



Parameterisation and calibration of L-MEB in the Level-2 SMOS algorithm

Jean-Pierre Wigneron, Yann H. Kerr, Kauzar Saleh Contell, Philippe Richaume, Patricia de Rosnay, Maria-José Escorihuela, Jean-Christophe Calvet, Aurelio Cano, Andre Chanzy, François Demontoux, et al.

► To cite this version:

Jean-Pierre Wigneron, Yann H. Kerr, Kauzar Saleh Contell, Philippe Richaume, Patricia de Rosnay, et al.. Parameterisation and calibration of L-MEB in the Level-2 SMOS algorithm. 10. Specialist Meeting on Microwave Radiometry and Remote Sensing of the Environment, Mar 2008, Florence, Italy. hal-02824714

HAL Id: hal-02824714

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02824714>

Submitted on 6 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Parameterisation and calibration of L-MEB in the Level-2 SMOS algorithm



J-P Wigneron, Y. Kerr, K. Saleh, P. Richaume, P. de Rosnay, M-J Escorihuela, J-C Calvet, A. Cano, A. Chanzy, F. Demontoux, J. P. Grant, M. Guglielmetti, H. Lauwrence, E. Lopez-Baeza, A. Mialon, T. Pellarin, C. Rüdiger, G. Ruffié, M. Schwank, N. Skou, P. Waldteufel, M. Berger, S. Delwart

MICRORAD'08, March 11-14, 2008, Firenze



Outlines:

- SMOS: L-MEB used in the Level-2 algorithm
- Improving L-MEB: key questions?
- recent results for soil:
 - surface roughness
 - effective soil temperature
- Conclusions

2. SMOS (Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity)

Low spatial resolution: ~ 35-50km

Revisit time: Max. 3 days


Sensitivity ~ 2K over land

Goal of accuracy in SM: ~ 0.04 m³/m³

Launch : 2008



Retrieval algorithm: using multiangular and dual polarization TB



Soil moisture & vegetation opacity (τ), ...

-Level-2 algorithm completed, now validation activities

the Expert Support Laboratory (ESL) includes CESBIO, IPSL, TOV-Roma

-based on L-MEB, (L-band Microwave Emission of the Biosphere)


L-MEB (L-band Microwave Emission of the Biosphere model)



[Wigneron et al., *in book 06*
, *RSE 07*]

- L-MEB = result of an extensive review of the current knowledge of the microwave emission from vegetation
- Based on based on R.T. modeling (τ - ω model for vegetation)
& specific parametrisations for roughness, $T_{\text{effective}}$, angular effects, etc.
- Parameter calibration for a variety of soil/vegetation types
(crops, prairies, shrubs, coniferous, deciduous forests, etc.)
- Valid $\sim$ in the 1- 10 GHz Range (L-, C-, X-MEB)

L-MEB (L-band Microwave Emission of the Biosphere model)



Zero order solution of radiative transfer equations:

$$TB_{veg} = (1 - e^{-\tau/\cos(\theta)}) (1 - \omega) T_{veg} (1 + \Gamma_{soil} e^{-\tau/\cos(\theta)})$$

Accounting for angular effects on τ :

$$\tau(\text{nadir}) = b \text{ VWC} = b' \text{ LAI} + b''$$

$$\tau_p = \tau_0(\text{nadir}) \cdot (\cos^2(\theta) + t t_p \sin^2(\theta))$$

param.: τ_{nadir} , ω , $t t v$, $t t h$, b' , b''

Roughness, effective temperature:

$$\Gamma_{soil} = \Gamma_{soil_smooth} e^{-HR \cos N p(\theta)} \text{ with } HR \text{ (SM)}$$

$$T_{G=} T_{depth} + C (T_{surf} - T_{depth}), \quad C = (SM/W0)^{wb}$$

param: $HR(SM)$, NRv , NRh , $w0$, wb

A few key questions still pending:




- soil emission:
 - surface roughness: link between NRp, HR, and (STD, Lc, ...)?,
 - HR(SM)?, use of Q ?
 - effective soil temperature: sensitivity of (W_0 , b) on the soil type?
 - model accuracy at rather large angles ($\theta \geq 40^\circ$)?
- soil permittivity:
 - model accuracy over a large range of soil types (use of Mironov routine for high sand fraction?)
- vegetation
 - dependence of ω , ttp ($p=v$, h) on the vegetation structure?
 - relating optical depth TAU with Veg. Water content, or LAI?
 - effect of interception (flagged currently using PR)?
- litter, understory in natural environment (forests, prairies, etc.)
 - several modelling approaches in the literature:
 - validation ?,
 - tractable for retrievals ?

Studies: based on experimental activities for a large range of soil and vegetation conditions:

experiments over the last years:

- **SMOSREX** (CESBIO, CNRM, INRA, ONERA), **soil-fallow**, Toulouse site, 2003-2008
- **BRAY-04-08** (INRA), **coniferous forest** EMIRAD (TUD), 2004-2008
- **MELBEX-1-2** (U. Valencia, INRA), **mattoral, vineyards** EMIRAD (TUD), 2006-2008
- **ELBARA** (ETH, U. of Bern), **grass, deciduous forest** 2004-2006
- **REFLEX'05** (Univ. of IOWA),
- ...



Modelling Soil TB in L-MEB

$$TB_{\text{soil}} = (1 - \Gamma_{\text{soil}}) \cdot T_G$$

Effective soil temperature T_G :

$$T_G = T_{\text{depth}} + C (T_{\text{surf}} - T_{\text{depth}}), \quad C = (SM/W0)^{wb}$$

Wigneron et al., 2001

Soil roughness effects derived from:

$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = (Q \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* + (1-Q) \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-q}}^*) e^{-HR \cos^2(\theta)}$$

Wang and Choudhury, 1981

- limited physical basis: meaning of calibrated parameters? site specific calibration ?
- account for ALL complex mechanisms at the origin of the soil emission (“geometric” and “dielectric” roughness, inhomogeneities, inclusions, ...)
- very good performance and efficiency for retrieval studies at L-band

L-Meb modeling of the effective soil temperature T_G

Wigneron et al., 2008

$$T_G = T_{\text{depth}} + C (T_{\text{surf}} - T_{\text{depth}}),$$

Choudhury et al., 1982

T_{depth} at $\sim 50\text{cm}$, T_{surf} at $\sim 5\text{ cm}$, $C = 0.246$ at L-band

However, the effective depth depends on SM (larger for dry soils)

$$T_G = T_{\text{depth}} + C (T_{\text{surf}} - T_{\text{depth}}), \quad C = (SM/W_0)^b$$

Wigneron et al., 2001

- W_0 , and b were calibrated, considering T_{depth} & T_{surf} at various depths
- $W_0 = 0.3$, $b = 0.3$; default L-MEB parameters

- modified and validated over SMOSREX (De Rosnay et al.; Holmes et al., 2006)

Sensitivity of W_0 and b to soil texture and density ?

soil texture affects T_G , through:

- relationship between ε and SM
- SM and temperature profiles within soil

Evaluating the effects of soil properties on T_G

Methods:

- building a very large synthetic reference data set:

- for a large range in soil texture & density, hourly over a 14-day period, 4 initial SM and 5 climatic conditions (winter, summer, etc.)
- simulating soil temperature & moisture profiles, with a mechanistic soil transfer model (TEC)
- coupling with a RT model simulating a “reference” T_G


- calibrating model parameters:

- for Choudhury (Ch): C ; Wigneron, (Wig): W0, b, ..., approaches

- considering
$$\begin{array}{l} T_{\text{surf}} = T_{\text{air}}, T_{0\text{cm}}, T_{2\text{cm}}, T_{5\text{cm}}, \text{etc.}, \\ T_{\text{depth}} = T_{10\text{cm}}, T_{20\text{cm}}, \dots \end{array}$$

- evaluating the sensitivity of the parameters on texture, density

PORTOS-93 experiment



Soil type	Texture type		SAND S (%)	CLAY C (%)	SILT L(%)	bulk soil density ρ_b (g / cm ³)
1. Poirson	Silty Clay Loam	measured	11	27.2	61.8	1.4
		range	3, 9, 15, 21	21, 24, 27, 30, 33, 36, 39	deduced from L=100-S-C	1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8
2. Collias	Sandy Loam	measured	38.8	10.5	50.6	1.45
		range	30, 37, 44, 51	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21	deduced from L=100-S-C	1.4, 1.6, 1.8
3. Vignère	Clay	measured	12.5	47.4	40.1	1.4
		range	3, 9, 15, 21	42, 45, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60	deduced from L=100-S-C	1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8

considered range in soil texture & density:

sand (3 → 51%)
 clay (3 → 60%)
 bulk density (1 → 1.8 g/cm3)

Main results

- best estimator of T_g are obtained at a depth which depends on the soil type (accuracy $\sim 1.5K$):
 - ~ 2 -5 cm for clay
 - ~ 5 cm for silty clay loam
 - ~ 5 -10 cm for sandy soils (drier at surface generally)
- air temperature (T_{air}) is a good estimator of T_g (accuracy ~ 3 K):
 - cannot be improved using information on T_{depth} (using Ch or Wig)
- surface temperature ($T_{0cm} \sim T_{IRT}$) is an estimator of T_g (acc. ~ 4 K):
 - can be improved using information on T_{depth} (acc. $\sim 1.8K$ using Ch)
- using $T_{surf} = T_{2cm}, T_{5cm}, \text{etc.}$, information on T_{depth} , with Ch or Wig, provide improvements:
 - acc. 4K $\rightarrow$ 1.8K ($T_{surf} = T_{0cm}$)
 - acc. 1.9K $\rightarrow$ 1.1K, ($T_{surf} = T_{2cm}$), etc.

Main results

- using Ch or Wig, results (model parameters, acc.) depend on the soil types:


- for the Ch method ($T_{\text{sur}} = 2\text{cm}$): CT varies $0.82 \rightarrow 0.65$ & RMSE $0.8\text{K} \rightarrow 1.3\text{K}$ (clay and sandy loam)

- investigating the use of additional information on soil characteristics: texture (clay, sand) or density (rob)


- a 4P formulation where, $W0 = \text{constant}$; $b = a + b \cdot \text{clay} + d \cdot \text{rob}$ is the best compromise (accuracy / complexity)

- the 4P formulation provides $\sim 0.2\text{K}$ improvement (larger for sandy soils)


Choudhury



Wigneron 2P



Wigneron 4P



Conclusions (effective T_g)



- effects of soil texture & density on T_g could be evaluated
 - several simplified formulations were developed for a variety of conditions (depending on the availability of ancillary data for: depths for T_{depth} , T_{surf} , texture, density...)
 - possibility to calibrate b & W_0 parameters from available global maps (FAO) (no need for in situ calibration)
 - interest of using T_{air} or T_0 as proxy of T_g
 - specific effects over sandy soils (much drier in general)
 - studies limited to clay < 60%, sand < 50%
- perspectives
 - accounting for the uncertainties on the ancillary data (on T_{air} vs T_0 , ..)
 - high interest to develop studies over larger ranges of fractions:
in particular the 'Mironov' routine allows to investigate sandy soils (sand > 80%) corresponding to large fraction of the globe (deserted areas).

Soil roughness modelling in L-MEB

$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = (Q \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* + (1-Q) \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-q}}^*) e^{-HR \cos^2(\theta)}$$

Wang and Choudhury, 1981

Regular improvements:

$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = (Q \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* + (1-Q) \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-q}}^*) e^{-HR \cos NR_p(\theta)}$$

used in L-MEB

with

-Q ~ 0 at L-band, increases with frequency

Wang et al., 1983, Wign. et al., 2001

-ev decreases with frequency, at large angles (Q $\neq 0$?)

Shi et al, 2002

-exponent NR ~ 0

Wang et al., 1983, Wign. et al., 2001

-HR = f(STD / LC)

Mo & Schmugge, 1982; Wign. et al., 2001

-HR = f(SM), accounting for higher “dielectric” roughness over dry soils?

Mo & Schmugge, 1982; Wign. et al., 2001, Escorihuela et al., 2007

-distinguishing NR for the V and H polarization, (NR_p, HR)

Escorihuela et al., 2007

PORTOS-1993: A Re-analysis

PORTOS 1993, experiment: 7 surface roughness conditions



Field N°	Label	Dry Bulk Density (2-4 cm) ρ_b (g/cm ³)	Roughness Characteristics				Surface Type
			Std Deviation of height σ_S (mm)		Correlation Length L_C (mm)		
			mean	std	mean	std	
6	SB	1.2*	59.37	13.77	67.32	12.54	P. (fast)
9	OD	1.35	4.76	1.89	63.05	19.01	P., R. (slow)
11	SC	1.43	8.39	1.24	31.47	20.14	P., R., H. (fast)
15	SL	1.3	8.96	2.84	71.5	61.9	P., R. (fast), H. (slow)
16	SR	1.2*	47.43	4.76	61.72	4.10	P. (fast)
17	SI	1.42	4.57	1.98	206.06	51.49	P., R. (slow), Roadrolled
18	SU	1.1	19.15	5.08	65.75	45.6	P., P. (fast), H. (slow)

Wigneron, 2001:

-Q= NRV=NRH=0

-HR(SM, slope M = STD/Lc)


$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* e^{-HR}$$

PORTOS-1993: Main results


(Wigneron et al., IEEE-GE, 2001)

$$-Q = NR_v = NR_h = 0$$

$$-HR = a \cdot SM^b + (STD/L_c)^c$$






-RMSE (TB) ~ 10K
simulated and measured TB



Since then , new results (Shi et al. 2002-2006, Escorihuela et al., 2007)

PORTOS-1993: Comparing measured and Fresnel reflectivities



→ V-pol, 40°: emissivity ↓ as roughness ↑ for 3 fields (11, 15, 17) as predicted by Shi et al., 2002


→ Simulations for these fields require the use of the additional Q parameter

PORTOS-1993: a re-analysis accounting for new results by Shi et al., Escorihuela et al.

- Considering Q , NR_v and NR_h

$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = (Q \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* + (1-Q) \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-q}}^*) e^{-HR \cos Np(\theta)}$$

- Filtering data more accurately (accounting for days with strong diurnal variations in SM, roughness, etc.)



$$HR = f(STD)$$

$$\rightarrow HR = (a.STD / (c.STD + d))^b;$$

$$R2 = 0.95,$$


→ no improvement using information about SM or L_c

→ $Q \sim 0.2$ for fields 11, 15, 17
 $Q = 0$, for the others


PORTOS-1993: a Re-analysis

- clear values of NRv and NRh can be associated to each field
- NRh ≈ 0
- NRv: could not be clearly related to geophys. param. (STd, Lc, etc.)

$$\text{NRv} = f(\text{STD})$$



$$\text{NRh} = f(\text{STD})$$




PORTOS-1993: a re-analysis

$$\Gamma_{\text{soil-p}} = (Q \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-p}}^* + (1-Q) \cdot \Gamma_{\text{soil-q}}^*) e^{-HR \cos Np(\theta)}$$

- $HR = (a \cdot \text{STD} / (c \cdot \text{STD} + d))^b$;
- $Q \sim 0.2$ for fields 11, 15, 17
 $Q = 0$, for the others
- $NRh = 0$
- $NRv = f(\text{field})$, between $[-2 \dots 1]$

Good agreement with other studies:

- REBEX $HR \sim 0.7$ for $STD = 28\text{mm}$
- SMOSREX: $NRv = -2$, $NRh = 0$




Comparing measured and
simulated reflectivities

RMSE ~ 5.5 K

L-meb calibration over vegetated fields

Wigneron et al., 2007



Good agreement with results obtained from P93:

	HR	NR _V	NR _H	tt _H	tt _V	ω _H	ω _V	Number of observation dates	RMSE on SM (m ³ /m ³)
PORTOS-91, soybean	0.1	0	0	1	2	0	0	32	0.044
BARC, soybean ⊥ //	0.2	-1	0	1	1	0	0	11 11	0.029 0.053
PORTOS-93, wheat	0.1	0	0	1	8	0	0	45	0.061
for DOY<161								30	0.042
EMIRAD-2001, corn ⊥	0.1	0	0	2	1	0.05	0.05	33	0.042
corn //								30	0.044
REBEX, corn	0.7	-1	0.5	2	1	0.05	0.05	5	0.025
BARC, corn ⊥ corn //	0.6	-1	0.5	2	1	0.05	0.05	14 14	0.035 0.023

PORTOS-1993: a re-analysis, conclusions

→ Calibration of the L-MEB parameters (HR, Q, NRv and NRh) was evaluated against the P93 & other (vegetated) data sets (Wign. et al., 2007, 2008)

- HR could be parameterized as a function of STD
- Q, NRh, NRv could be calibrated for each field
 - NRh ~ 0
 - NRv $\sim [-2, 0.5]$

-use of Q ? decrease of TBv at high roughness?

→ improved results were obtained (RMSE(TB) : 10K → 5K):
interest to use NRp at rather high angles ($\theta \geq 30^\circ$)

→ Link between the L-MEB parameters and surface characteristics ??

- no sensitivity of L-MEB parameters to SM & Lc could be revealed



