H.: Emerging methods for noninvasive sensing of soil moisture dynamics from field to catchment scale: a review: Emerging methods for noninvasive sensing of soil moisture dynamics, Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water, 2, 635–647, https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1097, 2015.

1210 Bonney, R., Cooper, C. B., Dickinson, J., Kelling, S., Phillips, T., Rosenberg, K. V., and Shirk, J.: Citizen Science: A Developing Tool for Expanding Science Knowledge and Scientific Literacy, BioScience, 59, 977–984, https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2009.59.11.9, 2009.

Boussetta, S., Balsamo, G., Dutra, E., Beljaars, A., and Albergel, C.: Assimilation of surface albedo and vegetation states from satellite observations and their impact on numerical weather prediction, Remote Sensing of Environment, 163, 111–126, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.03.009, 2015.

1215 Brocca, L., Morbidelli, R., Melone, F., and Moramarco, T.: Soil moisture spatial variability in experimental areas of central Italy, Journal of Hydrology, 333, 356–373, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.09.004, 2007.

Brocca, L., Melone, F., and Moramarco, T.: On the estimation of antecedent wetness condition in rainfall-runoff modeling, Hydrological Processes, 22, 629–642, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6629, 2008.

Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., and Morbidelli, R.: Antecedent wetness conditions based on ERS scatterometer data, Journal of
1220 Hydrology, 364, 73–87, 2009.

Brocca, L., Hasenauer, S., Lacava, T., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Wagner, W., A, D., Matgen, P., Martínez-Fernández, J., Llorens, P., Latron, J., Martin, C., and Bittelli, M.: Soil moisture estimation through ASCAT and AMSR-E sensors: An intercomparison and validation study across Europe, Remote Sensing of Environment, 115, 3390–3408, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.08.003, 2011.

1225   Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., Moramarco, T., Hahn, S., Hasenauer, S., Kidd, R., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., and Levizzani, V.: Soil as a natural rain gauge: Estimating global rainfall from satellite soil moisture data, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119, 5128–5141, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014jd021489, 2014a.

Brocca, L., Zucco, G., Mittelbach, H., Moramarco, T., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Absolute versus temporal anomaly and percent of saturation soil moisture spatial variability for six networks worldwide, Water Resources Research, 50, 5560–5576, https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015684, 2014b.

1230   Brocca, L., Massari, C., Ciabatta, L., Moramarco, T., Penna, D., Zuecco, G., Pianezzola, L., Borga, M., Matgen, P., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Rainfall estimation from in situ soil moisture observations at several sites in Europe: an evaluation of the SM2RAIN algorithm, Journal of Hydrology and Hydromechanics, 63, 201–209, https://doi.org/10.1515/johh-2015-0016, 2015.

Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., Massari, C., Camici, S., and Tarpanelli, A.: Soil Moisture for Hydrological Applications: Open Questions and New Opportunities, Water, 9, 140, https://doi.org/10.3390/w9020140, 2017.

1235   Calvet, J.-C., Fritz, N., Froissard, F., Suquia, D., Petitpa, A., and Piguet, B.: In situ soil moisture observations for the CAL/VAL of SMOS: the SMOSMANIA network, pp. 1196–1199, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2007.4423019, 2007.

Calvet, J.-C., Fritz, N., Berne, C., Piguet, B., Maurel, W., and Meurey, C.: Deriving pedotransfer functions for soil quartz fraction in southern France from reverse modeling, SOIL, 2, 615–629, https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2-615-2016, 2016.

Cammalleri, C., Micale, F., and Vogt, J.: On the value of combining different modelled soil moisture products for European drought moni-
1240   toring, Journal of Hydrology, 525, 547–558, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.04.021, 2015.

Campo, L., Castelli, F., Caparrini, F., and Entekhabi, D.: Production of a 5-years Dataset of Soil Moisture Maps on Italian Territory with an Operational Algorithm, European Water, 35, 45–56, 2011.

Canisius, F.: Calibration of Casselman, Ontario Soil Moisture Monitoring Network, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, ON, 37pp, 2011.

1245   Capello, G., Biddoccu, M., Ferraris, S., and Cavallo, E.: Effects of Tractor Passes on Hydrological and Soil Erosion Processes in Tilled and Grassed Vineyards, Water, 11, 2118, https://doi.org/10.3390/w11102118, 2019.

Castell, N., Dauge, F. R., Schneider, P., Vogt, M., Lerner, U., Fishbain, B., Broday, D., and Bartonova, A.: Can commercial low-cost sensor platforms contribute to air quality monitoring and exposure estimates?, Environment International, 99, 293–302, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.12.007, 2017.

1250   Chawla, S., Bachhtey, S., Gupta, V., Sharma, S., Seth, S., Gandhi, T., Varshney, S., Mehta, S., and Jha, R.: Low Cost Soil Moisture Sensors and their Application in Automatic Irrigation System, p. 4, 2019.

Chen, F., Crow, W. T., Colliander, A., Cosh, M. H., Jackson, T. J., Bindlish, R., Reichle, R. H., Chan, S. K., Bosch, D. D., Starks, P. J., Goodrich, D. C., and Seyfried, M. S.: Application of Triple Collocation in Ground-Based Validation of Soil Moisture Active/Passive (SMAP) Level 2 Data Products, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 10, 489–502,
1255   https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2016.2569998, 2017.

Chen, N., Xiang, Z., and Wang, C.: Integrated open geospatial web service enabled cyber-physical information infrastructure for precision agriculture monitoring, Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 111, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2014.12.009, 2015a.

Chen, N., Xiao, C., Pu, F., Wang, X., Wang, C., Wang, Z., and Gong, J.: Cyber-Physical Geographical Information Service-Enabled Control of Diverse In-Situ Sensors, Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 15, 2565–92, https://doi.org/10.3390/s150202565, 2015b.

1260 Chen, X., Su, Y., Liao, J., Shang, J., Dong, T., Wang, C., Liu, W., Zhou, G., and Liu, L.: Detecting significant decreasing trends of land surface soil moisture in eastern China during the past three decades (1979–2010), Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 121, 5177–5192, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024676, 2016.

Chen, Y., Sun, L., Wang, W., and Pei, Z.: Application of Sentinel 2 data for drought monitoring in Texas, America, in: 2019 8th International Conference on Agro-Geoinformatics (Agro-Geoinformatics), pp. 1–4, https://doi.org/10.1109/Agro-Geoinformatics.2019.8820491, 2019.

1265 Chen, Y., Feng, X., and Fu, B.: A new dataset of satellite observation-based global surface soil moisture covering 2003–2018, Earth System Science Data Discussions, 2020, 1–46, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-59, 2020.

Chen, Y., Feng, X., and Fu, B.: An improved global remote-sensing-based surface soil moisture (RSSSM) dataset covering 2003–2018, Earth System Science Data, 13, 1–31, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-1-2021, https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/13/1/2021/, 2021.

Chew, C. and Small, E.: Estimating inundation extent using CYGNSS data: A conceptual modeling study, Remote Sensing of Environment, 1270 246, 111 869, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111869, 2020.

Colliander, A., Jackson, T., Bindlish, R., Chan, S., Das, N., Kim, S., Cosh, M., Dunbar, R., Dang, L., Pashaian, L., Asanuma, J., Aida, K., Berg, A., Rowlandson, T., Bosch, D., Caldwell, T., Caylor, K., Goodrich, D., al Jassar, H., Lopez-Baeza, E., Martínez-Fernández, J., González-Zamora, A., Livingston, S., McNairn, H., Pacheco, A., Moghaddam, M., Montzka, C., Notarnicola, C., Niedrist, G., Pellarin, T., Prueger, J., Pulliainen, J., Rautiainen, K., Ramos, J., Seyfried, M., Starks, P., Su, Z., Zeng, Y., van der Velde, R., Thibeault, M., Dorigo, W.,
1275 Vreugdenhil, M., Walker, J., Wu, X., Monerris, A., O'Neill, P., Entekhabi, D., Njoku, E., and Yueh, S.: Validation of SMAP surface soil moisture products with core validation sites, Remote Sensing of Environment, 191, 215–231, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.01.021, 2017.

Cook, D. R.: Soil temperature and moisture profile (STAMP) system handbook, Tech. rep., DOE Office of Science Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Program . . . , 2016a.

1280 Cook, D. R.: Soil Water and Temperature System (SWATS) Instrument Handbook, Tech. rep., DOE Office of Science Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Program . . . , 2016b.

Cook, D. R. and Sullivan, R. C.: Surface Energy Balance System (SEBS) Instrument Handbook, Tech. rep., DOE Office of Science Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Program . . . , 2018.

Coopersmith, E. J., Cosh, M. H., Bindlish, R., and Bell, J.: Comparing AMSR-E soil moisture estimates to the extended record of the U.S. 1285 Climate Reference Network (USCRN), Advances in Water Resources, 85, 79–85, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2015.09.003, 2015.

Crow, W. T., Berg, A. A., Cosh, M. H., Loew, A., Mohanty, B. P., Panciera, R., de Rosnay, P., Ryu, D., and Walker, J. P.: Upscaling sparse ground-based soil moisture observations for the validation of coarse-resolution satellite soil moisture products: UPSCALING SOIL MOISTURE, Reviews of Geophysics, 50, https://doi.org/10.1029/2011RG000372, [Online; accessed 2020-07-07], 2012.

Cui, C., Xu, J., Zeng, J., Chen, K.-S., Bai, X., Lu, H., Chen, Q., and Zhao, T.: Soil Moisture Mapping from Satellites: An Intercomparison 1290 of SMAP, SMOS, FY3B, AMSR2, and ESA CCI over Two Dense Network Regions at Different Spatial Scales, Remote Sensing, 10, 33, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10010033, 2017.

Dabrowska-Zielinska, K., Musial, J., Malinska, A., Budzynska, M., Gurdak, R., Kiryla, W., Bartold, M., and Grzybowski, P.: Soil Moisture in the Biebrza Wetlands Retrieved from Sentinel-1 Imagery, Remote Sensing, 10, 1979, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10121979, 2018.

de Jeu, R. and Dorigo, W.: On the importance of satellite observed soil moisture, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and
    Geoinformation, 45, 107–109, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.10.007, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed
    Soil Moisture - Part 1, 2016.

de Jeu, R. A., Holmes, T. R., Parinussa, R. M., and Owe, M.: A spatially coherent global soil moisture product with improved temporal reso-
    lution, Journal of Hydrology, 516, 284–296, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.02.015, determination of soil moisture: Measurements
    and theoretical approaches, 2014.

de Rosnay, P., Muñoz, J., Sabater, C. A., Lawrence, H., Isaksen, L., and English, S.: ECMWF Final Report on SMOS brightness temperature
    activities over land: Monitoring and Data Assimilation, 2019.

Deng, Y., Wang, S., Bai, X., Luo, G., Wu, L., Chen, F., Wang, J., Li, C., Yang, Y., Hu, Z., Tian, S., and Lu, Q.: Vegetation green-
    ing intensified soil drying in some semi-arid and arid areas of the world, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 292-293, 108 103,
    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.108103, 2020a.

Deng, Y., Wang, S., Bai, X., Luo, G., Wu, L., Chen, F., Wang, J., Li, Q., Li, C., Yang, Y., Hu, Z., and Tian, S.: Spatiotemporal dy-
    namics of soil moisture in the karst areas of China based on reanalysis and observations data, Journal of Hydrology, 585, 124 744,
    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124744, 2020b.

Deng, Y., Wang, S., Bai, X., Wu, L., Cao, Y., Li, H., Wang, M., Li, C., Yang, Y., Hu, Z., Tian, S., and Lu, Q.: Comparison of soil moisture
    products from microwave remote sensing, land model, and reanalysis using global ground observations, Hydrological Processes, 34,
    836–851, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13636, 2020c.

Dente, L., Su, Z., and Wen, J.: Validation of SMOS soil moisture products over the Maqu and Twente regions, Sensors, 12, 9965–9986, 2012.

Dente, L., Vekerdy, Z., de Jeu, R., and Su, Z.: Seasonality and autocorrelation of satellite-derived soil moisture products, International Journal
    of Remote Sensing, 34, 3231–3247, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2012.716923, 2013.

Dirmeyer, P. A., Wu, J., Norton, H. E., Dorigo, W. A., Quiring, S. M., Ford, T. W., Santanello, Joseph A., J., Bosilovich, M. G., Ek, M. B.,
    Koster, R. D., Balsamo, G., and Lawrence, D. M.: Confronting Weather and Climate Models with Observational Data from Soil Moisture
    Networks over the United States, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 17, 1049–1067, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0196.1, 2016.

Domínguez-Niño, J. M., Bogena, H. R., Huisman, J. A., Schilling, B., and Casadesús, J.: On the Accuracy of Factory-Calibrated Low-Cost
    Soil Water Content Sensors, Sensors, 19, 3101, https://doi.org/10.3390/s19143101, 2019.

Dong, J., Crow, W. T., Tobin, K. J., Cosh, M. H., Bosch, D. D., Starks, P. J., Seyfried, M., and Collins, C. H.: Comparison of microwave
    remote sensing and land surface modeling for surface soil moisture climatology estimation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 242, 111 756,
    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111756, 2020.

Dorigo, W., van Oevelen, P., Wagner, W., Drusch, M., Mecklenburg, S., Robock, A., and Jackson, T.: A New International Network for in
    Situ Soil Moisture Data, EOS, 92, 141–142, https://doi.org/10.1029/2011EO170001, 2011a.

Dorigo, W., Xaver, A., Vreugdenhil, M., Gruber, A., Dostálová, A., Sanchis-Dufau, A. D., Zamojski, D., Cordes, C., Wagner, W., and Drusch,
    M.: Global Automated Quality Control of In Situ Soil Moisture Data from the International Soil Moisture Network, Vadose Zone Journal,
    12, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2012.0097, 2013.

Dorigo, W., Gruber, A., Jeu, R. D., Wagner, W., Stacke, T., Loew, A., Albergel, C., Brocca, L., Chung, D., Parinussa, R., and Kidd, R.:
    Evaluation of the ESA CCI soil moisture product using ground-based observations, Remote Sensing of Environment, 162, 380–395,
    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.07.023, 2015.

Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., Albergel, C., Albrecht, F., Balsamo, G., Brocca, L., Chung, D., Ertl, M., Forkel, M., Gruber, A., Haas, E.,
    Hamer, P. D., Hirschi, M., Ikonen, J., de Jeu, R., Kidd, R., Lahoz, W., Liu, Y. Y., Miralles, D., Mistelbauer, T., Nicolai-Shaw, N.,

Parinussa, R., Pratola, C., Reimer, C., van der Schalie, R., Seneviratne, S. I., Smolander, T., and Lecomte, P.: ESA CCI Soil Moisture for improved Earth system understanding: State-of-the art and future directions, Remote Sensing of Environment, 203, 185–215, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.07.001, 2017.

1335 Dorigo, W. A., Scipal, K., Parinussa, R. M., Liu, Y. Y., Wagner, W., de Jeu, R. A. M., and Naeimi, V.: Error characterisation of global active and passive microwave soil moisture datasets, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 14, 2605–2616, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-14-2605-2010, 2010.

Dorigo, W. A., Wagner, W., Hohensinn, R., Hahn, S., Paulik, C., Xaver, A., Gruber, A., Drusch, M., Mecklenburg, S., van Oevelen, P., Robock, A., and Jackson, T.: The International Soil Moisture Network: a data hosting facility for global in situ soil moisture measurements,

1340 Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 15, 1675–1698, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-1675-2011, 2011b.

Draper, C. and Reichle, R. H.: Assimilation of Satellite Soil Moisture for Improved Atmospheric Reanalyses, Monthly Weather Review, 147, 2163–2188, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-18-0393.1, 2019.

Du, J., Kimball, J. S., and Jones, L. A.: Passive Microwave Remote Sensing of Soil Moisture Based on Dynamic Vegetation Scattering Properties for AMSR-E, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 54, 597–608, 2016.

1345 Ebrahimi, M., Alavipanah, S. K., Hamzeh, S., Amiraslani, F., Neysani Samany, N., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Exploiting the synergy between SMAP and SMOS to improve brightness temperature simulations and soil moisture retrievals in arid regions, Journal of Hydrology, 557, 740–752, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.12.051, 2018.

Ebrahimi-Khusfi, M., Alavipanah, S. K., Hamzeh, S., Amiraslani, F., Neysani Samany, N., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Comparison of soil moisture retrieval algorithms based on the synergy between SMAP and SMOS-IC, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and

1350 Geoinformation, 67, 148–160, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2017.12.005, 2018.

Ebtehaj, A. and Bras, R. L.: A physically constrained inversion for high-resolution passive microwave retrieval of soil moisture and vegetation water content in L-band, Remote Sensing of Environment, 233, 111 346, 2019.

Enenkel, M., Reimer, C., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., Pfeil, I., Parinussa, R., and De Jeu, R.: Combining satellite observations to develop a global soil moisture product for near-real-time applications, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 20, 4191–4208, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-

1355 20-4191-2016, 2016.

Entekhabi, D., Njoku, E. G., O'Neill, P. E., Kellogg, K. H., Crow, W. T., Edelstein, W. N., Entin, J. K., Goodman, S. D., Jackson, T. J., Johnson, J., Kimball, J., Piepmeier, J. R., Koster, R. D., Martin, N., McDonald, K. C., Moghaddam, M., Moran, S., Reichle, R., Shi, J. C., Spencer, M. W., Thurman, S. W., Tsang, L., and Van Zyl, J.: The Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) Mission, Proceedings of the IEEE, 98, 704–716, https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2010.2043918, 2010.

1360 Erlingis, J. M., Rodell, M., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Li, B., Kumar, S. V., Famiglietti, J. S., Granger, S. L., Hurley, J. V., Liu, P.-W., and Mocko, D. M.: A High-Resolution Land Data Assimilation System Optimized for the Western United States, JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association, https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12910, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1752-1688.12910, 2021.

Eroglu, O., Kurum, M., Boyd, D., and Gurbuz, A. C.: High spatio-temporal resolution CYGNSS soil moisture estimates using artificial neural

1365 networks, Remote Sensing, 11, 2272, 2019.

Esposito, G., Matano, F., and Scepi, G.: Analysis of Increasing Flash Flood Frequency in the Densely Urbanized Coastline of the Campi Flegrei Volcanic Area, Italy, Frontiers in Earth Science, 6, 63, https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2018.00063, 2018.

Fairbairn, D., Barbu, A. L., Mahfouf, J.-F., Calvet, J.-C., and Gelati, E.: Comparing the ensemble and extended Kalman filters for in situ soil moisture assimilation with contrasting conditions, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 19, 4811–4830, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4811-2015, 2015.

Fairbairn, D., de Rosnay, P., and Browne, P. A.: The New Stand-Alone Surface Analysis at ECMWF: Implications for Land–Atmosphere DA Coupling, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 20, 2023–2042, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-19-0074.1, 2019.

Famiglietti, J. S., Ryu, D., Berg, A. A., Rodell, M., and Jackson, T. J.: Field observations of soil moisture variability across scales: SOIL MOISTURE VARIABILITY ACROSS SCALES, Water Resources Research, 44, https://doi.org/10.1029/2006WR005804, [Online; accessed 2020-06-18], 2008.

Fang, B., Lakshmi, V., Bindlish, R., and Jackson, T.: AMSR2 Soil Moisture Downscaling Using Temperature and Vegetation Data, Remote Sensing, 10, 1575, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10101575, 2018.

Fang, B., Lakshmi, V., Bindlish, R., Jackson, T. J., and Liu, P.-W.: Downscaling and Validation of SMAP Radiometer Soil Moisture in CONUS, in: IGARSS 2019-2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 6194–6197, IEEE, 2019.

Fang, B., Lakshmi, V., Bindlish, R., Jackson, T. J., and Liu, P.-W.: Evaluation and validation of a high spatial resolution satellite soil moisture product over the Continental United States, Journal of Hydrology, 588, 125 043, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125043, 2020.

Fang, B., Kansara, P., Dandridge, C., and Lakshmi, V.: Drought monitoring using high spatial resolution soil moisture data over Australia in 2015–2019, Journal of Hydrology, 594, 125 960, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.125960, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002216942100007X, 2021a.

Fang, B., Lakshmi, V., Cosh, M. H., and Hain, C.: Very High Spatial Resolution Downscaled SMAP Radiometer Soil Moisture in the CONUS Using VIIRS/MODIS Data, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 14, 4946–4965, https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2021.3076026, 2021b.

FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISS-CAS/JRC: Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.1). FAO, Rome,Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria., http://www.fao.org/3/a-aq361e.pdf, 2009.

Fascetti, F., Pierdicca, N., Pulvirenti, L., Crapolicchio, R., and Sabater, J. M.: Soil moisture comparison through triple and quadruple collocation between: Metop, ERA, SMOS and in-situ data, in: 2014 IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 2451–2454, 2014.

Fascetti, F., Pierdicca, N., Crapolicchio, R., Pulvirenti, L., and Muoz-Sabater, J.: An assessment of SMOS version 6.20 products through Triple and Quadruple Collocation techniques considering ASCAT, ERA/Interim LAND, ISMNand SMAP soil moisture data, in: 2016 14th Specialist Meeting on Microwave Radiometry and Remote Sensing of the Environment (MicroRad), pp. 91–94, 2016.

Fascetti, F., Pierdicca, N., Pulvirenti, L., Crapolicchio, R., and Muñoz-Sabater, J.: A comparison of ASCAT and SMOS soil moisture retrievals over Europe and Northern Africa from 2010 to 2013, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 45, 135–142, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.09.008, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture - Part 1, 2016.

Fascetti, F., Pierdicca, N., Pulvirenti, L., and Crapolicchio, R.: Error characterization of SMOS, ASCAT, SMAP, ERA and ISMN soil moisture products: Automatic detection of cross-correlation error through extended quadruple collocation, in: 2017 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), pp. 4154–4157, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2017.8127916, 2017.

Fernandez-Moran, R., Al-Yaari, A., Mialon, A., Mahmoodi, A., Al Bitar, A., De Lannoy, G., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Lopez-Baeza, E., Kerr, Y., and Wigneron, J.-P.: SMOS-IC: An Alternative SMOS Soil Moisture and Vegetation Optical Depth Product, Remote Sensing, 9, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9050457, 2017a.

Fernandez-Moran, R., Wigneron, J.-P., De Lannoy, G., Lopez-Baeza, E., Parrens, M., Mialon, A., Mahmoodi, A., Al-Yaari, A., Bircher, S., Al Bitar, A., Richaume, P., and Kerr, Y.: A new calibration of the effective scattering albedo and soil roughness parameters in the SMOS SM retrieval algorithm, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 62, 27–38, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2017.05.013, 2017b.

1410 Flammini, A., Corradini, C., Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Picciafuoco, T., and Giráldez, J. V.: Experimental analyses of the evaporation dynamics in bare soils under natural conditions, Water resources management, 32, 1153–1166, 2018a.

Flammini, A., Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Picciafuoco, T., Corradini, C., and Govindaraju, R. S.: Reassessment of a semi-analytical field-scale infiltration model through experiments under natural rainfall events, Journal of Hydrology, 565, 835–845, 2018b.

Foucras, M., Zribi, M., Albergel, C., Baghdadi, N., Calvet, J.-C., and Pellarin, T.: Estimating 500-m Resolution Soil Moisture Using Sentinel-1415 1 and Optical Data Synergy, Water, 12, 866, https://doi.org/10.3390/w12030866, 2020.

Fritz, S., Fonte, C., and See, L.: The Role of Citizen Science in Earth Observation, Remote Sensing, 9, 357, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9040357, 2017.

Fuchsberger, J., Kirchengast, G., and Kabas, T.: WegenerNet high-resolution weather and climate data 2007 to 2019, Earth System Science Data Discussions, 2020, 1–49, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-302, 2020.

1420 Galle, S., Manuela, G., Peugeot, C., Bouzou-Moussa, I., Cappelaere, B., Demarty, J., Mougin, E., Panthou, G., Adjomayi, P., Agbossou, E., Abdramane, B., Boucher, M., Cohard, J.-M., Descloitres, M., Descroix, L., Diawara, M., Do, M., Favreau, G., Fabrice, G., and Wilcox, C.: AMMA-CATCH, a critical zone observatory in West Africa monitoring a region in transition, Vadose Zone Journal, 17, 1–24, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2018.03.0062, 2018.

Gao, L., Sadeghi, M., and Ebtehaj, A.: Microwave retrievals of soil moisture and vegetation optical depth with improved resolution 1425 using a combined constrained inversion algorithm: Application for SMAP satellite, Remote Sensing of Environment, 239, 111 662, https://doi.org/h10.1016/j.rse.2020.111662, 2020.

Gao, L., Sadeghi, M., Feldman, A. F., and Ebtehaj, A.: A Spatially Constrained Multichannel Algorithm for Inversion of a First-Order Microwave Emission Model at L-Band, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, pp. 1–13, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2020.2987490, 2020.

1430 Gardner, W. and Kirkham, D.: Determination of soil moisture by neutron scattering, Soil Science, 73, 391–401, 1952.

GCOS: The Global Climate Observing System, https://gcos.wmo.int/en/gcos-implementation-plan, 2016.

Ghilain, N., Arboleda, A., Batelaan, O., Ardö, J., Trigo, I., Barrios, J.-M., and Gellens-Meulenberghs, F.: A new retrieval algorithm for soil moisture index from thermal infrared sensor on-board geostationary satellites over Europe and Africa and its validation, Remote Sensing, 11, 1968, 2019.

1435 González-Teruel, J., Torres-Sánchez, R., Blaya-Ros, P., Toledo-Moreo, A., Jiménez-Buendía, M., and Soto-Valles, F.: Design and Calibration of a Low-Cost SDI-12 Soil Moisture Sensor, Sensors, 19, 491, https://doi.org/10.3390/s19030491, 2019.

González-Zamora, A., Sánchez, N., Gumuzzio, A., Piles, M., Olmedo, E., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Validation of SMOS L2 and L3 soil moisture products over the Duero Basin at different spatial scales, ISPRS - International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, XL-7/W3, 1183–1188, https://doi.org/10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-7-W3-1183-2015, 2015.

1440 González-Zamora, A., Sánchez, N., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Validation of Aquarius Soil Moisture Products Over the Northwest of Spain: A Comparison With SMOS, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 9, 2763–2769, 2016.

González-Zamora, Á., Sanchez, N., Pablos, M., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: CCI soil moisture assessment with SMOS soil moisture and in situ data under different environmental conditions and spatial scales in Spain, Remote Sensing of Environment, 225, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.02.010, 2018.

1445 González-Zamora, Á., Sánchez, N., Pablos, M., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: CCI soil moisture assessment with SMOS soil moisture and in situ data under different environmental conditions and spatial scales in Spain, Remote Sensing of Environment, 225, 469–482, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.02.010, 2019.

Grainger, A.: Citizen Observatories and the New Earth Observation Science, Remote Sensing, 9, 153, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9020153, 2017.

1450 Greifeneder, F., Khamala, E., Sendabo, D., Wagner, W., Zebisch, M., Farah, H., and Notarnicola, C.: Detection of soil moisture anomalies based on Sentinel-1, Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 112, 75–82, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2018.11.009, 18th Water-Net/WARFSA/GWPSA Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Development and Management: Innovative Technological Advances for Water Security in Eastern and Southern Africa., 2019.

Greifeneder, F., Notarnicola, C., and Wagner, W.: A Machine Learning-Based Approach for Surface Soil Moisture Estimations with Google

1455 Earth Engine, Remote Sensing, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13112099, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/13/11/2099, 2021.

Grillakis, M. G., Koutroulis, A. G., Alexakis, D. D., Polykretis, C., and Daliakopoulos, I. N.: Regionalizing Root-Zone Soil Moisture Estimates From ESA CCI Soil Water Index Using Machine Learning and Information on Soil, Vegetation, and Climate, Water Resources Research, 57, e2020WR029 249, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR029249, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020WR029249, e2020WR029249 2020WR029249, 2021.

1460 Gruber, A., Dorigo, W., Zwieback, S., Xaver, A., and Wagner, W.: Characterizing Coarse-Scale Representativeness of in situ Soil Moisture Measurements from the International Soil Moisture Network, Vadose Zone Journal, 12, vzj2012.0170, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2012.0170, 2013.

Gruber, A., Paloscia, S., Santi, E., Notarnicola, C., Pasolli, L., Smolander, T., Pulliainen, J., Mittelbach, H., Dorigo, W., and Wagner, W.: Performance inter-comparison of soil moisture retrieval models for the MetOp-A ASCAT instrument, in: 2014 IEEE Geoscience and

1465 Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 2455–2458, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2014.6946969, 2014.

Gruber, A., Crow, W., Dorigo, W., and Wagner, W.: The potential of 2D Kalman filtering for soil moisture data assimilation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 171, 137–148, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.10.019, 2015.

Gruber, A., Su, C.-H., Crow, W. T., Zwieback, S., Dorigo, W. A., and Wagner, W.: Estimating error cross-correlations in soil moisture data sets using extended collocation analysis, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 121, 1208–1219,

1470 https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024027, 2016.

Gruber, A., Dorigo, W. A., Crow, W., and Wagner, W.: Triple Collocation-Based Merging of Satellite Soil Moisture Retrievals, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 55, 6780–6792, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2017.2734070, 2017.

Gruber, A., Crow, W. T., and Dorigo, W. A.: Assimilation of Spatially Sparse In Situ Soil Moisture Networks into a Continuous Model Domain, Water Resources Research, 54, 1353–1367, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017WR021277, 2018.

1475 Gruber, A., De Lannoy, G., and Crow, W.: A Monte Carlo based adaptive Kalman filtering framework for soil moisture data assimilation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 228, 105–114, 2019a.

Gruber, A., Scanlon, T., van der Schalie, R., Wagner, W., and Dorigo, W.: Evolution of the ESA CCI Soil Moisture climate data records and their underlying merging methodology, Earth System Science Data, 11, 717–739, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-717-2019, 2019b.

Gruber, A., De Lannoy, G., Albergel, C., Al-Yaari, A., Brocca, L., Calvet, J.-C., Colliander, A., Cosh, M., Crow, W., Dorigo, W., Draper, C., Hirschi, M., Kerr, Y., Konings, A., Lahoz, W., McColl, K., Montzka, C., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Peng, J., Reichle, R., Richaume, P., Rüdiger, C., Scanlon, T., van der Schalie, R., Wigneron, J.-P., and Wagner, W.: Validation practices for satellite soil moisture retrievals: What are (the) errors?, Remote Sensing of Environment, 244, 111 806, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111806, 2020.

Guevara, M. and Vargas, R.: Downscaling satellite soil moisture using geomorphometry and machine learning, PloS one, 14, e0219 639, 2019.

Guevara, M., Taufer, M., and Vargas, R.: Gap-free global annual soil moisture: 15 km grids for 1991–2018, Earth System Science Data, 13, 1711–1735, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-1711-2021, https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/13/1711/2021/, 2021.

Gumbricht, T.: Detecting Trends in Wetland Extent from MODIS Derived Soil Moisture Estimates, Remote Sensing, 10, 611, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10040611, 2018.

Gumbricht, T., Roman-Cuesta, R. M., Verchot, L., Herold, M., Wittmann, F., Householder, E., Herold, N., and Murdiyarso, D.: An expert system model for mapping tropical wetlands and peatlands reveals South America as the largest contributor, Global Change Biology, 23, 3581–3599, https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13689, 2017.

Gupta, D. K., Srivastava, P. K., Singh, A., Petropoulos, G. P., Stathopoulos, N., and Prasad, R.: SMAP Soil Moisture Product Assessment over Wales, U.K., Using Observations from the WSMN Ground Monitoring Network, Sustainability, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116019, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/11/6019, 2021.

Hagan, D. F. T., Wang, G., Kim, S., Parinussa, R. M., Liu, Y., Ullah, W., Bhatti, A. S., Ma, X., Jiang, T., and Su, B.: Maximizing Temporal Correlations in Long-Term Global Satellite Soil Moisture Data-Merging, Remote Sensing, 12, 2164, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12132164, 2020.

Hajdu, I., Yule, I., Bretherton, M., Singh, R., and Hedley, C.: Field performance assessment and calibration of multi-depth AquaCheck capacitance-based soil moisture probes under permanent pasture for hill country soils, Agricultural Water Management, 217, 332–345, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.03.002, 2019.

Han, M., Lu, H., and Yang, K.: Development of passive microwave retrieval algorithm for estimation of surface soil temperature from AMSR-E data, in: 2016 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), pp. 1671–1674, 2016.

Han, M., Lu, H., Yang, K., Qin, J., Chen, Y., Zhao, L., and Lazhu: A surface soil temperature retrieval algorithm based on AMSR-E multi-frequency brightness temperatures, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 38, 6735–6754, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2017.1363438, 2017.

Han, Y., Bai, X., Shao, W., and Wang, J.: Retrieval of Soil Moisture by Integrating Sentinel-1A and MODIS Data over Agricultural Fields, Water, 12, https://doi.org/10.3390/w12061726, 2020.

Hartmann, A., Gleeson, T., Rosolem, R., Pianosi, F., Wada, Y., and Wagener, T.: A large-scale simulation model to assess karstic groundwater recharge over Europe and the Mediterranean, Geoscientific Model Development, 8, 1729–1746, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-1729-2015, 2015.

He, L., Chen, J. M., Mostovoy, G., and Gonsamo, A.: Soil Moisture Active Passive Improves Global Soil Moisture Simulation in a Land Surface Scheme and Reveals Strong Irrigation Signals Over Farmlands, Geophysical Research Letters, 48, e2021GL092 658, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL092658, https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021GL092658, e2021GL092658 2021GL092658, 2021.

1515 Helgert, S. and Khodayar, S.: Improvement of the soil-atmosphere interactions and subsequent heavy precipitation modelling by enhanced initialization using remotely sensed 1 km soil moisture information, Remote Sensing of Environment, 246, 111 812, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111812, 2020.

Herbert, C., Pablos, M., Vall-llossera, M., Camps, A., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Analyzing Spatio-Temporal Factors to Estimate the Response Time between SMOS and In-Situ Soil Moisture at Different Depths, Remote Sensing, 12, 2614,
1520 https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12162614, 2020.

Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G., de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Villaume, S., and Thépaut,
1525 J.-N.: The ERA5 Global Reanalysis, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, n/a, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803, 2020.

Hirschi, M., Mueller, B., Dorigo, W., and Seneviratne, S.: Using remotely sensed soil moisture for land–atmosphere coupling diagnostics: The role of surface vs. root-zone soil moisture variability, Remote Sensing of Environment, 154, 246–252, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.08.030, 2014.

Hoang, K. O. and Lu, M.: Impacts of temperature effect removal on rainfall estimation from soil water content by using SM2RAIN algorithm,
1530 IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 344, 012 046, https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/344/1/012046, 2019.

Hollinger, S. and Isard, S.: A Soil Moisture Climatology of Illinois, Journal of Climate, 7, 822–833, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1994)007<0822:ASMCOI>2.0.CO;2, 1994.

Hottenstein, J. D., Ponce-Campos, G. E., Moguel-Yanes, J., and Moran, M. S.: Impact of Varying Storm Intensity and Consecutive Dry Days on Grassland Soil Moisture, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 16, 106–117, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0057.1, 2015.

1535 Hu, T., Zhao, T., Zhao, K., and Shi, J.: A continuous global record of near-surface soil freeze/thaw status from AMSR-E and AMSR2 data, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 40, 6993–7016, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2019.1597307, 2019.

Ikonen, J., Vehviläinen, J., Rautiainen, K., Smolander, T., Lemmetyinen, J., Bircher, S., and Pulliainen, J.: The Sodankylä in-situ soil moisture observation network: an example application to Earth Observation data product evaluation, GID, 5, 599–629, 2015.

Ikonen, J., Smolander, T., Rautiainen, K., Cohen, J., Lemmetyinen, J., Salminen, M., and Pulliainen, J.: Spatially distributed evaluation of
1540 ESA CCI Soil Moisture products in a northern boreal forest environment, Geosciences, 8, 51, 2018.

ISMN: ISMN stated terms and conditions for data use, https://ismn.geo.tuwien.ac.at/en/terms-and-conditions/, last accessed 20 August 2020.

J., L.: 2011 Installation Report for AAFC- SAGES Soil Moisture Stations in Kenaston, SK. Agriculture, 2011.

Jackson, T., Cosh, M., Bindlish, R., Starks, P., Bosch, D., Seyfried, M., Goodrich, D., Moran, M., and Du, J.: Validation of Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer Soil Moisture Products, Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on, 48, 4256–4272,
1545 https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2010.2051035, 2011.

Jalilvand, E., Tajrishy, M., Brocca, L., Massari, C., Ghazi Zadeh Hashemi, S., and Ciabatta, L.: Estimating the drainage rate from surface soil moisture drydowns: Application of DfD model to in situ soil moisture data, Journal of Hydrology, 565, 489–501, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.08.035, 2018.

Jensen, K. and Refsgaard, J.: HOBE: The Danish Hydrological Observatory, Vadose Zone Journal, 17,
1550 https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2018.03.0059, 2018.

Ji, P., Yuan, X., and Liang, X.-Z.: Do Lateral Flows Matter for the Hyperresolution Land Surface Modeling?, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 122, 12,077–12,092, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027366, 2017.

Jin, R., Li, X., Yan, B., Li, X., Luo, W., Ma, M., Guo, J., Kang, J., Zhu, Z., and Zhao, S.: A Nested Ecohydrological Wireless Sensor Network for Capturing the Surface Heterogeneity in the Midstream Areas of the Heihe River Basin, China, IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters, 11, 2015–2019, https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2014.2319085, 2014.

Kang, C. S., Kanniah, K. D., and Kerr, Y. H.: Calibration of SMOS Soil Moisture Retrieval Algorithm: A Case of Tropical Site in Malaysia, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 57, 3827–3839, 2019.

Kang, J., Li, X., Jin, R., Ge, Y., Wang, J., and Wang, J.: Hybrid Optimal Design of the Eco-Hydrological Wireless Sensor Network in the Middle Reach of the Heihe River Basin, China, Sensors, https://doi.org/10.3390/s141019095, 2014.

Kapilaratne, R. J. and Lu, M.: Automated general temperature correction method for dielectric soil moisture sensors, Journal of Hydrology, 551, 203–216, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.05.050, investigation of Coastal Aquifers, 2017.

Karthikeyan, L., Pan, M., Wanders, N., Kumar, D. N., and Wood, E. F.: Four decades of microwave satellite soil moisture observations: Part 2. Product validation and inter-satellite comparisons, Advances in Water Resources, 109, 236–252, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.09.010, 2017.

Kędzior, M. and Zawadzki, J.: Comparative study of soil moisture estimations from SMOS satellite mission, GLDAS database, and cosmic-ray neutrons measurements at COSMOS station in Eastern Poland, Geoderma, 283, 21–31, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.07.023, 2016.

Kerr, Y., Al-Yaari, A., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Parrens, M., Molero, B., Leroux, D., Bircher, S., Mahmoodi, A., Mialon, A., Richaume, P., Delwart, S., Al Bitar, A., Pellarin, T., Bindlish, R., Jackson, T., Rüdiger, C., Waldteufel, P., Mecklenburg, S., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Overview of SMOS performance in terms of global soil moisture monitoring after six years in operation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 40–63, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.042, special Issue: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission - Achievements and Applications, 2016.

Khaki, M., Hoteit, I., Kuhn, M., Forootan, E., and Awange, J.: Assessing data assimilation frameworks for using multi-mission satellite products in a hydrological context, Science of The Total Environment, 647, 1031–1043, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.032, 2019.

Kim, H. and Lakshmi, V.: Use of Cyclone Global Navigation Satellite System (CyGNSS) Observations for Estimation of Soil Moisture, Geophysical Research Letters, 45, 8272–8282, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078923, 2018.

Kim, H., Parinussa, R., Konings, A. G., Wagner, W., Cosh, M. H., Lakshmi, V., Zohaib, M., and Choi, M.: Global-scale assessment and combination of SMAP with ASCAT (active) and AMSR2 (passive) soil moisture products, Remote Sensing of Environment, 204, 260–275, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.10.026, 2018.

Kim, K., Jung, S., and Lee, Y.: A Study for establishment of soil moisture station in mountain terrain (1): the representative analysis of soil moisture for construction of Cosmic-ray verification system, Journal of Korea Water Resources Association, 52, 51–60, 2019.

Kim, S., Liu, Y., Johnson, F. M., Parinussa, R. M., and Sharma, A.: A global comparison of alternate AMSR2 soil moisture products: Why do they differ?, Remote Sensing of Environment, 161, 43–62, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.02.002, 2015a.

Kim, S., Parinussa, R. M., Liu, Y. Y., Johnson, F. M., and Sharma, A.: A framework for combining multiple soil moisture retrievals based on maximizing temporal correlation, Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 6662–6670, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064981, 2015b.

Kim, S., Parinussa, R., Liu, Y., Johnson, F., and Sharma, A.: Merging Alternate Remotely-Sensed Soil Moisture Retrievals Using a Non-Static Model Combination Approach, Remote Sensing, 8, 518, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8060518, 2016.

Kim, S., Sharma, A., Liu, Y., and Young, S.: Rethinking Satellite Data Merging: From Averaging to SNR Optimization, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.14214035, 2021.

Kirchengast, G., Kabas, T., Leuprecht, A., Bichler, C., and Truhetz, H.: WegenerNet: A Pioneering High-Resolution Network for Monitoring Weather and Climate, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 95, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00161.1, 2014.

Kizito, F., Campbell, C., Campbell, G., Cobos, D., Teare, B., Carter, B., and Hopmans, J.: Frequency, electrical conductivity and temperature analysis of a low-cost capacitance soil moisture sensor, Journal of Hydrology, 352, 367–378, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.01.021, 2008.

Kojima, Y., Shigeta, R., Miyamoto, N., Shirahama, Y., Nishioka, K., Mizoguchi, M., and Kawahara, Y.: Low-Cost Soil Moisture Profile Probe Using Thin-Film Capacitors and a Capacitive Touch Sensor, Sensors, 16, 1292, https://doi.org/10.3390/s16081292, 2016.

Kolassa, J., Aires, F., Polcher, J., Prigent, C., Jimenez, C., and Pereira, J. M.: Soil moisture retrieval from multi-instrument observations: Information content analysis and retrieval methodology, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 118, 4847–4859, https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD018150, 2013.

Kolassa, J., Gentine, P., Prigent, C., Aires, F., and Alemohammad, S.: Soil moisture retrieval from AMSR-E and ASCAT microwave observation synergy. Part 2: Product evaluation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 195, 202–217, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.04.020, 2017.

Kolassa, J., Reichle, R., Liu, Q., Alemohammad, S., Gentine, P., Aida, K., Asanuma, J., Bircher, S., Caldwell, T., Colliander, A., et al.: Estimating surface soil moisture from SMAP observations using a Neural Network technique, Remote sensing of environment, 204, 43–59, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.10.045, 2018.

Kornelsen, K. C. and Coulibaly, P.: Root-zone soil moisture estimation using data-driven methods, Water Resources Research, 50, 2946–2962, https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR014127, 2014.

Kornelsen, K. C. and Coulibaly, P.: Reducing multiplicative bias of satellite soil moisture retrievals, Remote Sensing of Environment, 165, 109–122, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.04.031, 2015.

Kosmala, M., Wiggins, A., Swanson, A., and Simmons, B.: Assessing data quality in citizen science, Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 14, 551–560, https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1436, 2016.

Kovačević, J., Cvijetinović, Z., Stančić, N., Brodić, N., and Mihajlović, D.: New Downscaling Approach Using ESA CCI SM Products for Obtaining High Resolution Surface Soil Moisture, Remote Sensing, 12, 1119, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12071119, 2020.

Kovács, K. Z., Hemment, D., Woods, M., van der Velden, N. K., Xaver, A., Giesen, R. H., Burton, V. J., Garrett, N. L., Zappa, L., Long, D., Dobos, E., and Skalsky, R.: Citizen observatory based soil moisture monitoring – the GROW example, Hungarian Geographical Bulletin, 68, 119–139, https://doi.org/10.15201/hungeobull.68.2.2, 2019.

Krueger, E. S., Ochsner, T. E., and Quiring, S. M.: Development and Evaluation of Soil Moisture-Based Indices for Agricultural Drought Monitoring, Agronomy Journal, 111, 1392–1406, https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2018.09.0558, 2019.

Kumar, M. S., Chandra, T. R., Kumar, D. P., and Manikandan, M. S.: Monitoring moisture of soil using low cost homemade Soil moisture sensor and Arduino UNO, pp. 1–4, 2016 3rd International Conference on Advanced Computing and Communication Systems (ICACCS), IEEE, Coimbatore, India, https://doi.org/10.1109/ICACCS.2016.7586312, [Online; accessed 2020-06-18], 2016.

Kumar, S., Newman, M., Wang, Y., and Livneh, B.: Potential Reemergence of Seasonal Soil Moisture Anomalies in North America, Journal of Climate, 32, 2707–2734, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0540.1, 2019a.

Kumar, S. V., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Santanello, J., Harrison, K., Liu, Y., and Shaw, M.: Land surface Verification Toolkit (LVT) – a generalized framework for land surface model evaluation, Geoscientific Model Development, 5, 869–886, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-869-2012, 2012.

Kumar, S. V., M. Mocko, D., Wang, S., Peters-Lidard, C. D., and Borak, J.: Assimilation of Remotely Sensed Leaf Area Index into the Noah-MP Land Surface Model: Impacts on Water and Carbon Fluxes and States over the Continental United States, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 20, 1359–1377, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-18-0237.1, 2019b.

Larson, K., Small, E., Gutmann, E., Bilich, A., Braun, J., Zavorotny, V., and Larson, C.: Use of GPS receivers as a soil moisture network for water cycle studies, Geophysical Research Letters - GEOPHYS RES LETT, 35, https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL036013, 2008.

Leavesley: A Modelling Framework for Improved Agricultural Water-Supply Forecasting, 2010.

Leavesley, G., David, O., Garen, D., Lea, J., Marron, J., Pagano, T., Perkins, T., and Strobel, M.: A Modeling Framework for Improved Agricultural Water Supply Forecasting, AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts, 2008.

Lee, J.: The consecutive dry days to trigger rainfall over West Africa, Journal of Hydrology, 556, 934–943, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.06.003, 2018.

Lee, J. and Im, J.: A Novel Bias Correction Method for Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) Soil Moisture: Retrieval Ensembles, Remote Sensing, 7, 16 045–16 061, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs71215824, 2015.

Lei, F., Crow, W. T., Shen, H., Su, C.-H., Holmes, T. R., Parinussa, R. M., and Wang, G.: Assessment of the impact of spatial heterogeneity on microwave satellite soil moisture periodic error, Remote Sensing of Environment, 205, 85–99, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.11.002, 2018.

Leng, P., Song, X., Li, Z.-L., Wang, Y., and Wang, R.: Toward the Estimation of Surface Soil Moisture Content Using Geostationary Satellite Data over Sparsely Vegetated Area, Remote Sensing, 7, 4112–4138, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs70404112, 2015.

Leng, P., Song, X., Duan, S.-B., and Li, Z.-L.: Preliminary validation of two temporal parameter-based soil moisture retrieval models using a satellite product and in situ soil moisture measurements over the REMEDHUS network, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 37, 5902–5917, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2016.1253896, 2016.

Leng, P., Song, X., Duan, S.-B., and Li, Z.-L.: Generation of continuous surface soil moisture dataset using combined optical and thermal infrared images, Hydrological Processes, 31, 1398–1407, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.11113, 2017.

Li, M., Wu, P., and Ma, Z.: A comprehensive evaluation of soil moisture and soil temperature from third-generation atmospheric and land reanalysis data sets, International Journal of Climatology, n/a, https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6549, 2020a.

Li, M., Wu, P., Sexton, D. M., and Ma, Z.: Potential shifts in climate zones under a future global warming scenario using soil moisture classification, Climate Dynamics, 56, 2071–2092, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05576-w, 2021.

Li, P., Zha, Y., Tso, C.-H. M., Shi, L., Yu, D., Zhang, Y., and Zeng, W.: Data assimilation of uncalibrated soil moisture measurements from frequency-domain reflectometry, Geoderma, 374, 114 432, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2020.114432, 2020b.

Li, X., Al-Yaari, A., Schwank, M., Fan, L., Frappart, F., Swenson, J., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Compared performances of SMOS-IC soil moisture and vegetation optical depth retrievals based on Tau-Omega and Two-Stream microwave emission models, Remote Sensing of Environment, 236, 111 502, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2019.111502, 2020c.

Liao, W., Wang, D., Wang, G., Xia, Y., and Liu, X.: Quality Control and Evaluation of the Observed Daily Data in the North American Soil Moisture Database, Journal of Meteorological Research, 33, 501–518, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13351-019-8121-2, 2019.

Lievens, H., Martens, B., Verhoest, N., Hahn, S., Reichle, R., and Miralles, D.: Assimilation of global radar backscatter and radiometer brightness temperature observations to improve soil moisture and land evaporation estimates, Remote Sensing of Environment, 189, 194–210, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.11.022, 2017.

Lin, L.-F. and Pu, Z.: Examining the Impact of SMAP Soil Moisture Retrievals on Short-Range Weather Prediction under Weakly and Strongly Coupled Data Assimilation with WRF-Noah, Monthly Weather Review, 147, 4345–4366, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-19-0017.1, 2019.

Lin, L.-F. and Pu, Z.: Improving Near-Surface Short-Range Weather Forecasts Using Strongly Coupled Land–Atmosphere Data Assimilation with GSI-EnKF, Monthly Weather Review, 148, 2863–2888, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-19-0370.1, 2020.

Link, M., Drusch, M., and Scipal, K.: Soil Moisture Information Content in SMOS, SMAP, AMSR2, and ASCAT Level-1 Data Over Selected In Situ Sites, IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters, 17, 1213–1217, 2020.

Liu, G., Chen, J.-M., Ji, L.-R., and Sun, S.-Q.: Relationship of summer soil moisture with early winter monsoon and air temperature over eastern China, International Journal of Climatology, 32, 1513–1519, https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2352, 2012a.

Liu, S., Mo, X., Li, H., Peng, G., and Robock, A.: Spatial Variation of Soil Moisture in China: Geostatistical Characterization, Journal of The Meteorological Society of Japan - J METEOROL SOC JPN, 79, 555–574, https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.79.555, 2001.

Liu, S., Roujean, J.-L., Kaptue Tchuente, A. T., Ceamanos, X., and Calvet, J.-C.: A parameterization of SEVIRI and MODIS daily surface albedo with soil moisture: Calibration and validation over southwestern France, Remote Sensing of Environment, 144, 137–151, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.01.016, 2014.

Liu, Y., Dorigo, W., Parinussa, R., de Jeu, R., Wagner, W., McCabe, M., Evans, J., and van Dijk, A.: Trend-preserving blending of passive and active microwave soil moisture retrievals, Remote Sensing of Environment, 123, 280–297, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2012.03.014, 2012b.

Liu, Y., Yang, Y., and Yue, X.: Evaluation of Satellite-Based Soil Moisture Products over Four Different Continental In-Situ Measurements, Remote Sensing, 10, 1161, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10071161, 2018.

Liu, Y., Jing, W., Wang, Q., and Xia, X.: Generating high-resolution daily soil moisture by using spatial downscaling techniques: a comparison of six machine learning algorithms, Advances in Water Resources, 141, 103 601, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2020.103601, 2020.

Liu, Y., Zhou, Y., Lu, N., Tang, R., Liu, N., Li, Y., Yang, J., Jing, W., and Zhou, C.: Comprehensive assessment of Fengyun-3 satellites derived soil moisture with in-situ measurements across the globe, Journal of Hydrology, 594, 125 949, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125949, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169420314104, 2021.

Liu, Y. Y., Parinussa, R. M., Dorigo, W. A., De Jeu, R. A. M., Wagner, W., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., McCabe, M. F., and Evans, J. P.: Developing an improved soil moisture dataset by blending passive and active microwave satellite-based retrievals, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 15, 425–436, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-425-2011, 2011.

Liu, Z., Li, P., and Yang, J.: Soil Moisture Retrieval and Spatiotemporal Pattern Analysis Using Sentinel-1 Data of Dahra, Senegal, Remote Sensing, 9, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9111197, 2017.

Loew, A., dall'Amico, J., Schlenz, F., and Mauser, W.: The Upper Danube soil moisture validation site: measurements and activities, 2009.

Loew, A., Bell, W., Brocca, L., Bulgin, C. E., Burdanowitz, J., Calbet, X., Donner, R. V., Ghent, D., Gruber, A., Kaminski, T., Kinzel, J., Klepp, C., Lambert, J.-C., Schaepman-Strub, G., Schröder, M., and Verhoelst, T.: Validation practices for satellite-based Earth observation data across communities, Reviews of Geophysics, 55, 779–817, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017RG000562, 2017.

Lu, Y., Jin, J., and Kueppers, L.: Crop growth and irrigation interact to influence surface fluxes in a regional climate-cropland model (WRF3.3-CLM4crop), Climate Dynamics, 45, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2543-z, 2015.

Lukyanenko, R., Wiggins, A., and Rosser, H. K.: Citizen Science: An Information Quality Research Frontier, Information Systems Frontiers, 22, 961–983, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-019-09915-z, 2020.

Ma, C., Li, X., and McCabe, M. F.: Retrieval of High-Resolution Soil Moisture through Combination of Sentinel-1 and Sentinel-2 Data, Remote Sensing, 12, 2303, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12142303, 2020.

Ma, H., Zeng, J., Chen, N., Zhang, X., Cosh, M. H., and Wang, W.: Satellite surface soil moisture from SMAP, SMOS, AMSR2 and ESA CCI: A comprehensive assessment using global ground-based observations, Remote Sensing of Environment, 231, 111 215, 2019.

1705 Mahecha, M., Gans, F., Sippel, S., Donges, J., Kaminski, T., Metzger, S., Migliavacca, M., Papale, D., Rammig, A., and Zscheis-chler, J.: Detecting impacts of extreme events with ecological in-situ monitoring networks, Biogeosciences, 14, 4255–4277, https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-4255-2017, 2017.

Majone, B., Viani, F., Filippi, E., Bellin, A., Massa, A., Toller, G., Robol, F., and Salucci, M.: Wireless Sensor Network Deployment for Monitoring Soil Moisture Dynamics at the Field Scale, Procedia Environmental Sciences, 19, 426–435, 1710 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2013.06.049, 2013.

Manfreda, S., Brocca, L., Moramarco, T., Melone, F., and Sheffield, J.: A physically based approach for the estimation of root-zone soil moisture from surface measurements, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 18, 1199–1212, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-18-1199-2014, 2014.

Mao, F., Khamis, K., Krause, S., Clark, J., and Hannah, D. M.: Low-Cost Environmental Sensor Networks: Recent Advances and Future 1715 Directions, Frontiers in Earth Science, 7, 221, https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2019.00221, 2019.

Marczewski, W., Slominski, J., Slominska, E., Usowicz, B., Usowicz, J., S, R., O, M., Nastula, J., and Zawadzki, J.: Strategies for validating and directions for employing SMOS data, in the Cal-Val project SWEX (3275) for wetlands, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 7, https://doi.org/10.5194/hessd-7-7007-2010, 2010.

Martens, B., Miralles, D., Lievens, H., van der Schalie, R., de Jeu, R. A., Fernández-Prieto, D., Beck, H. E., Dorigo, W., and Verhoest, 1720 N.: GLEAM v3 : satellite-based land evaporation and root-zone soil moisture, Geoscientific Model Development, 10, 1903–1925, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-1903-2017, 2017.

Martens, B., de Jeu, R., Verhoest, N., Schuurmans, H., Kleijer, J., and Miralles, D.: Towards Estimating Land Evaporation at Field Scales Using GLEAM, Remote Sensing, 10, 1720, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10111720, 2018.

Martínez-Fernández, J., González-Zamora, A., and Almendra-Martín, L.: Soil moisture memory and soil properties: An analysis with 1725 the stored precipitation fraction, Journal of Hydrology, 593, 125 622, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125622, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169420310830, 2021.

Massari, C., Su, C.-H., Brocca, L., Sang, Y.-F., Ciabatta, L., Ryu, D., and Wagner, W.: Near real time de-noising of satellite-based soil moisture retrievals: An intercomparison among three different techniques, Remote Sensing of Environment, 198, 17–29, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.05.037, 2017.

1730 Mattar, C., Santamaría-Artigas, A., Durán-Alarcón, C., Olivera-Guerra, L., and Fuster, R.: LAB-net the first Chilean soil moisture network for remote sensing applications, in: Quantitative Remote Sensing Symposium (RAQRS), pp. 22–26, 2014.

Mattar, C., Santamaría-Artigas, A., Durán-Alarcón, C., Olivera-Guerra, L., Fuster, R., and Borvarán, D.: The LAB-Net Soil Moisture Network: Application to Thermal Remote Sensing and Surface Energy Balance, Data, 1, https://doi.org/10.3390/data1010006, 2016.

McDonough, K. R., Hutchinson, S. L., Hutchinson, J. S., Case, J. L., and Rahmani, V.: Validation and assessment of 1735 SPoRT-LIS surface soil moisture estimates for water resources management applications, Journal of Hydrology, 566, 43–54, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.09.007, 2018.

Mecklenburg, S., Drusch, M., Kerr, Y. H., Font, J., Martin-Neira, M., Delwart, S., Buenadicha, G., Reul, N., Daganzo-Eusebio, E., Oliva, R., and Crapolicchio, R.: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission: Mission Performance and Operations, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 50, 1354–1366, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2012.2187666, 2012.

1740   Mimeau, L., Tramblay, Y., Brocca, L., Massari, C., Camici, S., and Finaud-Guyot, P.: Modeling the response of soil moisture to climate variability in the Mediterranean region, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 2020, 1–29, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-302, 2020.

Miralles, D. G., Crow, W. T., and Cosh, M. H.: Estimating Spatial Sampling Errors in Coarse-Scale Soil Moisture Estimates Derived from Point-Scale Observations, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 11, 1423–1429, https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JHM1285.1, 2010.

1745   Mishra, V., Shah, R., and Thrasher, B.: Soil Moisture Droughts under the Retrospective and Projected Climate in India, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 15, 2267–2292, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-13-0177.1, 2014.

Mishra, V., Shah, R., Azhar, S., Shah, H., Modi, P., and Kumar, R.: Reconstruction of droughts in India using multiple land-surface models (1951–2015), Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 2269–2284, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-2269-2018, 2018.

Mittelbach, H., Lehner, I., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Comparison of four soil moisture sensor types under field conditions in Switzerland, Journal
1750   of Hydrology, 430-431, 39–49, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.01.041, 2012.

Moghaddam, M., Entekhabi, D., Goykhman, Y., Li, K., Liu, M., Mahajan, A., Nayyar, A., Shuman, D., and Teneketzis, D.: A Wireless Soil Moisture Smart Sensor Web Using Physics-Based Optimal Control: Concept and Initial Demonstrations, Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, IEEE Journal of, 3, 522–535, https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2010.2052918, 2011.

MOGHADDAM, M., SILVA, A., CLEWLEY, D., AKBAR, R., HUSSAINI, S., Whitcomb, J., DEVARAKONDA, R., Shrestha, R., COOK,
1755   R., PRAKASH, G., SANTHANA VANNAN, S., and BOYER, A.: Soil Moisture Profiles and Temperature Data from SoilSCAPE Sites, USA, https://doi.org/10.3334/ORNLDAAC/1339, 2016.

Mohanty, B. P., Cosh, M. H., Lakshmi, V., and Montzka, C.: Soil Moisture Remote Sensing: State-of-the-Science, Vadose Zone Journal, 16, vzj2016.10.0105, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2016.10.0105, 2017.

Molero, B., Leroux, D. J., Richaume, P., Kerr, Y. H., Merlin, O., Cosh, M. H., and Bindlish, R.: Multi-Timescale Analysis of the Spatial
1760   Representativeness of In Situ Soil Moisture Data within Satellite Footprints: Soil Moisture Time and Spatial Scales, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 123, 3–21, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027478, 2018.

Montzka, C., Bogena, H., Zreda, M., Monerris, A., Morrison, R., Muddu, S., and Vereecken, H.: Validation of Spaceborne and Modelled Surface Soil Moisture Products with Cosmic-Ray Neutron Probes, Remote Sensing, 9, 103, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9020103, 2017.

Montzka, C., Cosh, M., Bayat, B., Bitar, A. A., Berg, A., Bindlish, R., Bogena, H. R., Bolton, J. D., Cabot, F., Caldwell, T., Chan, S.,
1765   Colliander, A., Crow, W., Das, N., Lannoy, G. D., Dorigo, W., Evett, S. R., Gruber, A., Hahn, S., Jagdhuber, T., Jones, S., Kerr, Y., Kim, S., Koyama, C., Kurum, M., Lopez-Baeza, E., Mattia, F., McColl, K., Mecklenburg, S., Mohanty, B., O´Neill, P., Or, D., Pellarin, T., Petropoulos, G. P., Piles, M., Reichle, R. H., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Rüdiger, C., Scanlon, T., Schwartz, R. C., Spengler, D., Srivastava, P., Suman, S., van der Schalie, R., Wagner, W., Wegmüller, U., Camacho, F., and Nickeson, J.: Soil Moisture Product Validation Best Practice Protocol, Version 1.0, 2020.

1770   Moradizadeh, M. and Srivastava, P. K.: A new model for an improved AMSR2 satellite soil moisture retrieval over agricultural areas, Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 186, 106 205, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2021.106205, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168169921002222, 2021.

Morbidelli, R., Corradini, C., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., and Rossi, E.: Infiltration-soil moisture redistribution under natural conditions: experimental evidence as a guideline for realizing simulation models, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 15, 2937–2945, 2011.

1775   Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., Rossi, E., and Corradini, C.: Soil water content vertical profiles under natural conditions: matching of experiments and simulations by a conceptual model, Hydrological Processes, 28, 4732–4742, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.9973, 2014a.

Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., Rossi, E., and Corradini, C.: Soil water content vertical profiles under natural conditions: Matching of experiments and simulations by a conceptual model, Hydrological Processes, 28, 4732–4742, 2014b.

1780   Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., Cifrodelli, M., Picciafuoco, T., Corradini, C., and Govindaraju, R. S.: In situ measurements of soil saturated hydraulic conductivity: Assessment of reliability through rainfall–runoff experiments, Hydrological Processes, 31, 3084–3094, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.11247, 2017.

Moreno-Martínez, Á., Piles, M., Muñoz-Marí, J., Campos-Taberner, M., Adsuara, J. E., Mateo, A., Perez-Suay, A., Javier García-Haro, F., Camps-Valls, G., Prasad, S., and Chanussot, J.: Machine Learning Methods for Spatial and Temporal Parameter Estimation, pp. 5–35,

1785   Springer International Publishing, Cham, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38617-7_2, 2020.

Mu, L., Li, S., Qin, B., and Liu, K.: Drought Monitoring Using Tiangong-2 Wide-Band Spectrometer Data, in: Proceedings of the Tiangong-2 Remote Sensing Application Conference, edited by Gu, Y., Gao, M., and Zhao, G., pp. 277–285, Springer Singapore, Singapore, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3501-3_26, 2019.

Muñoz Sabater, J., Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Sabater, J. M., Richaume, P., De Rosnay, P., Kerr, Y., Albergel, C., Drusch, M., and Meck-

1790   lenburg, S.: SMOS near-real-time soil moisture product: processor overview and first validation results, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 21, 5201–5216, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-5201-2017, 2017.

Musial, J. P., Dabrowska-Zielinska, K., Kiryla, W., Oleszczuk, R., Gnatowski, T., and Jaszczynski, J.: Derivation and validation of the high resolution satellite soil moisture products: a case study of the Biebrza Sentinel-1 validation sites, Geoinformation Issues, 8, 37–53, 2016.

Nair, A. and Indu, J.: Enhancing Noah Land Surface Model Prediction Skill over Indian Subcontinent by Assimilating SMOPS Blended Soil

1795   Moisture, Remote Sensing, 8, 976, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8120976, 2016.

Nair, A. S., Mangla, R., P, T., and Indu, J.: Remote sensing data assimilation, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 0, 1–33, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2020.1761021, 2020a.

Nair, A. S., Mangla, R., P, T., and Indu, J.: Remote sensing data assimilation, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 0, 1–33, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2020.1761021, 2020b.

1800   Naz, B. S., Kollet, S., Franssen, H.-J. H., Montzka, C., and Kurtz, W.: A 3 km spatially and temporally consistent European daily soil moisture reanalysis from 2000 to 2015, Scientific Data, 7, 111, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0450-6, 2020.

Nguyen, H. H., Kim, H., and Choi, M.: Evaluation of the soil water content using cosmic-ray neutron probe in a heterogeneous monsoon climate-dominated region, Advances in Water Resources, 108, 125–138, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.07.020, 2017.

Nicolai-Shaw, N., Hirschi, M., Mittelbach, H., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Spatial representativeness of soil moisture using in situ, remote sensing,

1805   and land reanalysis data, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 120, 9955–9964, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023305, 2015a.

Nicolai-Shaw, N., Hirschi, M., Mittelbach, H., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Spatial representativeness of soil moisture using in situ, remote sensing, and land reanalysis data, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 120, 9955–9964, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023305, 2015b.

Notarnicola, C., Caporaso, L., Giuseppe, F. D., Temimi, M., Ventura, B., and Zebisch, M.: Inferring soil moisture variability in the Mediterrean Sea area using infrared and passive microwave observations, Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing, 38, 46–59,

1810   https://doi.org/10.5589/m12-011, 2012.

O, S. and Orth, R.: Global soil moisture data derived through machine learning trained with in-situ measurements, Scientific Data, 8, 1–14, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00964-1, 2021.

Ochsner, T., Cosh, M., Cuenca, R., Dorigo, W., Draper, C., Hagimoto, Y., Kerr, Y., Larson, K., Njoku, E., Small, E., and Zreda, M.: State of the Art in Large-Scale Soil Moisture Monitoring, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 77, 1888–1919, https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2013.03.0093, 2013.

Ojha, N., Merlin, O., Suere, C., and Escorihuela, M. J.: Extending the Spatio-Temporal Applicability of DISPATCH Soil Moisture Downscaling Algorithm: A Study Case Using SMAP, MODIS and Sentinel-3 Data, Frontiers in Environmental Science, 9, 40, https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.555216, https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fenvs.2021.555216, 2021.

Ojha, R., Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., and Govindaraju, R. S.: Scaling of surface soil moisture over heterogeneous fields subjected to a single rainfall event, Journal of Hydrology, 516, 21–36, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.01.057, determination of soil moisture: Measurements and theoretical approaches, 2014.

Ojo, E. R., Bullock, P., L. Heureux, J., Powers, J., McNairn, H., and Pacheco, A.: Calibration and Evaluation of a Frequency Domain Reflectometry Sensor for Real-Time Soil Moisture Monitoring, Vadose Zone Journal, 14, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2014.08.0114, 2015.

Osenga, E., Arnott, J., Endsley, K., and Katzenberger, J.: Bioclimatic and Soil Moisture Monitoring Across Elevation in a Mountain Watershed: Opportunities for Research and Resource Management, Water Resources Research, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023653, 2019.

Pablos, M., Martínez-Fernández, J., Piles, M., Sánchez, N., Vall-llossera, M., and Camps, A.: Multi-Temporal Evaluation of Soil Moisture and Land Surface Temperature Dynamics Using in Situ and Satellite Observations, Remote Sensing, 8, 587, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8070587, 2016.

Pablos, M., González-Zamora, Á., Sánchez, N., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: Assessment of Root Zone Soil Moisture Estimations from SMAP, SMOS and MODIS Observations, Remote Sensing, 10, 981, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10070981, 2018.

Pacheco, A., L'Heureux, J., McNairn, H., Powers, J., Howard, A., Geng, X., Rollin, P., Gottfried, K., Freeman, J., Ojo, R., et al.: Real-time in-situ soil monitoring for agriculture (RISMA) network metadata, Science and Technology, 2014.

Pal, M. and Maity, R.: Development of a spatially-varying Statistical Soil Moisture Profile model by coupling memory and forcing using hydrologic soil groups, Journal of Hydrology, 570, 141–155, 2019.

Pal, M., Maity, R., and Dey, S.: Statistical Modelling of Vertical Soil Moisture Profile: Coupling of Memory and Forcing, Water Resources Management, 30, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-016-1263-4, 2016.

Palmer, J. R. B., Oltra, A., Collantes, F., Delgado, J. A., Lucientes, J., Delacour, S., Bengoa, M., Eritja, R., and Bartumeus, F.: Citizen science provides a reliable and scalable tool to track disease-carrying mosquitoes, Nature Communications, 8, 916, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00914-9, 2017.

Paloscia, S., Pettinato, S., Santi, E., Notarnicola, C., Pasolli, L., and Reppucci, A.: Soil moisture mapping using Sentinel-1 images: Algorithm and preliminary validation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 134, 234–248, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.02.027, 2013.

Pan, X., Kornelsen, K. C., and Coulibaly, P.: Estimating Root Zone Soil Moisture at Continental Scale Using Neural Networks, JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association, 53, 220–237, https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12491, 2017.

Parinussa, R., Wang, G., Holmes, T., Liu, Y., Dolman, A., de Jeu, R., Jiang, T., Zhang, P., and Shi, J.: Global surface soil moisture from the Microwave Radiation Imager onboard the Fengyun-3B satellite, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 35, 7007–7029, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2014.960622, 2014a.

Parinussa, R., de Jeu, R., van der Schalie, R., Crow, W., Lei, F., and Holmes, T.: A Quasi-Global Approach to Improve Day-Time Satellite Surface Soil Moisture Anomalies through the Land Surface Temperature Input, Climate, 4, 50, https://doi.org/10.3390/cli4040050, 2016.

Parinussa, R. M., Holmes, T. R. H., and de Jeu, R. A. M.: Soil Moisture Retrievals From the WindSat Spaceborne Polarimetric Microwave Radiometer, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 50, 2683–2694, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2011.2174643, 2012.

Parinussa, R. M., Yilmaz, M. T., Anderson, M. C., Hain, C. R., and de Jeu, R. A. M.: An intercomparison of remotely sensed soil moisture products at various spatial scales over the Iberian Peninsula, Hydrological Processes, 28, 4865–4876, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.9975, 2014b.

Parinussa, R. M., Holmes, T. R. H., Wanders, N., Dorigo, W. A., and de Jeu, R. A. M.: A Preliminary Study toward Consistent Soil Moisture from AMSR2, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 16, 932–947, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-13-0200.1, 2015.

Parinussa, R. M., Wang, G., Liu, Y., Lou, D., Hagan, D. F. T., Zhan, M., Su, B., and Jiang, T.: Improved surface soil moisture anomalies from Fengyun-3B over the Jiangxi province of the People's Republic of China, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 39, 8950–8962, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2018.1500729, 2018.

Park, C.-H., Montzka, C., Jagdhuber, T., Jonard, F., De Lannoy, G., Hong, J., Jackson, T. J., and Wulfmeyer, V.: A Dielectric Mixing Model Accounting for Soil Organic Matter, Vadose Zone Journal, 18, 190 036, 2019.

Park, C.-H., Jagdhuber, T., Colliander, A., Lee, J., Berg, A., Cosh, M., Kim, S.-b., Kim, Y., and Wulfmeyer, V.: Parameterization of Vegetation Scattering Albedo in the Tau-Omega Model for Soil Moisture Retrieval on Croplands, https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202007.0717.v1, 2020.

Parrens, M., Zakharova, E., Lafont, S., Calvet, J.-C., Kerr, Y., Wagner, W., and Wigneron, J.-P.: Comparing soil moisture retrievals from SMOS and ASCAT over France, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, 423–440, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-423-2012, 2012.

Paulik, C., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W., and Kidd, R.: Validation of the ASCAT Soil Water Index using in situ data from the International Soil Moisture Network, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 30, 1–8, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2014.01.007, 2014.

Peel, M. C., Finlayson, B. L., and Mcmahon, T. A.: Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 4, 439–473, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00298818, 2007.

Peischl, S., Walker, J., Rüdiger, C., Ye, N., Kerr, Y., Kim, E., Bandara, R., and Allahmoradi, M.: The AACES field experiments: SMOS calibration and validation across the Murrumbidgee River catchment, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 9, 2763–2795, https://doi.org/10.5194/hessd-9-2763-2012, 2012.

Pellarin, T., de Rosnay, P., Albergel, C., Abdalla, S., and al Bitar, A.: Root-zone soil moisture index complementary validation at global scale based on triple collocation method . Comparison with State-OfThe-Art global scale root-zone soil moisture products, in: H-SAF Visiting Scientist Program HSAF_CDOP2_VS12_02, 2013.

Peng, J., Loew, A., Merlin, O., and Verhoest, N. E. C.: A review of spatial downscaling of satellite remotely sensed soil moisture: Downscale Satellite-Based Soil Moisture, Reviews of Geophysics, 55, 341–366, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016RG000543, 2017.

Petropoulos, G. P. and McCalmont, J. P.: An operational in situ soil moisture & soil temperature monitoring network for West Wales, UK: The WSMN network, Sensors, 17, 1481, 2017.

Petropoulos, G. P., Ireland, G., Srivastava, P. K., and Ioannou-Katidis, P.: An appraisal of the accuracy of operational soil moisture estimates from SMOS MIRAS using validated in situ observations acquired in a Mediterranean environment, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 35, 5239–5250, https://doi.org/10.1080/2150704X.2014.933277, 2014.

Pierdicca, N., Pulvirenti, L., and Fascetti, F.: Multitemporal soil moisture retrieval from 3-days ERS-2 data: Comparison with ASCAT, SMOS and in situ measurements, in: 2014 IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 2459–2462, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2014.6946970, 2014.

Pierdicca, N., Fascetti, F., Pulvirenti, L., Crapolicchio, R., and Muñoz Sabater, J.: Quadruple Collocation Analysis for Soil Moisture Product Assessment, IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters, 12, 1595–1599, https://doi.org/10.1109/LGRS.2015.2414654, 2015a.

Pierdicca, N., Fascetti, F., Pulvirenti, L., Crapolicchio, R., and Muñoz-Sabater, J.: Analysis of ASCAT, SMOS, in-situ and land model soil moisture as a regionalized variable over Europe and North Africa, Remote Sensing of Environment, 170, 280–289, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.09.005, 2015b.

Pierdicca, N., Fascetti, F., Pulvirenti, L., and Crapolicchio, R.: Error Characterization of Soil Moisture Satellite Products: Retrieving Error Cross-Correlation Through Extended Quadruple Collocation, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 10, 4522–4530, https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2017.2714025, 2017.

Piles, M., Petropoulos, G. P., Sánchez, N., Ángel González-Zamora, and Ireland, G.: Towards improved spatio-temporal resolution soil moisture retrievals from the synergy of SMOS and MSG SEVIRI spaceborne observations, Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 403–417, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.048, special Issue: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission - Achievements and Applications, 2016.

Piles, M., Ballabrera-Poy, J., and Muñoz-Sabater, J.: Dominant features of global surface soil moisture variability observed by the SMOS satellite, Remote Sensing, 11, 95, 2019.

Portal, G., Jagdhuber, T., Vall-llossera, M., Camps, A., Pablos, M., Entekhabi, D., and Piles, M.: Assessment of Multi-Scale SMOS and SMAP Soil Moisture Products across the Iberian Peninsula, Remote Sensing, 12, 570, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12030570, 2020.

Pradhan, N. R.: Estimating growing-season root zone soil moisture from vegetation index-based evapotranspiration fraction and soil properties in the Northwest Mountain region, USA, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 64, 771–788, 2019.

Pratola, C., Barrett, B., Gruber, A., and Dwyer, E.: Quality Assessment of the CCI ECV Soil Moisture Product Using ENVISAT ASAR Wide Swath Data over Spain, Ireland and Finland, Remote Sensing, 7, 15 388–15 423, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs71115388, 2015.

Przeździecki, K., Zawadzki, J., Cieszewski, C., and Bettinger, P.: Estimation of soil moisture across broad landscapes of Georgia and South Carolina using the triangle method applied to MODIS satellite imagery, Silva Fennica, 51, article id 1683, https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.1683, 2017.

Qin, M., Giménez, D., and Miskewitz, R.: Temporal dynamics of subsurface soil water content estimated from surface measurement using wavelet transform, Journal of Hydrology, 563, 834–850, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.06.023, 2018.

Raffelli, G., Id, M., Previati, M., Id, D., Canone, D., Gisolo, D., Bevilacqua, I., Capello, G., Biddoccu, M., Cavallo, E., Id, R., Deiana, R., Id, G., Cassiani, G., and Ferraris, S.: Local-and Plot-Scale Measurements of Soil Moisture: Time and Spatially Resolved Field Techniques in Plain, Hill and Mountain Sites, Water, 9, https://doi.org/10.3390/w9090706, 2018.

Rains, D., Han, X., Lievens, H., Montzka, C., and Verhoest, N.: SMOS brightness temperature assimilation into the Community Land Model, HYDROLOGY AND EARTH SYSTEM SCIENCES, 21, 5929–5951, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-5929-2017, 2017.

Ramsauer, T., Weiß, T., Löw, A., and Marzahn, P.: RADOLAN_API: An Hourly Soil Moisture Data Set Based on Weather Radar, Soil Properties and Reanalysis Temperature Data, Remote Sensing, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13091712, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/13/9/1712, 2021.

Raoult, N., Ottlé, C., Peylin, P., Bastrikov, V., and Maugis, P.: Evaluating and Optimizing Surface Soil Moisture Drydowns in the ORCHIDEE Land Surface Model at In Situ Locations, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 22, 1025–1043, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-20-0115.1, 2021.

Rautiainen, K., Parkkinen, T., Lemmetyinen, J., Schwank, M., Wiesmann, A., Ikonen, J., Derksen, C., Davydov, S., Davydova, A., Boike, J., Langer, M., Drusch, M., and Pulliainen, J.: SMOS prototype algorithm for detecting autumn soil freezing, Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 346–360, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.01.012, special Issue: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission - Achievements and Applications, 2016.

Reichle, R. H., Koster, R. D., Dong, J., and Berg, A. A.: Global Soil Moisture from Satellite Observations, Land Surface Models, and Ground Data: Implications for Data Assimilation, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 5, 430–442, https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2004)005<0430:GSMFSO>2.0.CO;2, 2004.

Reichle, R. H., Draper, C. S., Liu, Q., Girotto, M., Mahanama, S. P. P., Koster, R. D., and De Lannoy, G. J. M.: Assessment of MERRA-2 Land Surface Hydrology Estimates, Journal of Climate, 30, 2937–2960, https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0720.1, 2017.

Reimer, A. C., Melzer, B. T., Kidd, C. R., and Wagner, D. W.: Validation of the enhanced resolution ERS-2 scatterometer soil moisture product, in: 2012 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, pp. 1208–1211, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2012.6351330, 2012.

Rinollo, A., Vulpiani, G., Puca, S., Pagliara, P., Kaňák, J., Labo, E., Okon, L., Roulin, E., Baguis, P., Cattani, E., Laviola, S., and Levizzani, V.: Definition and impact of a quality index for radar-based reference measurements in the H-SAF precipitation product validation, Natural hazards and earth system sciences, 13, 2695–2705, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-13-2695-2013, 2013.

Robinson, D. A., Campbell, C. S., Hopmans, J. W., Hornbuckle, B. K., Jones, S. B., Knight, R., Ogden, F., Selker, J., and Wendroth, O.: Soil Moisture Measurement for Ecological and Hydrological Watershed-Scale Observatories: A Review, Vadose Zone Journal, 7, 358–389, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2007.0143, 2008.

Robock, A., Vinnikov, K., Srinivasan, G., Entin, J., Hollinger, S., Speranskaya, N., Liu, S., and Namkhai, A.: The Global Soil Moisture Data Bank, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 81, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2000)081<1281:TGSMDB>2.3.CO;2, 2000.

Rodionova, N.: Correlation of the Sentinel 1 Radar Data with Ground-Based Measurements of the Soil Temperature and Moisture, Izvestiya, Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics, 55, 939–948, 2019a.

Rodionova, N. V.: Backscattering from the near-surface layer of Thawed/Frozen Soils of Alaska from Sentinel 1 Radar Data, RENSIT, 11(1), 21–30, https://doi.org/10.17725/rensit.2019.11.021, 2019b.

Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., Aires, F., Richaume, P., Kerr, Y., Prigent, C., Kolassa, J., Cabot, F., Jimenez, C., Mahmoodi, A., and Drusch, M.: Soil Moisture Retrieval Using Neural Networks: Application to SMOS, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 53, 5991–6007, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2015.2430845, 2015.

Rodriguez-Fernandez, N., de Rosnay, P., Albergel, C., Richaume, P., Aires, F., Prigent, C., and Kerr, Y.: SMOS Neural Network Soil Moisture Data Assimilation in a Land Surface Model and Atmospheric Impact, Remote Sensing, 11, 1334, 2019.

Romano, N.: Soil moisture at local scale: Measurements and simulations, Journal of Hydrology, 516, 6–20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.01.026, 2014.

Rüdiger, C., Hancock, G., Hemakumara, H., Jacobs, B., Kalma, J., Martinez, C., Thyer, M., Walker, J., Wells, T., and Willgoose, G.: Goulburn River experimental catchment data set, Water Resources Research, 43, https://doi.org/10.1029/2006WR005837, 2007.

Sadeghi, M., Gao, L., Ebtehaj, A., Wigneron, J.-P., Crow, W. T., Reager, J. T., and Warrick, A. W.: Retrieving global surface soil moisture from GRACE satellite gravity data, Journal of Hydrology, 584, 124 717, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124717, 2020.

Sadri, S., Pan, M., Wada, Y., Vergopolan, N., Sheffield, J., Famiglietti, J. S., Kerr, Y., and Wood, E.: A global near-real-time soil moisture index monitor for food security using integrated SMOS and SMAP, Remote Sensing of Environment, 246, 111 864, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.111864, 2020.

Sanchez, N., Martinez-Fernandez, J., Scaini, A., and Perez-Gutierrez, C.: Validation of the SMOS L2 Soil Moisture Data in the REMEDHUS Network (Spain), IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 50, 1602–1611, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2012.2186971, 2012.

Santi, E., Paloscia, S., Pettinato, S., Brocca, L., and Ciabatta, L.: Robust Assessment of an Operational Algorithm for the Retrieval of Soil Moisture From AMSR-E Data in Central Italy, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 9, 2478–2492, 2016.

Santi, E., Paloscia, S., Pettinato, S., Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., and Entekhabi, D.: Integration of microwave data from SMAP and AMSR2 for soil moisture monitoring in Italy, Remote Sensing of Environment, 212, 21–30, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.04.039, 2018.

Sawada, Y.: Quantifying Drought Propagation from Soil Moisture to Vegetation Dynamics Using a Newly Developed Ecohydrological Land Reanalysis, Remote Sensing, 10, 1197, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10081197, 2018.

Scaini, A., Sánchez, N., Vicente-Serrano, S. M., and Martínez-Fernández, J.: SMOS-derived soil moisture anomalies and drought indices: a comparative analysis using in situ measurements, Hydrological Processes, 29, 373–383, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.10150, 2015.

Scanlon, T., Dorigo, W., Baum, D., Preimesberger, W., Buttinger, P., Bakcsa, Z., van der Schalie, R., Reimer, C., Hirschi, M., Kidd, R., et al.: ESA CCI and C3S Soil Moisture-Recent advances and quality assurance based on the online validation platform QA4SM., in: Geophysical Research Abstracts, vol. 21, 2019.

Schaefer, G., Cosh, M., and Jackson, T.: The USDA natural resources conservation service soil climate analysis network (SCAN), Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology - J ATMOS OCEAN TECHNOL, 24, https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JTECHA930.1, 2007.

Schellekens, J., Dutra, E., Martínez-de la Torre, A., Balsamo, G., van Dijk, A., Sperna Weiland, F., Minvielle, M., Calvet, J.-C., Decharme, B., Eisner, S., Fink, G., Flörke, M., Peßenteiner, S., van Beek, R., Polcher, J., Beck, H., Orth, R., Calton, B., Burke, S., Dorigo, W., and Weedon, G. P.: A global water resources ensemble of hydrological models: the eartH2Observe Tier-1 dataset, Earth System Science Data, 9, 389–413, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-389-2017, 2017.

Schlenz, F., dall'Amico, J. T., Loew, A., and Mauser, W.: Uncertainty Assessment of the SMOS Validation in the Upper Danube Catchment, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 50, 1517–1529, 2012.

Schlenz, F., dall'Amico, J. T., Mauser, W., and Loew, A.: Analysis of SMOS brightness temperature and vegetation optical depth data with coupled land surface and radiative transfer models in Southern Germany, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, 3517–3533, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-3517-2012, 2012.

Scholze, M., Kaminski, T., Knorr, W., Blessing, S., Vossbeck, M., Grant, J., and Scipal, K.: Simultaneous assimilation of SMOS soil moisture and atmospheric CO2 in-situ observations to constrain the global terrestrial carbon cycle, Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 334–345, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.058, special Issue: ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission - Achievements and Applications, 2016.

Senanayake, I., Yeo, I.-Y., Tangdamrongsub, N., Willgoose, G., Hancock, G., Wells, T., Fang, B., Lakshmi, V., and Walker, J.: An in-situ data based model to downscale radiometric satellite soil moisture products in the Upper Hunter Region of NSW, Australia, Journal of Hydrology, 572, 820–838, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.03.014, 2019.

Senyurek, V., Lei, F., Boyd, D., Kurum, M., Gurbuz, A. C., and Moorhead, R.: Machine Learning-Based CYGNSS Soil Moisture Estimates over ISMN sites in CONUS, Remote Sensing, 12, 1168, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12071168, 2020.

Sheng, J., Rao, P., and Ma, H.: Spatial Downscaling of the FY3B Soil Moisture Using Random Forest Regression, in: 2019 8th International Conference on Agro-Geoinformatics (Agro-Geoinformatics), pp. 1–6, 2019.

Shin, Y., Lim, K., Park, K., and Jung, Y.: Development of Dynamic Ground Water Data Assimilation for Quantifying Soil Hydraulic Properties from Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture, Water, 8, 311, https://doi.org/10.3390/w8070311, 2016.

Shin, Y., Mohanty, B. P., and Ines, A. V.: Development of non-parametric evolutionary algorithm for predicting soil moisture dynamics, Journal of Hydrology, 564, 208–221, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.07.003, 2018.

Shuman, D. I., Nayyar, A., Mahajan, A., Goykhman, Y., Li, K., Liu, M., Teneketzis, D., Moghaddam, M., and Entekhabi, D.: Measurement Scheduling for Soil Moisture Sensing: From Physical Models to Optimal Control, Proceedings of the IEEE, 98, 1918–1933, https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2010.2052532, 2010.

2005 Skierucha, W., Sławiński, C., Wilczek, A., Żyromski, A., and Biniak-Pieróg, M.: Telemetric system for the measurement of soil moisture based on the TDR technique, Woda Środowisko Obszary Wiejskie, 12, 257–267, 2012a.

Skierucha, W., Wilczek, A., Szypłowska, A., Sławiński, C., and Lamorski, K.: A TDR-Based Soil Moisture Monitoring System with Simultaneous Measurement of Soil Temperature and Electrical Conductivity, Sensors, 12, 13 545–13 566, https://doi.org/10.3390/s121013545, 2012b.

2010 Smith, A., Walker, J., Western, A., Young, R., Ellett, K., Pipunic, R., Grayson, R., Siriwardena, L., Chiew, F., and Richter, H.: The Murrumbidgee Soil Moisture Monitoring Network data set, Water Resources Research, 48, 7701–, https://doi.org/10.1029/2012WR011976, 2012.

Solander, K. C., Newman, B. D., Carioca de Araujo, A., Barnard, H. R., Berry, Z. C., Bonal, D., Bretfeld, M., Burban, B., Antonio Candido, L., Célleri, R., Chambers, J. Q., Christoffersen, B. O., Detto, M., Dorigo, W. A., Ewers, B. E., José Filgueiras Ferreira, S., Knohl, A., 2015 Leung, L. R., McDowell, N. G., Miller, G. R., Terezinha Ferreira Monteiro, M., Moore, G. W., Negron-Juarez, R., Saleska, S. R., Stiegler, C., Tomasella, J., and Xu, C.: The pantropical response of soil moisture to El Niño, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 24, 2303–2322, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-2303-2020, 2020.

Steele-Dunne, S. C., Hahn, S., Wagner, W., and Vreugdenhil, M.: Towards Including Dynamic Vegetation Parameters in the EUMETSAT H SAF ASCAT Soil Moisture Products, Remote Sensing, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13081463, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/13/8/ 2020 1463, 2021.

Su, C.-H., Narsey, S. Y., Gruber, A., Xaver, A., Chung, D., Ryu, D., and Wagner, W.: Evaluation of post-retrieval de-noising of active and passive microwave satellite soil moisture, Remote Sensing of Environment, 163, 127–139, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.03.010, 2015.

Su, C.-H., Ryu, D., Dorigo, W., Zwieback, S., Gruber, A., Albergel, C., Reichle, R. H., and Wagner, W.: Homogeneity of a global multisatellite 2025 soil moisture climate data record, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 11,245–11,252, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070458, 2016.

Su, Y., Chen, X., Su, H., Liu, L., and Liao, J.: Digitizing the thermal and hydrological parameters of land surface in subtropical China using AMSR-E brightness temperatures, International Journal of Digital Earth, 10, 687–700, https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2016.1247472, 2017.

Su, Z., Wen, J., Dente, L., Velde, R., Wang, L., Ma, Y., Yang, K., and Hu, Z.: The Tibetan Plateau observatory of plateau scale soil moisture 2030 and soil temperature (Tibet-Obs) for quantifying uncertainties in coarse resolution satellite and model products, Hydrology and earth system sciences, 15, 2303–2316, 2011.

Suman, S., Srivastava, P. K., Petropoulos, G. P., Pandey, D. K., and O'Neill, P. E.: Appraisal of SMAP Operational Soil Moisture Product from a Global Perspective, Remote Sensing, 12, 1977, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12121977, 2020.

Sun, H. and Cui, Y.: Evaluating Downscaling Factors of Microwave Satellite Soil Moisture Based on Machine Learning Method, Remote 2035 Sensing, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13010133, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/13/1/133, 2021.

Sun, H., Zhou, B., Zhang, C., Liu, H., and Yang, B.: DSCALE_mod16: A Model for Disaggregating Microwave Satellite Soil Moisture with Land Surface Evapotranspiration Products and Gridded Meteorological Data, Remote Sensing, 12, 980, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12060980, 2020.

Sure, A., Varade, D., and Dikshit, O.: Factors determining spatio-temporal variations of soil moisture using microwave data, in: 2017 International Conference on Emerging Trends in Computing and Communication Technologies (ICETCCT), pp. 1–5, https://doi.org/10.1109/ICETCCT.2017.8280301, 2017.

Szczypta, C., Calvet, J.-C., Maignan, F., Dorigo, W., Baret, F., and Ciais, P.: Suitability of modelled and remotely sensed essential climate variables for monitoring Euro-Mediterranean droughts, Geoscientific Model Development, 7, 931–946, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-931-2014, 2014.

Tagesson, T., Fensholt, R., Guiro, I., Rasmussen, M., Huber, S., Mbow, C., Garcia, M., Horion, S., Sandholt, I., Holm-Rasmussen, B., Göttsche, F.-M., Ridler, M., Boke-Olén, N., Olsen, J., Ehammer, A., Madsen, M., Olesen, F., and Ardö, J.: Ecosystem properties of semi-arid savanna grassland in West Africa and its relationship to environmental variability, Global Change Biology, 21, https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12734, 2014.

Tagesson, T., Horion, S., Nieto, H., Zaldo Fornies, V., Mendiguren González, G., Bulgin, C., Ghent, D., and Fensholt, R.: Disaggregation of SMOS soil moisture over West Africa using the Temperature and Vegetation Dryness Index based on SEVIRI land surface parameters, Remote Sensing of Environment, 206, 424–441, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.12.036, 2018.

Teuling, A. J., Uijlenhoet, R., Hupet, F., van Loon, E. E., and Troch, P. A.: Estimating spatial mean root-zone soil moisture from point-scale observations, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., p. 13, 2006.

Tian, J., Zhang, B., He, C., Han, Z., Bogena, H. R., and Huisman, J. A.: Dynamic response patterns of profile soil moisture wetting events under different land covers in the Mountainous area of the Heihe River Watershed, Northwest China, Agricultural and forest meteorology, 271, 225–239, 2019a.

Tian, S.: Monitoring and forecasting drought through the assimilation of satellite water observations, Ph.D. thesis, Research School of Earth Sciences, The Australian National University, https://doi.org/10.25911/5c94abe15c9ec, 2018.

Tian, S., Renzullo, L. J., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., Tregoning, P., and Walker, J. P.: Global joint assimilation of GRACE and SMOS for improved estimation of root-zone soil moisture and vegetation response, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 23, 1067–1081, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-23-1067-2019, 2019b.

Tobin, K. J., Torres, R., Crow, W. T., and Bennett, M. E.: Multi-decadal analysis of root-zone soil moisture applying the exponential filter across CONUS, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 21, 4403–4417, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-4403-2017, 2017.

Vachaud, G., Passerat De Silans, A., Balabanis, P., and Vauclin, M.: Temporal Stability of Spatially Measured Soil Water Probability Density Function, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 49, 822–828, https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1985.03615995004900040006x, 1985.

Van Cleve, K., Chapin F.S., S., and Ruess, R. W.: Bonanza Creek Long Term Ecological Research Project Climate Database - University of Alaska Fairbanks. http://www.lter.uaf.edu/, 2015.

van der Schalie, R., Kerr, Y., Wigneron, J., Rodríguez-Fernández, N., Al-Yaari, A., and Jeu, R.: Global SMOS Soil Moisture Retrievals from The Land Parameter Retrieval Model, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 45, 125–134, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.08.005, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture - Part 1, 2016.

van der Schalie, R., de Jeu, R., Kerr, Y., Wigneron, J., Rodríguez-Fernández, N., Al-Yaari, A., Parinussa, R., Mecklenburg, S., and Drusch, M.: The merging of radiative transfer based surface soil moisture data from SMOS and AMSR-E, Remote Sensing of Environment, 189, 180–193, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.11.026, 2017.

van der Schalie, R., de Jeu, R., Parinussa, R., Rodríguez-Fernández, N., Kerr, Y., Al-Yaari, A., Wigneron, J.-P., and Drusch, M.: The Effect of Three Different Data Fusion Approaches on the Quality of Soil Moisture Retrievals from Multiple Passive Microwave Sensors, Remote Sensing, 10, 107, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10010107, 10.3390/rs10010107, 2018.

van der Schalie, R., van der Vliet, M., Rodríguez-Fernández, N., Dorigo, W. A., Scanlon, T., Preimesberger, W., Madelon, R., and de Jeu, R. A. M.: L-Band Soil Moisture Retrievals Using Microwave Based Temperature and Filtering. Towards Model-Independent Climate Data Records, Remote Sensing, 13, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13132480, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/13/13/2480, 2021.

2080 Van doninck, J., Peters, J., Lievens, H., De Baets, B., and Verhoest, N.: Accounting for seasonality in a soil moisture change detection algorithm for ASAR Wide Swath time series, HYDROLOGY AND EARTH SYSTEM SCIENCES, 16, 773–786, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-773-2012, 2012.

Verrier, S.: Multifractal and multiscale entropy scaling of in-situ soil moisture time series: Study of SMOSMANIA network data, southwestern France, Journal of Hydrology, 585, 124 821, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.124821, 2020.

2085 Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., Lorenzo-Lacruz, J., Camarero, J. J., López-Moreno, J. I., Azorin-Molina, C., Revuelto, J., Morán-Tejeda, E., and Sanchez-Lorenzo, A.: Performance of Drought Indices for Ecological, Agricultural, and Hydrological Applications, Earth Interactions, 16, 1–27, https://doi.org/10.1175/2012EI000434.1, 2012.

Vreugdenhil, M., Dorigo, W., Broer, M., Haas, P., Eder, A., Hogan, P., Bloeschl, G., and Wagner, W.: Towards a high-density soil moisture network for the validation of SMAP in Petzenkirchen, Austria, in: 2013 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium - IGARSS, pp. 1865–1868, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2013.6723166, 2013.

2090

Wanders, N., Karssenberg, D., Bierkens, M., Parinussa, R., de Jeu, R., van Dam, J., and de Jong, S.: Observation uncertainty of satellite soil moisture products determined with physically-based modeling, Remote Sensing of Environment, 127, 341–356, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2012.09.004, 2012.

Wang, L., Li, X., Chen, Y., Yang, K., Chen, D., Zhou, J., Liu, W., Qi, J., and Huang, J.: Validation of the global land data assimilation system based on measurements of soil temperature profiles, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 218-219, 288–297, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.01.003, 2016.

2095

Wang, L., He, B., Bai, X., and Xing, M.: Assessment of different vegetation parameters for parameterizing the coupled water cloud model and advanced integral equation model for soil moisture retrieval using time series Sentinel-1A data, Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 85, 43–54, 2019a.

2100 Wang, L., Xie, Z., Jia, B., Xie, J., Wang, Y., Liu, B., Li, R., and Chen, S.: Contributions of climate change and groundwater extraction to soil moisture trends, Earth System Dynamics, 10, 599–615, https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-10-599-2019, 2019b.

Wang, L., Fang, S., Pei, Z., Zhu, Y., Khoi, D. N., and Han, W.: Using FengYun-3C VSM Data and Multivariate Models to Estimate Land Surface Soil Moisture, Remote Sensing, 12, 1038, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12061038, 2020a.

WANG, R., ZHU, Q., MA, H., and et al.: Spatial and temporal variations of the surface soil moisture in the source region of the Yellow River from 2003 to 2010 based on AMSR-E[J]., SSWC, 15(1), 22–32, 2017.

2105

Wang, T., Franz, T. E., Li, R., You, J., Shulski, M. D., and Ray, C.: Evaluating climate and soil effects on regional soil moisture spatial variability using EOFs, Water Resources Research, 53, 4022–4035, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017WR020642, 2017.

Wang, Y., Yang, J., Chen, Y., Fang, G., Duan, W., Li, Y., and De Maeyer, P.: Quantifying the Effects of Climate and Vegetation on Soil Moisture in an Arid Area, China, Water, 11, https://doi.org/10.3390/w11040767, 2019c.

2110 Wang, Y., Shi, L., Lin, L., Holzman, M., Carmona, F., and Zhang, Q.: A robust data-worth analysis framework for soil moisture flow by hybridizing sequential data assimilation and machine learning, Vadose Zone Journal, 19, e20 026, https://doi.org/10.1002/vzj2.20026, 2020b.

Wang, Y., Leng, P., Peng, J., Marzahn, P., and Ludwig, R.: Global assessments of two blended microwave soil moisture products CCI and SMOPS with in-situ measurements and reanalysis data, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 94, 102 234, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2020.102234, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0303243420308771, 2021.

Western, A. W., Grayson, R. B., and Blöschl, G.: Scaling of Soil Moisture: A Hydrologic Perspective, Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 30, 149–180, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.earth.30.091201.140434, 2002.

Wigneron, J.-P., Dayan, S., Kruszewski, A., Aluome, C., Al-Yaari, A., Fan, L., Guven, S., Chipeaux, C., Moisy, C., Guyon, D., and Loustau, D.: The Aqui Network: Soil Moisture Sites in the "Les Landes" Forest and Graves Vineyards (Bordeaux Aquitaine Region, France), pp. 3739–3742, https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS.2018.8517392, 2018.

Wigneron, J.-P., Li, X., Frappart, F., Fan, L., Al-Yaari, A., De Lannoy, G., Liu, X., Wang, M., Le Masson, E., and Moisy, C.: SMOS-IC data record of soil moisture and L-VOD: Historical development, applications and perspectives, Remote Sensing of Environment, 254, 112 238, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.112238, 2021.

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., Gonzalez-Beltran, A., Gray, A. J., Groth, P., Goble, C., Grethe, J. S., Heringa, J., 't Hoen, P. A., Hooft, R., Kuhn, T., Kok, R., Kok, J., Lusher, S. J., Martone, M. E., Mons, A., Packer, A. L., Persson, B., Rocca-Serra, P., Roos, M., van Schaik, R., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Sengstag, T., Slater, T., Strawn, G., Swertz, M. A., Thompson, M., van der Lei, J., van Mulligen, E., Velterop, J., Waagmeester, A., Wittenburg, P., Wolstencroft, K., Zhao, J., and Mons, B.: The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship, Scientific Data, 3, 160 018, https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18, 2016.

Williams, S.: The Coordinated Energy and Water cycle Observations Project (CEOP) Data Integration Approach, EMS, p. 798, 2010.

Wu, K., Ryu, D., Nie, L., and Shu, H.: Time-variant error characterization of SMAP and ASCAT soil moisture using Triple Collocation Analysis, Remote Sensing of Environment, 256, 112 324, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112324, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425721000420, 2021.

Wu, M., Scholze, M., Voßbeck, M., Kaminski, T., and Hoffmann, G.: Simultaneous Assimilation of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture and FAPAR for Improving Terrestrial Carbon Fluxes at Multiple Sites Using CCDAS, Remote Sensing, 11, 27, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11010027, 2018.

Wu, Q., Liu, H., Wang, L., and Deng, C.: Evaluation of AMSR2 soil moisture products over the contiguous United States using in situ data from the International Soil Moisture Network, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 45, 187–199, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.10.011, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture - Part 1, 2016.

Xaver, A., Zappa, L., Rab, G., Pfeil, I., Vreugdenhil, M., Hemment, D., and Dorigo, W. A.: Evaluating the suitability of the consumer low-cost Parrot Flower Power soil moisture sensor for scientific environmental applications, Geoscientific Instrumentation, Methods and Data Systems, 9, 117–139, https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-9-117-2020, 2020.

Xia, Y., Ford, T. W., Wu, Y., Quiring, S. M., and Ek, M. B.: Automated Quality Control of In Situ Soil Moisture from the North American Soil Moisture Database Using NLDAS-2 Products, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 54, 1267–1282, https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-14-0275.1, 2015.

Xia, Y., Hao, Z., Shi, C., Li, Y., Meng, J., Xu, T., Wu, X., and Zhang, B.: Regional and Global Land Data Assimilation Systems: Innovations, Challenges, and Prospects, Journal of Meteorological Research, 33, 159–189, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13351-019-8172-4, 2019.

Xie, Q., Menenti, M., and Jia, L.: Improving the AMSR-E/NASA Soil Moisture Data Product Using In-Situ Measurements from the Tibetan Plateau, Remote Sensing, 11, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11232748, 2019.

Xing, C., Chen, N., Zhang, X., and Gong, J.: A Machine Learning Based Reconstruction Method for Satellite Remote Sensing of Soil Moisture Images with In Situ Observations, Remote Sensing, 9, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9050484, 2017.

Xu, H., Yuan, Q., Li, T., Shen, H., Zhang, L., and Jiang, H.: Quality Improvement of Satellite Soil Moisture Products by Fusing with In-Situ Measurements and GNSS-R Estimates in the Western Continental U.S., Remote Sensing, 10, 1351, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10091351, 2018.

Xu, L., Chen, N., Zhang, X., Moradkhani, H., Zhang, C., and Hu, C.: In-situ and triple-collocation based evaluations of eight global root zone soil moisture products, Remote Sensing of Environment, 254, 112 248, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.112248, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425720306210, 2021.

Yang, K., Qin, J., Zhao, L., Chen, Y., Tang, W., Han, M., Zhu, l., Chen, Z., Lv, N., Ding, B., Wu, H., and Lin, C.: A Multi-Scale Soil Moisture and Freeze-Thaw Monitoring Network on the Third Pole, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 94, 1907–1916, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00203.1, 2013.

Yao, P., Shi, J., Zhao, T., Lu, H., and Al-Yaari, A.: Rebuilding Long Time Series Global Soil Moisture Products Using the Neural Network Adopting the Microwave Vegetation Index, Remote Sensing, 9, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9010035, 2017.

Yao, P., Lu, H., Shi, J., Zhao, T., Yang, K., Cosh, M. H., Gianotti, D. J. S., and Entekhabi, D.: A long term global daily soil moisture dataset derived from AMSR-E and AMSR2 (2002–2019), Scientific data, 8, 1–16, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00925-8, 2021.

Yin, Z., Ottlé, C., Ciais, P., Guimberteau, M., Wang, X., Zhu, D., Maignan, F., Peng, S., Piao, S., Polcher, J., Zhou, F., Kim, H., and other China-Trend-Stream project members: Evaluation of ORCHIDEE-MICT-simulated soil moisture over China and impacts of different atmospheric forcing data, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 5463–5484, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-5463-2018, https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/22/5463/2018/, 2018.

Young, R., Walker, J., Yeoh, N., Smith, A., Ellett, K., Merlin, O., and Western, A.: Soil moisture and meteorological observations from the Murrumbidgee catchment, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The University of Melbourne, 2008.

Zacharias, S., Bogena, H., Samaniego, L., Mauder, M., Fuß, R., Pütz, T., Frenzel, M., Schwank, M., Baessler, C., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Bens, O., Borg, E., Brauer, A., Dietrich, P., Hajnsek, I., Helle, G., Kiese, R., Kunstmann, H., Klotz, S., and Vereecken, H.: A Network of Terrestrial Environmental Observatories in Germany, Vadose Zone Journal, 10, 955–973, https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2010.0139, 2011.

Zappa, L., Forkel, M., Xaver, A., and Dorigo, W.: Deriving Field Scale Soil Moisture from Satellite Observations and Ground Measurements in a Hilly Agricultural Region, Remote Sensing, 11, 2596, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11222596, 2019.

Zappa, L., Woods, M., Hemment, D., Xaver, A., and Dorigo, W.: Evaluation of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture Products using Crowdsourced Measurements, Eighth International Conference on Remote Sensing and Geoinformation of Environment, SPIE, Cyprus, 2020.

Zawadzki, J. and Kędzior, M.: Soil moisture variability over Odra watershed: Comparison between SMOS and GLDAS data, International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 45, 110–124, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.03.005, advances in the Validation and Application of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture - Part 1, 2016.

Zeng, J., Li, Z., Quan, C., and Bi, H.: A simplified physically-based algorithm for surface soil moisture retrieval using AMSR-E data, Frontiers of Earth Science, 8, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11707-014-0412-4, 2014.

Zeng, J., Chen, K., Bi, H., and Chen, Q.: A Preliminary Evaluation of the SMAP Radiometer Soil Moisture Product Over United States and Europe Using Ground-Based Measurements, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 54, 4929–4940, 2016.

Zhang, Q., Shi, L., Holzman, M., Ye, M., Wang, Y., Carmona, F., and Zha, Y.: A dynamic data-driven method for dealing with model structural error in soil moisture data assimilation, Advances in Water Resources, 132, 103 407, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2019.103407, 2019a.

Zhang, Q., Yuan, Q., Li, J., Wang, Y., Sun, F., and Zhang, L.: Generating seamless global daily AMSR2 soil moisture (SGD-SM) long-term products for the years 2013–2019, Earth System Science Data, 13, 1385–1401, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-1385-2021, https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/13/1385/2021/, 2021a.

Zhang, R., Kim, S., and Sharma, A.: A comprehensive validation of the SMAP Enhanced Level-3 Soil Moisture product using ground measurements over varied climates and landscapes, Remote Sensing of Environment, 223, 82–94, 2019b.

Zhang, R., Kim, S., Sharma, A., and Lakshmi, V.: Identifying relative strengths of SMAP, SMOS-IC, and ASCAT to capture temporal variability, Remote Sensing of Environment, 252, 112 126, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2020.112126, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425720304995, 2021b.

Zhang, S., Calvet, J.-C., Darrozes, J., Roussel, N., Frappart, F., and Bouhours, G.: Deriving surface soil moisture from reflected GNSS signal observations from a grassland site in southwestern France, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 1931–1946, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-1931-2018, 2018a.

Zhang, S., Meurey, C., and Calvet, J.-C.: Identification of soil-cooling rains in southern France from soil temperature and soil moisture observations, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 19, 5005–5020, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-5005-2019, 2019c.

Zhang, X., Chen, N., Chen, Z., Wu, L., Li, X., Zhang, L., Di, L., Gong, J., and Li, D.: Geospatial sensor web: A cyber-physical infrastructure for geoscience research and application, Earth-science reviews, 185, 684–703, 2018b.

Zhao, L. and Yang, Z.-L.: Multi-sensor land data assimilation: Toward a robust global soil moisture and snow estimation, Remote Sensing of Environment, 216, 13–27, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.06.033, 2018.

Zhao, L., Yang, Z.-L., and Hoar, T. J.: Global Soil Moisture Estimation by Assimilating AMSR-E Brightness Temperatures in a Coupled CLM4–RTM–DART System, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 17, 2431–2454, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0218.1, 2016.

Zhao, T., Shi, J., Lin, M., Yin, X., Liu, Y., Lan, H., and Xiong, C.: Potential soil moisture product from the Chinese HY-2 scanning microwave radiometer and its initial assessment, Journal of Applied Remote Sensing, 8, 1–12, https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JRS.8.083560, 2014.

Zhao, W. and Li, A.: A Downscaling Method for Improving the Spatial Resolution of AMSR-E Derived Soil Moisture Product Based on MSG-SEVIRI Data, Remote Sensing, 5, 6790–6811, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs5126790, 2013.

Zhao, W. and Li, A.: A comparison study on empirical microwave soil moisture downscaling methods based on the integration of microwave-optical/IR data on the Tibetan Plateau, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 36, 4986–5002, https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2015.1041178, 2015.

Zhao, W., Li, A., Jin, H., Zhang, Z., Bian, J., and Yin, G.: Performance Evaluation of the Triangle-Based Empirical Soil Moisture Relationship Models Based on Landsat-5 TM Data and In Situ Measurements, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 55, 2632–2645, https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2017.2649522, 2017.

Zhao, W., Sánchez, N., Lu, H., and Li, A.: A spatial downscaling approach for the SMAP passive surface soil moisture product using random forest regression, Journal of Hydrology, 563, 1009–1024, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.06.081, 2018.

Zhu, L., Wang, H., Tong, C., Liu, W., and Du, B.: Evaluation of ESA Active, Passive and Combined Soil Moisture Products Using Upscaled Ground Measurements, Sensors, 19, 2718, 2019.

Zreda, M., Desilets, D., Ferré, T., and Scott, R.: Measuring soil moisture content non-invasively at intermediate spatial scale using cosmic-ray neutrons, Geophysical Research Letters, 35, https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL035655, 2008.

Zreda, M., Shuttleworth, W. J., Zeng, X., Zweck, C., Desilets, D., Franz, T., and Rosolem, R.: COSMOS: the COsmic-ray Soil Moisture Observing System, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 16, 4079–4099, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-4079-2012, 2012.

Zwieback, S., Dorigo, W., and Wagner, W.: Estimation of the temporal autocorrelation structure by the collocation technique with an emphasis on soil moisture studies, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 58, 1729–1747, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.839876, 2013.

Zwieback, S., Paulik, C., and Wagner, W.: Frozen Soil Detection Based on Advanced Scatterometer Observations and Air Temperature Data as Part of Soil Moisture Retrieval, Remote Sensing, 7, 3206–3231, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs70303206, 2015.

2230 Zwieback, S., Su, C.-H., Gruber, A., Dorigo, W. A., and Wagner, W.: The Impact of Quadratic Nonlinear Relations between Soil Moisture Products on Uncertainty Estimates from Triple Collocation Analysis and Two Quadratic Extensions, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 17, 1725–1743, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-0213.1, 2016.