



HAL
open science

Global-scale evaluation of two satellite-based passive microwave soil moisture datasets (SMOS and AMSR-E) with respect to Land Data Assimilation System estimates

Amen Al-Yaari, Jean-Pierre Wigneron, Agnès Ducharne, Yann H. Kerr, Patricia de Rosnay, Richard de Jeu, Ajit Govind, Al Bitar Ahmad, Clément Albergel, Joaquin Munoz-Sabater, et al.

► To cite this version:

Amen Al-Yaari, Jean-Pierre Wigneron, Agnès Ducharne, Yann H. Kerr, Patricia de Rosnay, et al.. Global-scale evaluation of two satellite-based passive microwave soil moisture datasets (SMOS and AMSR-E) with respect to Land Data Assimilation System estimates. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2014, 140, pp.181-195. 10.1016/j.rse.2014.04.006 . hal-01062447

HAL Id: hal-01062447

<https://hal.science/hal-01062447v1>

Submitted on 12 Sep 2014

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.

1 **Global- scale evaluation of two satellite-based passive microwave soil moisture**
2 **datasets (SMOS and AMSR-E) with respect to Land Data Assimilation**
3 **System estimates**

4

5 A. Alyaari^{a,b}, JP. Wigneron^a, A. Ducharne^b, Y. Kerr^c, P. de Rosnay^d, R. de Jeu^e, A. Govind^a, A.
6 Al Bitar^c, C. Albergel^d, J. Muñoz-Sabater^d, P. Richaume^c, A. Mialon^c

7

8 ^a INRA, UR1263 EPHYSE, F-33140 Villenave d'Ornon, Bordeaux, France

9 ^b Sisyphe, Université Pierre-et-Marie Curie/CNRS, Paris, France

10 ^c Centre d'Etudes Spatiales de la BIOSphère (CESBIO - CNES, CNRS, IRD, Université Toulouse III),
11 Toulouse, France

12 ^d European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), Reading, UK

13 ^e Department of Earth Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Abstract

24 Global Level-3 surface Soil Moisture (SM) maps derived from the passive microwave SMOS
25 (Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity) observations at L-band have recently been released. In this
26 study, a comparative analysis of this Level 3 product (referred to as SMOSL3) along with
27 another Surface SM (SSM) product derived from the observations of the Advanced Microwave
28 Scanning Radiometer (AMSR-E) at C-band is presented (this latter product is referred to as
29 AMSRM). SM-DAS-2, a SSM product produced by the European Centre for Medium Range
30 Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) Land Data Assimilation System (LDAS) was used to monitor
31 both SMOSL3 and AMSRM quality. The present study was carried out from 03/2010 to
32 09/2011, a period during which both SMOS and AMSR-E products were available at global
33 scale. Three statistical metrics were used for the evaluation; the correlation coefficient (R), the
34 Root Mean Squared Difference (RMSD), and the bias. Results were analysed using maps of
35 biomes and Leaf Area Index (LAI). It is shown that both SMOSL3 and AMSRM captured well
36 the spatio-temporal variability of SM-DAS-2 for most of the biomes. In term of correlation
37 values, the SMOSL3 product was found to better capture the SSM temporal dynamics in highly
38 vegetated biomes (“tropical humid”, “temperate humid”, etc.) while best results for AMSRM
39 were obtained over arid and semi-arid biomes (“desert temperate”, “desert tropical”, etc.).
40 Finally, we showed that the accuracy of the remotely sensed SSM products is strongly related
41 to LAI. Both the SMOSL3 and AMSRM (marginally better) SSM products correlated well with
42 the SM-DAS-2 product over regions with sparse vegetation for values of $LAI \leq 1$ (these regions
43 represent almost 50% of the pixels considered in this global study). In regions where $LAI > 1$,
44 SMOSL3 showed better correlations with SM-DAS-2 than AMSRM: SMOSL3 had a
45 consistent performance up to $LAI = 6$, whereas the AMSRM performance deteriorated with
46 increasing values of LAI. This study reveals that SMOS and AMSR-E complement one another

47 in monitoring SSM over a wide range in conditions of vegetation density and that there are
48 valuable satellite observed SSM data records over more than 10 years, which can be used to
49 study land-atmosphere processes.

50

51 **1. Introduction**

52

53 Soil moisture (SM) is a key environmental variable, which interacts with vegetation and
54 ecosystem functioning (Bolten et al., 2010; Daly & Porporato, 2005), water resources (Dobriyal
55 et al., 2012), and the climate system. It is central to land-atmosphere interactions due to its
56 positive control on evapotranspiration, with feedback loops that are usually negative on air
57 temperature (Cheruy et al., 2013), and still not well understood on rainfall (Taylor et al., 2012).
58 SM also influences the dynamics of all the above mentioned processes by buffering or memory
59 effects, with consequences on the persistence of extreme events, climate and hydrologic
60 predictability, and even anthropogenic climate change trajectories (Entekhabi et al., 1996; Koster
61 et al., 2010; Koster et al., 2004b; Quesada et al., 2012; Seneviratne et al., 2013; Thirel et al.,
62 2010).

63 As a result, accurate SM initialization is crucial to the quality of most water-related
64 environmental forecasts up to at least seasonal forecasts, including numerical weather predictions
65 (NWP) (Beljaars et al., 1996; De Lannoy et al., 2013; de Rosnay et al., 2012; de Rosnay et al.,
66 2013; Drusch & Viterbo, 2007; Koster et al., 2006). In particular, it is important to achieve an
67 accurate SM initialization at the scale of the forecast models, which can exceed $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ for
68 NWP and climate models. In situ SM measurements can now be routinely achieved with an
69 accuracy as high as $0.025 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ (Walker et al., 2004). However, considering the high spatial
70 variability of SM and the poor density of in situ measurement sites, it is not possible to produce

71 accurate large-scale estimate of SM from in situ measurement networks (Dorigo et al., 2011;
72 Hollinger & Isard, 1994; Vivoni et al., 2008).

73 A major alternative to estimate SM at the large scale is to rely on remote sensing satellites, using
74 passive or active microwave sensors, which offer global coverage and good temporal repetitivity,
75 but are only sensitive to a shallow layer of the soil. Historically, passive microwave sensors were
76 first used, starting with the Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR; 6.6, 10.7 ,
77 18.0 21, and 37 GHz channels; Wang, 1985) which operated on Nimbus-7 between 1978 and
78 1987, then the Special Sensor Microwave Imager (SSM/I) which started in 1987. Later passive
79 sensors include the microwave imager from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM;
80 10, 19 and 21 GHz channel; Bindlish et al., 2003; Gao et al., 2006), the Advanced Microwave
81 Scanning Radiometer on Earth Observing System (AMSR-E; from 6.9 to 89.0 GHz; Njoku & Li,
82 1999) which operated on the AQUA satellite between 2002 and 2011, and Coriolis Windsat
83 which started in 2003 (Parinussa et al., 2011a). More recently, the Soil Moisture and Ocean
84 Salinity (SMOS; 1.4 GHz) was launched in 2009 (Kerr et al., 2010) and the upcoming SMAP
85 (Soil Moisture Active/Passive) mission, including a radiometer at L-band, was planned by the
86 National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and scheduled for launch in 2014
87 (Entekhabi et al., 2010). Low resolution active microwave sensors (scatterometers) have also
88 been used (Bartalis et al., 2007; Wagner et al., 2007).

89 Among all these microwave sensors, SMOS is the first satellite dedicated and specifically
90 designed to measure directly surface SM (SSM) and sea surface salinity on a global scale (Kerr
91 et al., 2012; Kerr et al., 2010) owing to its polar-orbiting 2-D interferometric radiometer at L-
92 band. The Level 2 SMOS SSM products (SMOSL2) are derived from the multiangular and fully
93 polarized L-band passive microwave measurements (Kerr et al., 2012). A new global Level 3

94 SSM dataset (referred to as SMOSL3; Jacquette et al., 2010) has been released very recently.
95 The general principle of the algorithm is similar to the one used for producing the standard Level
96 2 SSM products, but the quality of the SSM product is enhanced by using multi-orbit retrievals
97 (Kerr et al., 2013).

98 Another strategy to produce large-scale estimates of SM relies on modelling, either directly using
99 multimodel SM means (Dirmeyer et al., 2006; Georgakakos & Carpenter, 2006), or via
100 assimilation systems, which aim at optimally combining land surface models and SM related
101 observations (de Rosnay et al., 2012; Drusch & Viterbo, 2007). This strategy has proved to be
102 particularly fruitful and highlighted the need for accurate surface and root zone SM remotely
103 sensed estimates (de Rosnay et al., 2011; de Rosnay et al., 2013; Draper et al., 2009a; Muñoz-
104 Sabater et al., 2007; Reichle et al., 2007). The SM-DAS-2 analysis, for instance, is retrieved by
105 assimilating ASCAT SSM products in the ECMWF (European Centre for Medium-Range
106 Weather Forecasts) Land Data Assimilation System, and the resulting estimates of SM benefit
107 from high quality analysed atmospheric data (de Rosnay et al., 2011; de Rosnay et al., 2013;
108 Drusch et al., 2009).

109 Whatever their origin, the evaluation of global SSM products is needed to guide their correct use,
110 and to improve our understanding of their strengths and weaknesses over a large spectrum of
111 climate and environmental conditions across the world. Several studies have evaluated SSM
112 products based on passive microwave sensors against in situ measurements and modelled data
113 over different regions (Al Bitar et al., 2012; Albergel et al., 2012; Brocca et al., 2011;
114 Dall'Amico et al., 2012; Draper et al., 2009a; Jackson et al., 2012; Lacava et al., 2012; Leroux et
115 al., 2011; Mladenova et al., 2011; Sahoo et al., 2008; Su et al., 2011). Although consistent results
116 were generally obtained from the remotely sensed and modelled data, disagreements or biases

117 between the different sources of SSM data were noted depending on the particular regions or
118 time periods. For instance, Albergel et al. (2012) found that the SM-DAS-2 SSM estimates were
119 closer to in situ measurements in terms of correlation than SMOS and ASCAT SSM products, in
120 several stations situated in Africa, Australia, Europe, and the United States.

121 In this context, we present in this study a global evaluation of two SSM datasets retrieved from
122 passive microwave observations (SMOSL3 and AMSRM, respectively based on SMOS and
123 AMSR-E observations) against the SM-DAS-2 product, which is used here as a reference,
124 because it is the most consistent SM product compared to in situ SM data (Albergel et al., 2012).

125 In doing so, we have two specific objectives. The first objective is to provide the first assessment
126 of the SMOSL3 product at global scale. The second objective is to compare SSM products
127 retrieved from passive microwave observations at two different frequency bands: L-band (~ 1.4
128 GHz) for SMOSL3 vs. C-band (~ 5 GHz) for AMSRM. Although the performances of L-band
129 vs. C-band for SSM retrievals have been compared against experimental or simulated data sets
130 (Calvet et al., 2011; Wigneron et al., 1993), no global study based on satellite data has yet been
131 made, to our knowledge. L-band is generally considered to be the optimum frequency band for
132 SM monitoring due to (i) lower attenuation effects by vegetation (ii) lower atmospheric effects
133 and larger effective sampling depth (~ 0-3 cm; Escorihuela et al., 2010) than C-band.

134 The SSM datasets used and the methodology for their evaluation are described in Section 2. The
135 results are then presented in Section 3. Finally, discussion and conclusions are given in Section
136 4.

137

138 **2. Materials and methods**

139

140 2.1. Global-scale soil moisture datasets

141

142 The main characteristics of the three SSM datasets considered in this study are summarized in
143 Table 1. The evaluation was performed for the period 03/2010 - 09/2011, which corresponds to
144 the full period of availability of the two satellite-based products: tests made during the SMOS
145 commissioning phase ended in March 2010 while the AMSR-E spatial mission ended in October
146 2011.

147 2.1.1. SMOSL3

148

149 The SMOS satellite was launched in November 2009 and is operated by the European Space
150 Agency (ESA), as part of its Living Planet Programme, and the Centre National d'Etudes
151 Spatiales (CNES) in France. SMOS operates at L-band with a spatial resolution of 35–50 km
152 (Kerr et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2001). The SMOS mission aims to monitor SSM at a depth of
153 about 3 to 5 cm and an accuracy of $0.04 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$. SMOS provides global coverage with a 3-day
154 revisit at the equator with a morning ascending orbit at 0600 hours local time and an afternoon
155 descending orbit at 1800 hours (Kerr et al., 2012).

156 The CATDS Centre (Centre Aval de Traitement des Données; <http://catds.ifremer.fr/>) recently
157 provided re-processed global maps of SSM at different temporal resolutions: daily products, 3
158 day global products insuring a complete coverage of the Earth surface, 10-day composite
159 products, and monthly average products, the so-called SMOS level 3 products (SMOSL3). These
160 products are presented in the NetCDF format on the EASE grid (Equal Area Scalable Earth grid)
161 with a spatial resolution of $\sim 25 \text{ km} \times 25 \text{ km}$. The main principle of the algorithm used to retrieve
162 SSM is the same as the one used by the ESA operational algorithm for producing the standard
163 level 2 SSM products (Kerr et al., 2012; Wigneron et al., 2007). In both Level 2 (L2) and Level 3

164 (L3) products, multiangular observations are used to retrieve simultaneously SSM and vegetation
165 optical depth at nadir (τ -NAD) using a standard iterative minimization approach of a cost
166 function (Statistical Inversion Approach as discussed in Wigneron et al. (2003)). The main
167 difference with the L2 processing is the fact that the L3 processing takes into account over each
168 pixel several revisits simultaneously in a multi-orbit retrieval approach (Jacquette et al., 2010;
169 Kerr et al., 2013). In the L2 algorithm, SSM and τ -NAD are retrieved from multiangular
170 observations made using one SMOS overpass at 0600 or 1800 hours local time. Conversely, in
171 the L3 algorithm, SSM and τ -NAD are retrieved from multiangular observations made using
172 several overpasses (3 at most) over a 7-day window. Over the short 7-day window, it is
173 considered that optical depth at nadir (τ -NAD) varies slowly in time. In the L3 processor, this is
174 accounted for by assuming that the retrieved values of τ -NAD are correlated using a Gaussian
175 auto-correlation function over the 7-day window (while the SM values are considered as
176 uncorrelated). The multi-orbit retrieval approach was selected to produce the L3 product as it
177 improves the SM retrieval (Kerr et al., 2013):

- 178 (i) Increasing the number of overpasses over a given node taking into account several
179 revisits (multi-orbit approach) increases the number of observations available for a
180 node. As the number of observations increases, more nodes are considered in the
181 retrieval process, resulting in a larger coverage. This is mostly significant at the edge
182 of the swath for which a single overpass does not provide enough brightness
183 temperature (TB) data for an accurate retrieval process (Wigneron et al., 2000).
- 184 (ii) Considering that the vegetation optical thickness is correlated over a given period of
185 time adds more constraints in the retrieval process and the robustness of the retrieval
186 is improved.

187 SMOSL3 (ascending and descending) datasets include flags that can be used to filter out the
188 datasets (Jacquette et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2013; Kerr et al., 2008). More details on the flags
189 used to filter SMOSL3 data are given in Section 3.

190 Note that new versions of the SMOSL3 data set will be produced based on re-processing
191 activities in the near future and will lead to improvements in the product accuracy. The version
192 of SMOSL3 used in the present study was the latest version available at CATDS. The version of
193 the processor is V2.48, corresponding to a Level-2 version higher than \sim V5.0, although there is
194 not a strict correspondence between Level-2 and Level-3 versions.

195 *2.1.2. AMSRM*

196
197 The Aqua satellite is operated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). It
198 was launched in May-2002 and carries, among others, the AMSR-E radiometer providing
199 passive microwave measurements at six frequencies (6.925, 10.65, 18.7, 23.8, 36.5, and 89.0
200 GHz) with day-time ascending orbit at 1330 hours and night-time descending orbit at 0130 hours
201 (Owe et al., 2008). The datasets cover the period from June 2002 to October 2011. On this latter
202 date, AMSR-E on board the NASA Aqua satellite stopped producing data due to a problem with
203 the rotation of its antenna.

204 The AMSR-E sensor was one of the first sensors to target SSM as a standard product (Njoku &
205 Chan, 2006; Njoku et al., 2003). Various algorithms have been developed to retrieve SSM from
206 the AMSR-E observations. The main ones were developed at (i) NASA which produced the
207 standard AMSR-E-NASA algorithm (Njoku et al., 2003), (ii) the Japan Aerospace Exploration
208 Agency (Koike et al., 2004), and (iii) the “Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam” in collaboration with
209 NASA, referred to as the NASA-VUA algorithm (Owe et al., 2008; Owe et al., 2001). The
210 NASA-VUA algorithm uses a three-parameter retrieval approach (i.e., SSM, vegetation optical

211 depth, and soil/canopy temperature are retrieved simultaneously) to convert multi-frequency TB
212 measured by AMSR-E to SSM. The retrieved SSM products accuracy was shown to be 0.06
213 m^3/m^3 for sparsely to moderately vegetated canopies (de Jeu et al., 2008).

214 A range of studies (Brocca et al., 2011; Draper et al., 2009a; Hain et al., 2011; Rüdiger et al.,
215 2009) addressed the evaluation of the NASA-VUA SSM products based on combinations of
216 observations made at different AMSR-E frequencies, mainly using C-band (6.925 GHz) and/or
217 X-band (10.65 GHz). Using in situ observations and/or modelled SM data as reference, these
218 studies showed good performance of the NASA-VUA products in capturing the SSM variability
219 at global scale.

220 In this paper a version (Level 3 gridded data) of the NASA-VUA product exclusively based on
221 the AMSR-E C-band and descending orbit observations was used. It is referred hereafter to as
222 AMSRM. Descending orbit (night time) SM products were shown in previous studies to be more
223 accurate and less affected by temperature-related errors than ascending orbit (day time) products
224 (Draper et al., 2009a; Jackson et al., 2010; Kerr & Njoku, 1990; Su et al., 2011). The use of C-
225 band (6.925 GHz) data, i.e. the lowest frequency available for the AMSR-E instrument,
226 maximises the soil sampling depth ($\sim 0\text{-}1\text{ cm}$) of the retrieved product (Owe et al., 2008) and
227 minimises the sampling depth mismatch with the SMOSL3 product.

228 *2.1.3. ECMWF soil moisture analysis*

229
230 This study used the SM-DAS-2 SM analysis product as a reference. SM-DAS-2 is produced at
231 ECMWF in the framework of the H-SAF project of EUMETSAT (Satellite Application Facility
232 on support to operational Hydrology and water management; more information at
233 <http://hsaf.meteoam.it/>). The SM-DAS-2 analysis uses the Hydrology Tiled ECMWF Scheme for
234 Surface Exchanges over Land (HTESSEL; Balsamo et al., 2009; van den Hurk & Viterbo, 2003).

235 HTESSEL is a multilayer model where the soil is discretized in four layers (thickness: 7, 21, 72
236 and 189 cm). SM-DAS-2 relies on a dedicated advanced Land Data Assimilation System: a
237 simplified Extended Kalman Filter able to ingest information contained in observations close to
238 the surface (temperature and relative humidity at 2 meters) as well as ASCAT SM retrieval (de
239 Rosnay et al., 2013; Drusch et al., 2009), which is used to correct the model SM prognostic
240 variable. SM-DAS-2 analysis is available at a spatial resolution of about 25 km (Gaussian
241 reduced grid T799). The first layer (0-7 cm) is considered only, to represent the relatively low
242 sampled soil layer of the SSM estimates derived from microwave remote sensing sensors (\sim 0-3
243 cm at L-band and \sim 0-1 cm at C-band). SM-DAS-2 was shown to represent SM variability well.
244 For instance, Albergel et al. (2012) have used in situ measurements from more than 200 stations
245 located in western Africa, Australia, Europe, and the United States to determine the reliability of
246 SM-DAS-2 to represent SM over 2010. Correlation values with in situ data were found to be
247 very satisfactory over most of the investigated sites located in contrasted biomes and climate
248 conditions with averaged correlation (R) values of 0.70 and an estimate of the averaged error is
249 about $0.07 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$. SM-DAS-2 is produced in the framework of the H-SAF project from
250 EUMETSAT and it benefits from the latest model and analysis developments from ECMWF.
251 This is why it was selected as the benchmarking dataset for this study. However it is important to
252 emphasize that, as shown by the validation statistics above, SM-DAS-2 does not represent the
253 absolute truth. It was used as a reference in this paper because at the time of this study it was the
254 product that best captures the SM dynamics. On the longer term, when the SM retrieval
255 algorithms will be fully calibrated, it is likely that satellite products such as SMOS SM will be
256 used as reference data sets for SM product comparison studies. SM-DAS-2 is a SM index
257 product; however in this study it was converted to volumetric SM (in m^3/m^3) using global soil

258 texture and hydraulic soil properties derived from the Food and Agriculture Organization digital
259 (FAO) soil map as described in Balsamo et al. (2009). Hereafter, this product will be referred to
260 as “DAS2”.

261 2.2. *Pre-processing*

262 Quality control was applied to SMOSL3 and AMSRM prior to the evaluation based on quality
263 flags associated with the remotely sensed datasets. The uncertainties associated with the NASA-
264 VUA retrieval algorithm are based on error propagation analysis, related to the sensor
265 characteristics and vegetation optical depth, as described in Parinussa et al. (2011b). AMSRM
266 SSM values with an estimated SSM uncertainty greater than $0.35 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ were rejected. Flags
267 such as Data Quality IndeX (DQX) and Radio Frequency Interferences (RFI) are also associated
268 with the SMOSL3 data and were used in our data selection. The DQX is an index related to the
269 quality of the retrieved parameter. It takes into account the uncertainties associated with the
270 parameter retrievals, depending on the number of multi-angular observations available, the
271 surface conditions (dry or wet soil conditions, dense or sparse vegetation cover etc.), the TB
272 accuracy, etc (Kerr et al., 2012; Wigneron et al., 2000). The DQX value is provided in
273 volumetric SSM moisture units between 0 and $0.1 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$. In this study, we selected data with a
274 value of DQX lower than 0.06, as we considered this ratio represents a good compromise
275 between the need to keep sufficient data and the need to ensure data quality. Radio Frequency
276 Interferences come from man-made emissions (e.g. satellite transmissions, aircraft
277 communications, radar, TV radio-links, FM broadcast, and wireless camera monitoring systems).
278 It perturbs the natural microwave emission emitted by the Earth surface and measured by passive
279 microwave systems (Njoku et al., 2005; Oliva et al., 2012). With the SMOS interferometric
280 system (based on a three arm Y-shaped antenna array), RFI effects are complex and oscillating

281 interference effects may happen (Oliva et al., 2012). These effects could not be systematically
282 detected and the SMOS L3 product is still contaminated by RFI effects. To illustrate the spatial
283 patterns of the probability of RFI occurrences on SMOS observations, a map is given in Fig. 1.
284 This map represents the three-year (i.e., 2010-2012) average of probability of RFI occurrences
285 and shows the regions where the undetected RFI effects are the most likely. The RFI flags
286 provided in the SMOSL3 data set are given in an attempt to filter out the most significant RFI
287 effects. In the present study, SMOSL3 data were rejected if one of the following conditions was
288 fulfilled:

- 289 (i) $DQX > 0.06$ and DQX is equal to fill value (meaning the retrieval has failed),
- 290 (ii) Percentage of Radio Frequency Interference ($RFI_{fraction} > 30\%$), which is a daily RFI
291 indicator, and
- 292 (iii) Probability of RFI ($RFI_{prob} > 30\%$), which was computed from a moving window
293 average of RFI events over several months.

294 Within the NASA-VUA algorithm for AMSR-E, Radio Frequency Interference is detected
295 according to the method of Li et al. (2004). This method is based on absolute differences
296 between the different frequencies. In the AMSRM product, the standard configuration of NASA-
297 VUA was used and C-band observations were used generally. Only when an RFI threshold value
298 was reached, NASA-VUA made a switch to X band observations (Chung et al., 2013).

299 Based on flags, AMSRM and SMOSL3 data were also rejected in regions of strong topography
300 or wetlands. AMSRM, SMOSL3, and the reference DAS2 dataset were provided on different
301 grids and formats. So pre-processing was required to allow a comparison of all products on the
302 same grid. All the datasets were re-projected from their original coordinate systems onto a

303 regular $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ grid using a nearest neighbour approach (e.g., Draper et al., 2011; Rüdiger
304 et al., 2009; Scipal et al., 2008).

305 2.3. Comparison metrics

306
307 Three statistical indicators were computed between pairs of the remotely sensed (SSM_{RS}) and
308 reference SSM products (SSM_{REF}). We considered the Pearson correlation coefficient (R), the
309 mean difference (Bias), and the Root Mean Squared Difference (RMSD) between the remotely
310 sensed (SSM_{RS}) and the reference SM products. The equations for the calculation of the three
311 indicators are given as follows (Brocca et al., 2011; CECR, 2012):

$$312 \quad R = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (SSM_{REF(i)} - \overline{SSM_{REF}})(SSM_{RS(i)} - \overline{SSM_{RS}})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (SSM_{REF(i)} - \overline{SSM_{REF}})^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (SSM_{RS(i)} - \overline{SSM_{RS}})^2}} \quad (1)$$

313

$$\text{Bias} = \overline{(SSM_{RS} - SSM_{REF})} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{RMSD} = \sqrt{\overline{(SSM_{RS} - SSM_{REF})^2}} \quad (3)$$

314

315 Where the overbar denotes the mean operator, n is the number of SSM data, SSM_{RS} is the
316 satellite-based SSM product (SMOSL3 and AMSRM), and SSM_{REF} is the reference SSM
317 (DAS2). We used RMSD instead of RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error) because the reference
318 SSM values may contain errors and cannot be considered as the “true” SSM values.

319 2.4. Regional-scale analyses

320 This regional study was made to compare the three different datasets for a variety of conditions.

321 We compared the SSM time series from SMOSL3, AMSRM, and the reference (DAS2) over

322 eight sites which were selected taking into consideration contrasting vegetation types and climate

323 conditions (see Fig. 2). A summary of the main characteristics of the eight selected sites is given
 324 in Table 2. This evaluation was limited to only eight sites which cannot span the whole range of
 325 soil, vegetation, and climate conditions present at global scale. However, this evaluation allowed
 326 us to analyse and illustrate some major features of the three datasets. To compare the temporal
 327 dynamics of SSM between remotely sensed and reference observations, we removed the
 328 systematic differences by matching the remotely sensed time series to the reference time series as
 329 discussed by Dorigo et al. (2010). This was done by normalizing the original remotely sensed
 330 data (the data referred to as ‘original’ in the following are the data extracted directly from the
 331 SMOSL3 or AMSRM data set and expressed in volumetric units (m^3/m^3) SSM_{or} so that they
 332 have the same mean and standard deviation as the reference SSM dataset SSM_{REF} according to
 333 the following equation (Brocca et al., 2010; Draper et al., 2009a):

$$\text{SSM}(t) = \overline{\text{SSM}_{\text{REF}}} + \frac{\sigma(\text{SSM}_{\text{or}})}{\sigma(\text{SSM}_{\text{REF}})} (\text{SSM}_{\text{or}}(t) - \overline{\text{SSM}_{\text{or}}}) \quad (4)$$

334 Here, $\text{SSM}(t)$ stands for the rescaled remotely sensed retrievals at time steps $t=1, \dots, n$, where n is
 335 the total number of observations, $\overline{\text{SSM}_{\text{or}}}$ and $\sigma(\text{SSM}_{\text{or}})$ are the mean and standard deviation of
 336 the original remotely sensed retrievals, respectively, and SSM_{REF} and $\sigma(\text{SSM}_{\text{REF}})$ are mean and
 337 standard deviation of the reference dataset, respectively.

338 2.5. SSM seasonal anomalies

339 All the above statistics were calculated for original SSM values, expressed in volumetric units
 340 (m^3/m^3). We also applied the above performance metrics to SSM anomalies. The anomaly time-
 341 series were calculated in order to avoid seasonal effects that can unrealistically increase the
 342 degree of correlation (Scipal et al., 2008) and to analyse the ability of remotely sensed SSM
 343 products to capture the day-to-day variability in the SSM time series. We computed the

344 anomalies following the method described by Albergel et al. (2009). The anomalies $SSM_{anom}(t)$
 345 were computed as the difference to the mean for a sliding window of 35 days, which was further
 346 scaled using the standard deviation in order to be dimensionless:

347

$$SSM_{anom}(t) = \frac{SSM_{or}(t) - \overline{SSM_{or}(t - 17 : t + 17)}}{\sigma[SSM_{or}(t - 17 : t + 17)]} \quad (5)$$

348 where $SSM_{or}(t)$ is the original SSM value at time t obtained from the satellite sensor or
 349 reference datasets, the over-bar and σ symbols are the temporal mean and standard deviation
 350 operators, respectively, for a time window of 35 days corresponding to the time interval [$t - 17$
 351 days, $t + 17$ days]. The use of a \sim monthly window is a very common approach to compute SM
 352 anomalies (Brocca et al., 2011; Draper et al., 2013; Draper et al., 2009b; Reichle et al., 2008).

353 2.6. Global-scale analyses

354

355 Global maps of (i) correlations (R), to assess the global consistency in the SSM variability at
 356 both long- (original) and short-term (anomaly) scales, (ii) RMSD, and (iii) bias between the
 357 reference and the two remotely sensed SMOSL3 and AMSRM SSM time series were computed.
 358 The performance indicators were computed for all common pixels on a daily basis. To analyse
 359 the effects of the vegetation and climatic conditions and to facilitate the interpretation of the
 360 results of the global comparison, the values of the three performance indexes were averaged for a
 361 variety of biomes. These biomes represent different bioclimatic conditions and contrasting
 362 vegetation types. In this study we used the classification made by Chesworth (2008), illustrated
 363 in Fig. 2., who distinguished: “tundra”, “boreal semi-humid”, “boreal humid”, “temperate semi-
 364 arid”, “temperate humid”, “Mediterranean cold”, “Mediterranean warm”, “desert tropical”,
 365 “desert temperate”, “desert cold”, and “tropical humid” biomes.

366 The analysis of the results was also made accounting for the LAI (mean value computed over the
367 pixel) to evaluate the link between the accuracy of the remotely sensed SSM products and the
368 vegetation effects (in relation with vegetation density and biomass). To investigate this link, the
369 global correlation results (original and anomalies) were averaged according to the global
370 distribution of LAI values. The values of LAI were the long term-mean LAI values taken from
371 the Global Soil Wetness Project (Dirmeyer et al., 2006) illustrated in Fig. 3.

372 **3. Results**

373 *3.1. Comparison of SMOSL3 ascending and descending overpasses*

374

375 Original SMOSL3 retrievals obtained from the ascending and descending overpasses were
376 compared to the reference SSM data. In terms of correlation, a better performance of SMOSL3
377 for ascending orbits compared with descending orbits with respect to the reference can be clearly
378 seen in Fig. 4. In much of the world (e.g., central USA, Europe, South America, and South
379 Africa), ascending SMOSL3 retrievals were found to be better correlated to the reference
380 datasets than descending SMOSL3 retrievals. This was expected because at dawn soil is often in
381 near hydraulic equilibrium (Jackson, 1980), and factors affecting SM retrieval, such as vertical
382 soil-vegetation temperature gradients, are minimized. In some places, however, particularly in
383 India, Eastern USA, Eastern Australia, and the Middle East, descending SMOSL3 retrievals were
384 found to be closer to the reference than the ascending ones. This result could be partly explained
385 by the fact that ascending retrievals over these regions are highly affected by RFI (see Fig. 1),
386 which is the main source of errors in the SMOS SSM products (Oliva et al., 2012). As the SMOS
387 antenna is tilted forward by 32°, there is an asymmetry in the patterns of RFI contaminations
388 between ascending and descending passes for a given ground location. For instance, when
389 considering ascending overpasses over a given point in the Central Plains in the USA, the SMOS

390 has a trajectory from South to North. And because the antenna is tilted by 32° toward the North,
391 it picks up RFI emission from the Defense Early Warning (DEW) system in Northern Canada
392 (the DEW line can be seen through the lighter blue band around the USA-Canada border in Fig.
393 1). Conversely, for descending overpasses over the same sites, the tilted antenna is looking in a
394 more southerly direction and is not contaminated by these northern RFI sites. To get a global
395 assessment of the differences between the SSM retrievals for the ascending and descending
396 overpasses, we computed the global averaged value of the RMSD and R coefficient between the
397 SMOSL3 data and the reference; we obtained for ascending: $\text{RMSD} = 0.18 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ and $R = 0.44$
398 and for descending: $\text{RMSD} = 0.20 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ and $R = 0.41$. Given that better performances were
399 generally found for ascending retrievals, only SMOSL3 ascending overpasses will be considered
400 in the following.

401 *3.2. Comparison of the SSM time series over eight selected sites*

402 The time series of the three SSM products (SMOSL3, AMSRM, and DAS2) are compared in
403 Fig. 5 for the eight selected sites described in Table 2. The SSM time series were spatially
404 averaged over the whole site and normalized to have the same mean and standard deviation using
405 the method given in Equation (4). The eight sites were selected to illustrate the SSM dynamics in
406 the three products for a variety in vegetation, soil, and climatic conditions (see Fig. 2).

407 In general, the seasonal dynamics of SSM for the three products were found to be similar.

408 However, over the “tropical humid” site (Fig. 5a) the seasonal dynamic of the reference product
409 is better reproduced by the SMOSL3 retrievals. Over this site, it can be seen that the seasonal
410 trend in the AMSRM product is almost opposite to that of the two other products (SMOSL3 and
411 DAS2): increasing trends in AMSRM correspond more or less to decreasing trends in both
412 SMOSL3 and DAS2 and vice versa. Over the same site, it can be seen that there is a large

413 plateau (~ six months from October to April) in the DAS2 values, which cannot be seen for the
414 two other products.

415 Over the site in India (Fig. 5b), a plateau for high values of SSM during the monsoon season can
416 also be seen for DAS2 and not for SMOSL3 and AMSRM, but it is shorter (~ three months) than
417 over the site in the “tropical humid” biome. Also, the transition from wet to dry conditions after
418 the monsoon season is more abrupt for DAS2 than for the remotely sensed SSM values. Over
419 this region, ascending SMOSL3 data are highly impacted by RFI from Northern India and
420 surrounding countries (see Fig. 1) but they still reproduce a SSM dynamic, which is in good
421 agreement with the AMSRM and DAS2 datasets.

422 The site in Central Australia (Fig. 5c), is a desert area which has the advantage of being almost
423 free of RFI contaminations at both L- (see Fig. 1) and C-bands (Njoku et al., 2005) along with
424 low vegetation and unfrozen conditions in general. In this area, both SMOSL3 and AMSRM
425 were found to be very close to the reference and the very dry conditions were well depicted.

426 There is generally good agreement between all three products in the detection of rain events over
427 this desert area. It should be noted that during the wet season (May, June, July), the declining
428 trend in the SSM time series based on SMOSL3 and DAS2 seems to be slightly steeper than the
429 one retrieved from AMSRM. Also, during rain events, very high values of SSM can be seen for
430 SMOSL3. Such results have already been noted in previous studies and could be explained by
431 water ponding effects when soil is at saturation during intensive rain events (Al Bitar et al., 2012;
432 Jackson et al., 2012; Wigneron et al., 2012).

433 Over the two sites in the USA (Figs. 5d and 5e), and in the Sahel (Fig. 5f), there is generally
434 good agreement between the three SSM products, but it can be clearly seen that there is a much
435 larger scatter in the remotely sensed products than in the reference one (DAS2). During cold

436 periods in the Great Basin Region in the USA (Fig. 5d) very low values can be seen (below 0.1
437 m^3/m^3). These values can be explained by the effect of soil freezing. In DAS2, the SSM values
438 do not account for the frozen soil water content and its SSM estimates correspond only to the
439 liquid soil water content. These peak values corresponding to “very dry conditions” cannot be
440 seen in SMOSL3 and AMSRM, as frozen soil conditions were flagged and excluded in the
441 remotely sensed products. In the site in Sahel (Fig. 4f), there is quite a good agreement between
442 the general seasonal trends of all three SSM products. However, some outliers can be noted for
443 AMSRM, especially when it rains and at the end of the wet season, and the scatter in the
444 SMOSL3 dataset is much larger than that of the two other products.

445 Finally, results for two sites in wet regions are illustrated in Fig. 5g (Central Europe) and Fig. 5h
446 (Argentina). Even if the seasonal trend is relatively low over these two sites (SSM varying
447 between 0.3 and 0.4 m^3/m^3), it can be seen that there is good general agreement between all three
448 products. As was found in some previous figures, very high values in SMOSL3 SSM data can be
449 seen in Fig. 5g during some rain events and very low values corresponding to freezing conditions
450 can be seen in Fig. 5h for DAS2. In summary, all the three products behaved similarly over the
451 different test sites considered in this study, each product having in some cases some caveats
452 either irregular behaviour or adversely affected by RFI effects.

453 3.3. *Spatial Analysis of SSM retrievals at Global Scale*

454

455 To get a more global evaluation of the SMOSL3 and AMSRM products, maps of the calculated
456 statistical indicators (Correlation coefficient (R) for both original SSM values and anomalies,
457 RMSD and Bias) described in section 3.2 are shown in Figs. 6a-h at global scale. In these maps,
458 SMOSL3 and AMSRM were evaluated against the reference dataset (DAS2) for the period
459 03/2010–09/2011 and only significant correlations are presented. In this study, we consider that

460 the correlation is statistically significant when the p-value is less than the significance level of
461 0.05 (p-value < 0.05 meaning that the probability of observing such a correlation value by
462 chance is lower than 5%) as considered in several studies in this field (Albergel et al., 2012).
463 In general, it can be seen that the three products have similar spatial patterns over most of the
464 globe, although there are important differences between them in the amplitude of the temporal
465 SSM variations. Figs. 6a and 6b show that robust correlations between the global remotely
466 sensed and the reference SSM products ($R > 0.5$) were found in the transition zones between wet
467 and dry climates (e.g., Sahel), in the Great Plains (USA), Western Europe, Eastern Australia,
468 India, South Africa, and the south-eastern region of Brazil. This can be explained by the strong
469 seasonal annual cycle of SSM in these regions
470 (Koster et al., 2004a). Conversely, remotely sensed datasets exhibited weak correlations ($R <$
471 0.20) against the reference in arid regions (e.g., Sahara) due to the small range of variation in the
472 SSM values, which corresponds roughly to the remotely sensed retrieval accuracy (~ 0.04
473 m^3/m^3). Low correlations in high latitude regions can also be seen in Fig. 6a and b, where
474 correlations values (R) drop below 0.25. The significant differences between satellites and model
475 products in high latitude regions may partly be explained by the effect of frozen soil conditions.
476 Correlation values (R) computed on seasonal anomalies, as described in section 3.4, are shown in
477 Fig. 6c and 6d. It can be seen that the global spatial patterns are relatively similar for both
478 SMOSL3 and AMSRM, with better ability of SMOSL3 to capture the short-term SM variability
479 than AMSRM. The highest values of the R coefficient were found in eastern Australia, extreme
480 South Africa, Western Europe, and Central America while the lowest values were found in the
481 northern tundra region.

482 A similar distribution of RMSD and bias values was found for both SMOSL3 and AMSRM
483 products (Figs. 6e-h). Low RMSD and bias values were found in deserts and semi-arid regions
484 (e.g., the Sahara, the Arabian Peninsula, extreme South Africa, and central Australia), while high
485 RMSD and bias values were found in high latitude regions (e.g., in Northern Canada, Alaska,
486 Northern Europe, and Siberia). Large differences between the remotely sensed and the reference
487 SSM products were also found in tropical regions. In Figs. 6g and 6h, relatively similar patterns
488 can be noted for both SMOSL3 and AMSRM at global scale but the values of the biases are quite
489 different: a strong overestimation of the reference SSM values can be noted for AMSRM,
490 especially in the high latitude and desert regions, while a strong underestimation can be noted for
491 SMOSL3.

492 To better identify the spatial differences in the results obtained for SMOSL3 and AMSRM, Fig.
493 7a and 7b show the areas where SMOSL3 correlates better with the reference than AMSRM
494 (red), where AMSRM correlates better with the reference than SMOSL3 (green) and where the
495 difference in the correlation coefficient (R) between both SMOSL3 and AMSRM is less than
496 0.05 (blue). The top panel shows results for the original SSM datasets, while the bottom panel
497 shows results for anomalies, i.e. areas where either SMOSL3 or AMSRM better captured the
498 short-term variability in the reference SSM values. In these maps only significant values are
499 plotted (p-value < 0.05). In general, it can be seen that better correlations with DAS2 were
500 obtained with SMOSL3 over regions with high to moderate vegetation density (e.g., in parts of
501 Amazonia, Eastern Australia and the North-Central US). These latter regions are known to be
502 little contaminated by RFI effects (see Fig. 1). On the other hand, it can be seen that AMSRM
503 shows better correlations with DAS2 than SMOSL3 in areas with low to moderate vegetation
504 density and where there is a strong seasonality in the SSM variability (e.g., India, Western

505 Australia, Sahara, and Arabian Peninsula). Poor results were also obtained systematically for
506 SMOSL3 in regions known to be strongly contaminated by RFI effects (Middle East, Southern
507 Europe, China, and India).

508 When looking at anomalies, AMSRM and SMOSL3 have relatively similar performances over
509 dry regions, but better correlations with the reference were obtained for SMOSL3 over most of
510 the grid cells.

511 *3.4. Biome influence*

512

513 To investigate more in depth the dependence of the results shown in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 on the
514 vegetation and climatic conditions, the statistical indicators were averaged for the twelve types of
515 biomes described in Section 3.5 and illustrated in Fig. 2. The results are shown in Figs. 8a-d in
516 terms of correlation (R) for original SSM data and anomalies, RMSD, and bias.

517 The distributions of the correlation (R) and RMSD values as a function of biome types are quite
518 similar for both SMOSL3 and AMRSM (Figs. 8a-c). In terms of correlation values computed
519 from the original SSM data (Fig. 8a), the best results were obtained for biomes with relatively
520 sparse vegetation covers (“Mediterranean warm”, “Mediterranean cold”, “temperate semi-arid”,
521 “tropical semi-arid”, etc.), while the poorest results were found in Northern environments
522 (“tundra”, “boreal semi-arid”, and “boreal humid”). Yet, the results are quite different for the
523 “Tropical humid” biome, where performances of SMOSL3 were more coherent with DAS2 (R=
524 0.42) compared to the results found for AMSRM (R= 0.15).

525 Fig. 8b shows that the mean correlation coefficients computed from the SSM anomalies are
526 lower than the mean correlation coefficients computed from the original SSM, as the
527 covariations imposed on all three datasets by the seasonal forcing are largely filtered out in SSM
528 anomalies. The general pattern of the distribution of the R values as a function of the biomes is

529 similar to the one obtained for the original SSM data. It seems that the short-term variability in
530 the SSM values is better detected by SMOSL3: better performances were obtained for SMOSL3
531 over all biomes, even if the correlation values are relatively small.

532 In Fig. 8c, confirming previous results, the poorest performances (corresponding to the largest
533 RMSD values), were obtained again in Northern environments (“tundra”, “boreal semi-arid, and
534 “boreal humid”) for both SMOSL3 and AMSRM, while the best results (smallest RMSD values)
535 were obtained in desert regions (“desert temperate”, “desert tropical”) and in semi-arid regions.
536 As discussed previously, in desert areas, the range in the SSM values simulated in DAS2 is
537 relatively small and this fact partly explains the low values of RMSD computed.

538 Finally, Fig. 8d shows that biases with respect to the reference dataset are opposite for SMOSL3
539 and AMSRM. In all biomes, AMSRM overestimates SSM DAS2 values while SMOSL3
540 underestimates them. Moreover, the bias between remotely sensed and reference SSM varies
541 substantially across biomes. The bias is very large in northern environments for both SMOSL3
542 and AMSRM but it is also large in humid regions (“temperate humid”, “tropical humid”) for
543 SMOSL3. The lowest biases were found in deserts (“desert temperate”, “desert tropical”, and
544 “desert cold”) and in semi-arid regions (“temperate semi-arid”, “Mediterranean warm” and
545 “Mediterranean cold”) for both SMOSL3 and AMSRM.

546 3.5. *Influence of leaf area index (LAI)*

547

548 Previous results showed that vegetation plays a key role in the performance results of the
549 SMOSL3 and AMSRM products. To analyse in more detail the effect of vegetation, we
550 computed the distribution of the correlation values as a function of the LAI. We chose to focus
551 our study on the R correlation indicator as correlation is of particular interest for many
552 hydrologic and atmospheric applications (Koster et al., 2009). In Figs. 9a and 9b, the correlation

553 values shown in Fig. 6a and 6b (for original and anomaly SSM data) were averaged according to
554 the values of LAI illustrated in the global map shown in Fig. 3. The results for both original SSM
555 data (Fig. 9a) and anomalies (Fig. 9b) show that the performance of the remotely sensed SSM
556 products (i.e., SMOSL3 and AMSRM) is strongly related to the distribution of the LAI values. In
557 Fig. 9a, it can be seen that the values of the correlation coefficient (R) decrease almost linearly
558 with the mean value of LAI for both SMOSL3 and AMSRM. The rate of the decrease is much
559 larger for AMSRM than for SMOSL3. For AMSRM the value of R decreases from $R \approx 0.45$ to
560 negative correlation values ($R \approx -0.1$) as LAI increased from about 1 to 7. For the same increase
561 in LAI values, the decrease in R for SMOSL3 is more limited: from $R \approx 0.4$ to $R \approx 0.3$. However,
562 it should be noted that AMSRM provides slightly better performances than SMOSL3 when LAI
563 is lower than 1 (i.e. over sparse vegetation covers), which corresponds to almost 50% of the
564 pixels considered in this global analysis.

565 In Fig. 9b, the same analysis is shown for anomalies. It can be seen that better performances
566 were obtained for SMOSL3, whatever the range of LAI values. Moreover, for this latter product,
567 the correlation values remain stable ($R \approx 0.3$) as LAI values increase. Conversely, the values of
568 the R coefficient decrease rapidly and continuously for AMSMR as LAI values increase: $R \approx$
569 0.25 for $LAI \approx 1$ down to $R \approx 0.03$ for $LAI \approx 7$.

570 **4. Discussion and conclusions**

571

572 This study investigated the performances of two remotely sensed SSM products (SMOSL3 and
573 AMSRM) with respect to a reference SSM product (DAS2) at global scale, with 0.25° spatial
574 sampling and a daily time step. The study was made during the whole period of common

575 availability of the SMOS and AMSR-E products, i.e. after the test periods during the
576 commissioning phase of SMOS and before AMSR-E stopped producing data (03/2010-09/2011).
577 Both AMSRM and SMOSL3 generally showed a good agreement with the reference dataset and
578 successfully captured the seasonal SSM variations present in the reference DAS2 product. For
579 instance, SMOSL3 and AMSRM performed well (in terms of correlation) in the transition zones
580 between wet and dry climates and over semi-arid regions (e.g., Indian subcontinent, Great Plains
581 of North America, Sahel, Eastern Australia, and South-eastern regions of Brazil). It is
582 particularly important that the two remotely sensed SSM products being compared give
583 consistent and correct results in these areas, where SM has been recognized to exert a strong
584 influence on the weather/climate (e.g., Koster et al., 2004a; Taylor et al., 2012; Teuling et al.,
585 2010). Conversely, both SMOSL3 and AMSRM exhibited weak correlations with the reference
586 data in dry regions (e.g. Sahara, Arabian Peninsula, and central Australia). These results could be
587 related to the low range of variations in SSM in these regions, which roughly corresponds to the
588 expected retrieval accuracy of the remotely sensed products ($\sim 0.04 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$).

589 We found quite opposite results in terms of bias for SMOSL3 and AMSRM: over all biomes,
590 AMSRM overestimated SSM compared to the reference, while SMOSL3 underestimated SSM.
591 The analysis of the SSM anomaly time series, obtained by removing the seasonal cycle, showed
592 that the short-term SSM dynamics were better captured by SMOSL3 than by AMSRM at global
593 scale. In addition, considering a variety of biomes, both SMOSL3 and AMSRM showed lowest
594 performances in northern environments (“tundra”, “boreal semi-arid”, and “boreal humid”),
595 while the best performances were found over biomes with relatively sparse vegetation covers
596 (“Mediterranean warm”, “Mediterranean cold”, “temperate semi-arid”, “tropical semi-arid”,

597 etc.). In the “tropical humid” biome, SMOSL3 was found to be much better correlated to DAS2
598 than AMSRM.

599 The results confirmed that vegetation plays a key role in the performance evaluation of the
600 SMOSL3 and AMSRM SSM products. Over areas with sparse vegetation, with LAI values lower
601 than 1, both SMOSL3 and AMSRM had relatively good and similar performances. However, for
602 higher LAI values, SMOSL3 had a consistent performance, whereas the performance of
603 AMSRM quickly deteriorated with the increase in foliar abundance.

604 The fact that better performances could be obtained with SMOS (operating at L-band) than with
605 AMSR-E (operating at C-band) over vegetated areas is not surprising. However this study
606 presents one of the first studies confirming this effect with observations from sensors in space. In
607 the passive microwave domain, L-band has long been considered as an optimal frequency to
608 monitor SSM. When a vegetation layer is present over the soil surface, it attenuates the soil
609 emissions and adds its own contribution to the emitted radiation measured by passive microwave
610 radiometers. The retrieval algorithm attempts to decouple the effects of soil and vegetation in
611 order to provide an estimation of SSM. However, as vegetation effects increase with increasing
612 frequency (Calvet et al., 2011), the correction for vegetation effects is more complex at C-band
613 (~ 6.6 GHz for AMSR-E) than at L-band (~ 1.4 GHz for SMOS). Moreover, SMOS has multi-
614 angular capabilities which make it, theoretically, more efficient for decoupling the soil and
615 vegetation effects than mono-angular spatial radiometers such as AMSR-E (Wigneron et al.,
616 2000). The combination of both a L-band system and multi-angular capabilities for SMOS
617 compared to a C-band system and monoangular capabilities for AMSR-E might explain the
618 better performance of SMOS over biomes with dense vegetation cover (e.g., “tropical humid”) in
619 Figs. 8a and 8b or for LAI values larger than 1 in Figs 9a and 9b. However, it should be noted

620 that AMSRM had comparable performances to SMOSL3 (better performances if we consider the
621 original SSM data and slightly lower performances if we consider anomalies) over sparse
622 vegetation covers (with $LAI \leq 1$), which represent more than 50% of the pixels considered in this
623 global study. Future works will address in more depth the possibilities to exploit the
624 complementary capabilities of both SMOS and AMRS-E to retrieve SSM over a gradient of
625 vegetation density and to produce a coherent long term SSM product based on passive
626 microwave sensors.

627 Some other aspects should be considered in this evaluation. As noted in the Introduction, the
628 effective SM sampling depth at L-band ($\sim 0-3$ cm) is larger than at C-band ($\sim 0-1$ cm). Over a
629 shallower soil layer (0-1 cm) SSM is more prone to quick time variations, especially during
630 drying-out periods, due to weather events (rainfall, wind, high insolation, etc.) than over deeper
631 soils. This effect may lead to lower correlations with SSM measurements or retrievals, which are
632 not made at the exact same time or over larger soil sampling depth. Moreover, in the present
633 study, the sampling depth corresponding to the SMOSL3 SSM product ($\sim 0-3$ cm) is closer to
634 that of the reference (0-7 cm for DAS2), than the sampling depth of AMRSM. Therefore, the
635 mismatch between the sampling depths of the different products considered in this study is more
636 detrimental for AMRSM, though it is present for both satellite data sets.

637 The effect due to the mismatch between the sampling depths of the different products may have
638 an impact in the statistical indicators used in this study but it cannot fully explain the large and
639 contrasting biases found between both the AMRSM and SMOSL3 products and the DAS2
640 reference. The positive bias in the AMSRM retrievals can be partially explained by the absence
641 of correction in the NASA-VUA algorithm for open water bodies. It can also be caused by a
642 wrong estimation of the effective temperature in NASA-VUA algorithm over northern regions,

643 leading to positive bias in satellite retrievals (Owe et al., 2008). In contrast, the negative bias
644 found in SMOSL3 is consistent with the results obtained in previous studies (Al Bitar et al.,
645 2012; Albergel et al., 2012; Dall'Amico et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2012; Lacava et al., 2012;
646 Sanchez et al., 2012) comparing SMOS retrievals with in situ measurement networks in different
647 regions of the world which all relied on the first release of the SMOS retrieval algorithm. RFI
648 may increase the brightness temperatures (TB) measured by SMOS, leading to smaller retrieved
649 SSM values and, thus, to a negative bias (Oliva et al., 2012). However, Wigneron et al. (2012)
650 showed that, even though no bias could be observed in the measured TB data over the VAS site
651 in Spain, a strong negative bias could be noted in the SMOS SSM retrievals. Thus, the negative
652 bias found in the SMOS SSM products (Fig. 8d) is likely to be related to some issues in the
653 retrieval algorithm (e.g., accounting for pixel heterogeneity, use of auxiliary data, etc.) or in the
654 L-MEB (L-band Microwave Emission of the Biosphere) forward modelling. For instance, recent
655 results showed that the use of the dielectric soil model developed by Mironov et al. (2012),
656 instead of the model of Dobson et al. (1985) led to improved results (the bias decreased by about
657 $0.04 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ at global scale) and the New L2 SSM shows almost no negative bias. Moreover,
658 improvements will be made by better accounting for the effects of litter, surface roughness,
659 effective soil temperature, etc. (Grant et al., 2007; Saleh et al., 2009).

660 Finally, it should be noted that even though the reference product used in this study (SM-DAS-2
661 from ECMWF) was found to be very reliable according to some recent studies (Albergel et al.,
662 2012), estimates of SSM from LDAS cannot be considered as “ground truth” (Albergel et al.,
663 2013). One must keep in mind that when using them to evaluate other SSM products, the
664 interpretation of the results is hampered by their own accuracy (the accuracy of LDAS itself and
665 its required inputs such as the atmospheric forcing, observations, etc.). For instance, Albergel et

666 al. (2012) pointed out some non-realistic representation of SM in ECMWF products in some
667 regions of the world (e.g. the Tibetan plateau), due to shortcomings in the description of soil
668 characteristics, in the pedotransfer functions employed, and the difficulty of representing soil
669 spatial heterogeneity.

670

671

672 **Acknowledgments**

673 The authors would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and
674 the TOSCA (Terre Océan Surfaces Continentales et Atmosphère) CNES program and the Islamic
675 Development Bank (IDB) for funding this research work. The authors acknowledge CATDS for
676 the SMOSL3 dataset (<http://catds.ifremer.fr>) and the EUMETSAT Satellite Application Facility
677 (SAF) on support to operational hydrology and water management (H-SAF) for the SM-DAS-2
678 product. The authors also wish to thank the whole SMOS team at CESBIO for fruitful
679 discussions. We are also grateful to Mr Christophe Moisy for providing valuable technical
680 assistance and to Dr Barry Gardiner for revising the English of the manuscript.

681

682

683 **References**

- 684 Al Bitar, A., Leroux, D., Kerr, Y.H., Merlin, O., Richaume, P., Sahoo, A. & Wood, E.F. (2012).
685 Evaluation of SMOS Soil Moisture Products Over Continental U.S. Using the
686 SCAN/SNOTEL Network. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 50,
687 1572-1586
- 688 Albergel, C., de Rosnay, P., Gruhier, C., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Hasenauer, S., Isaksen, L., Kerr, Y.
689 & Wagner, W. (2012). Evaluation of remotely sensed and modelled soil moisture
690 products using global ground-based in situ observations. *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
691 118, 215-226
- 692 Albergel, C., Dorigo, W., Balsamo, G., Muñoz-Sabater, J., de Rosnay, P., Isaksen, L., Brocca,
693 L., de Jeu, R. & Wagner, W. (2013). Monitoring multi-decadal satellite earth observation

- 694 of soil moisture products through land surface reanalyses. *Remote Sensing of*
695 *Environment*, 138, 77-89
- 696 Albergel, C., Rüdiger, C., Carrer, D., Calvet, J.-C., Fritz, N., Naeimi, V., Bartalis, Z. &
697 Hasenauer, S. (2009). An evaluation of ASCAT surface soil moisture products with in-
698 situ observations in Southwestern France. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 13
- 699 Balsamo, G., Viterbo, P., Beljaars, A.C.M., van den Hurk, B.J.J.M., Hirschi, M., Betts, A.K. &
700 K., S. (2009). A revised hydrology for the ECMWF model: Verification from field site to
701 terrestrial water storage and impact in the ECMWF-IFS. *J. Hydrometeorol*, 10
- 702 Bartalis, Z., Wagner, W., Naeimi, V., Hasenauer, S., Scipal, K., Bonekamp, H., Figa, J. &
703 Anderson, C. (2007). Initial soil moisture retrievals from the METOP-A Advanced
704 Scatterometer (ASCAT). *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L20401
- 705 Beljaars, A.C.M., Viterbo, P., Miller, M.J. & Betts, A.K. (1996). The Anomalous Rainfall over
706 the United States during July 1993: Sensitivity to Land Surface Parameterization and Soil
707 Moisture Anomalies. *Monthly Weather Review*, 124, 362-383
- 708 Bindlish, R., Jackson, T.J., Wood, E., Gao, H., Starks, P., Bosch, D. & Lakshmi, V. (2003). Soil
709 moisture estimates from TRMM Microwave Imager observations over the Southern
710 United States. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 85, 507-515
- 711 Bolten, J.D., Crow, W.T., Xiwu, Z., Jackson, T.J. & Reynolds, C.A. (2010). Evaluating the
712 Utility of Remotely Sensed Soil Moisture Retrievals for Operational Agricultural
713 Drought Monitoring. *Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*,
714 *IEEE Journal of*, 3, 57-66
- 715 Brocca, L., Hasenauer, S., Lacava, T., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Wagner, W., Dorigo, W.,
716 Matgen, P., Martínez-Fernández, J., Llorens, P., Latron, J., Martín, C. & Bittelli, M.
717 (2011). Soil moisture estimation through ASCAT and AMSR-E sensors: An
718 intercomparison and validation study across Europe. *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
719 115, 3390-3408
- 720 Brocca, L., Melone, F., Moramarco, T., Wagner, W. & Hasenauer, S. (2010). ASCAT soil
721 wetness index validation through in situ and modeled soil moisture data in central Italy.
722 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114, 2745-2755
- 723 Calvet, J.C., Wigneron, J.P., Walker, J., Karbou, F., Chanzy, A. & Albergel, C. (2011).
724 Sensitivity of Passive Microwave Observations to Soil Moisture and Vegetation Water
725 Content: L-Band to W-Band. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*,
726 49, 1190-1199
- 727 CECR (2012). Comprehensive Error Characterisation Report, Version 0.7. *ESA Climate Change*
728 *Initiative Phase 1 Soil Moisture Project*
- 729 Cheruy, F., Campoy, A., Dupont, J.C., Ducharne, A., Hourdin, F., Haeffelin, M., Chiriaco, M. &
730 Idelkadi, A. (2013). Combined influence of atmospheric physics and soil hydrology on
731 the simulated meteorology at the SIRTAs atmospheric observatory. *Climate Dynamics*,
732 40, 2251-2269
- 733 Chesworth, W. (2008). Biomes and their Soils. In W. Chesworth (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Soil*
734 *Science* (pp. 61-68): Springer Netherlands
- 735 Chung, D., de Jeu, R.A.M., Dorigo, W., Hahn, S., Melzer, T. & Parinussa, R.M.e.a. (2013). ESA
736 CCI soil moisture algorithm theoretical baseline document version, 1, 36-44
- 737 Dall'Amico, J.T., Schlenz, F., Loew, A. & Mauser, W. (2012). First Results of SMOS Soil
738 Moisture Validation in the Upper Danube Catchment. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*,
739 *IEEE Transactions on*, 50, 1507-1516

- 740 Daly, E. & Porporato, A. (2005). A review of soil moisture dynamics: from rainfall infiltration to
741 ecosystem response. *Environ Eng Sci* 22(1), 9-24
- 742 de Jeu, R.A.M., Wagner, W., Holmes, T.R.H., Dolman, A.J., Giesen, N.C. & Friesen, J. (2008).
743 Global Soil Moisture Patterns Observed by Space Borne Microwave Radiometers and
744 Scatterometers. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 29, 399-420
- 745 De Lannoy, G.J.M., Reichle, R.H. & Pauwels, V.R.N. (2013). Global Calibration of the GEOS-5
746 L-Band Microwave Radiative Transfer Model over Nonfrozen Land Using SMOS
747 Observations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 14, 765-785
- 748 de Rosnay, P., Balsamo, G., Albergel, C., Muñoz-Sabater, J. & Isaksen, L. (2012). Initialisation
749 of Land Surface Variables for Numerical Weather Prediction. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 1-
750 15
- 751 de Rosnay, P., Drusch, M., Balsamo, G., Isaksen, L. & Albergel, C. (2011). Extended Kalman
752 Filter soil moisture analysis in the IFS. *ECMWF Spring Newsletter n127*
- 753 de Rosnay, P., Drusch, M., Vasiljevic, D., Balsamo, G., Albergel, C. & Isaksen, L. (2013). A
754 simplified Extended Kalman Filter for the global operational soil moisture analysis at
755 ECMWF. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 139, 1199-1213
- 756 Dirmeyer, P.A., Gao, X., Zhao, M., Zhichang, G., Oki, T. & Hanasaki, N. (2006). GSWP-2:
757 Multimodel analysis and implications for our perception of the land surface. *B. Am.*
758 *Meteorol*, 87
- 759 Dobriyal, P., Qureshi, A., Badola, R. & Hussain, S.A. (2012). A review of the methods available
760 for estimating soil moisture and its implications for water resource management. *Journal*
761 *of Hydrology*, 458-459, 110-117
- 762 Dobson, M.C., Ulaby, F.T., Hallikainen, M.T. & El-Rayes, M.A. (1985). Microwave Dielectric
763 Behavior of Wet Soil-Part II: Dielectric Mixing Models. *Geoscience and Remote*
764 *Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, GE-23, 35-46
- 765 Dorigo, W.A., Scipal, K., Parinussa, R.M., Liu, Y.Y., Wagner, W., de Jeu, R.A.M. & Naeimi, V.
766 (2010). Error characterisation of global active and passive microwave soil moisture
767 datasets. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 2605-2616
- 768 Dorigo, W.A., Wagner, W., Hohensinn, R., Hahn, S., Paulik, C., Drusch, M., Mecklenburg, S.,
769 van Oevelen, P., Robock, A. & Jackson, T. (2011). The International Soil Moisture
770 Network: a data hosting facility for global in situ soil moisture measurements. *Hydrol.*
771 *Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 8
- 772 Draper, C., Mahfouf, J.F., Calvet, J.C., Martin, E. & Wagner, W. (2011). Assimilation of
773 ASCAT near-surface soil moisture into the SIM hydrological model over France. *Hydrol.*
774 *Earth Syst. Sci.*, 15, 3829-3841
- 775 Draper, C., Reichle, R., de Jeu, R., Naeimi, V., Parinussa, R. & Wagner, W. (2013). Estimating
776 root mean square errors in remotely sensed soil moisture over continental scale domains.
777 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 137, 288-298
- 778 Draper, C.S., Mahfouf, J.F. & Walker, J.P. (2009a). An EKF assimilation of AMSR-E soil
779 moisture into the ISBA land surface scheme. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
780 *Atmospheres*, 114, D20104
- 781 Draper, C.S., Walker, J.P., Steinle, P.J., de Jeu, R.A.M. & Holmes, T.R.H. (2009b). An
782 evaluation of AMSR-E derived soil moisture over Australia. *Remote Sensing of*
783 *Environment*, 113, 703-710

- 784 Drusch, M., Scipal, K., de Rosnay, P., Balsamo, G., Andersson, E., Bougeault, P. & Viterbo, P.
785 (2009). Towards a Kalman Filter based soil moisture analysis system for the operational
786 ECMWF Integrated Forecast System. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36, L10401
- 787 Drusch, M. & Viterbo, P. (2007). Assimilation of Screen-Level Variables in ECMWF's
788 Integrated Forecast System: A Study on the Impact on the Forecast Quality and Analyzed
789 Soil Moisture. *Monthly Weather Review*, 135, 300-314
- 790 Entekhabi, D., Njoku, E.G., O'Neill, P.E., Kellogg, K.H., Crow, W.T., Edelstein, W.N., Entin,
791 J.K., Goodman, S.D., Jackson, T.J., Johnson, J., Kimball, J., Piepmeier, J.R., Koster,
792 R.D., Martin, N., McDonald, K.C., Moghaddam, M., Moran, S., Reichle, R., Shi, J.C.,
793 Spencer, M.W., Thurman, S.W., Leung, T. & Van Zyl, J. (2010). The Soil Moisture
794 Active Passive (SMAP) Mission. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98, 704-716
- 795 Entekhabi, D., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. & Castelli, F. (1996). Mutual interaction of soil moisture
796 state and atmospheric processes. *Journal of Hydrology*, 184, 3-17
- 797 Escorihuela, M.J., Chanzy, A., Wigneron, J.P. & Kerr, Y.H. (2010). Effective soil moisture
798 sampling depth of L-band radiometry: A case study. *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
799 114, 995-1001
- 800 Gao, H., Wood, E.F., Jackson, T.J., Drusch, M. & Bindlish, R. (2006). Using TRMM/TMI to
801 Retrieve Surface Soil Moisture over the Southern United States from 1998 to 2002.
802 *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7, 23-38
- 803 Georgakakos, K.P. & Carpenter, T.M. (2006). Potential value of operationally available and
804 spatially distributed ensemble soil water estimates for agriculture. *Journal of Hydrology*,
805 328, 177-191
- 806 Grant, J.P., Wigneron, J.P., Van de Griend, A.A., Kruszewski, A., Søbjaerg, S.S. & Skou, N.
807 (2007). A field experiment on microwave forest radiometry: L-band signal behaviour for
808 varying conditions of surface wetness. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 109, 10-19
- 809 Hain, C.R., Crow, W.T., Mecikalski, J.R., Anderson, M.C. & Holmes, T. (2011). An
810 intercomparison of available soil moisture estimates from thermal infrared and passive
811 microwave remote sensing and land surface modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
812 *Atmospheres*, 116, D15107
- 813 Hollinger, S.E. & Isard, S.A. (1994). A Soil Moisture Climatology of Illinois. *Journal of Climate*, 7
- 814 Jackson, T.J. (1980). Profile soil moisture from surface measurements. *Journal of the Irrigation*
815 *and Drainage Division of the ASCE*, 106
- 816 Jackson, T.J., Bindlish, R., Cosh, M.H., Tianjie, Z., Starks, P.J., Bosch, D.D., Seyfried, M.,
817 Moran, M.S., Goodrich, D.C., Kerr, Y.H. & Leroux, D. (2012). Validation of Soil
818 Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) Soil Moisture Over Watershed Networks in the
819 U.S. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 50, 1530-1543
- 820 Jackson, T.J., Cosh, M.H., Bindlish, R., Starks, P.J., Bosch, D.D., Seyfried, M., Goodrich, D.C.,
821 Moran, M.S. & Jinyang, D. (2010). Validation of Advanced Microwave Scanning
822 Radiometer Soil Moisture Products. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions*
823 *on*, 48, 4256-4272
- 824 Jacquette, E., Al Bitar, A., Mialon, A., Kerr, Y., Quesney, A., Cabot, F. & Richaume, P. (2010).
825 SMOS CATDS level 3 global products over land. *Proc.SPIE, Remote Sensing for*
826 *Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Hydrology XII*, 78240K, 7824
- 827 Kerr, Y., Jacquette, E., Al Bitar, A., Cabot, F., Mialon, A., Richaume, P., Quesney, A., Berthon,
828 L. & Wigneron, J. (2013). CATDS SMOS L3 soil moisture retrieval processor,
829 Algorithm Theoretical Baseline Document (ATBD). *SO-TN-CBSA-GS-0029,14/07/2013*

- 830 Kerr, Y.H. & Njoku, E.G. (1990). A semiempirical model for interpreting microwave emission
831 from semiarid land surfaces as seen from space. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE*
832 *Transactions on*, 28, 384-393
- 833 Kerr, Y.H., Vergely, J.L., Waldteufel, P., Richaume, P., Anterrieu, E. & Moreno, R. (2008).
834 CATDS SMOS L3 processor: Algorithm Theoretical Baseline Document for the soil
835 moisture retrieval (ATBD). *CNES-CESBIO, Toulouse, France, CATDS-ATBD-SM-L3,*
836 *V1.1*
- 837 Kerr, Y.H., Waldteufel, P., Richaume, P., Wigneron, J.P., Ferrazzoli, P., Mahmoodi, A., Al
838 Bitar, A., Cabot, F., Gruhier, C., Juglea, S.E., Leroux, D., Mialon, A. & Delwart, S.
839 (2012). The SMOS Soil Moisture Retrieval Algorithm. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing,*
840 *IEEE Transactions on*, 50, 1384-1403
- 841 Kerr, Y.H., Waldteufel, P., Wigneron, J.P., Delwart, S., Cabot, F., Boutin, J., Escorihuela, M.J.,
842 Font, J., Reul, N., Gruhier, C., Juglea, S.E., Drinkwater, M.R., Hahne, A., Martin-Neira,
843 M. & Mecklenburg, S. (2010). The SMOS Mission: New Tool for Monitoring Key
844 Elements of the Global Water Cycle. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98, 666-687
- 845 Kerr, Y.H., Waldteufel, P., Wigneron, J.P., Martinuzzi, J., Font, J. & Berger, M. (2001). Soil
846 moisture retrieval from space: the Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission.
847 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 39, 1729-1735
- 848 Koike, T., Nakamura, Y., Kaihotsu, I., Davva, G., Matsuura, N., Tamagawa, K. & Fujii, H.
849 (2004). Development of an advanced microwave scanning radiometer (AMSR-E)
850 algorithm of soil moisture and vegetation water content. *Annual Journal of Hydraulic*
851 *Engineering, JSCE*, 48
- 852 Koster, R.D., Dirmeyer, P.A., Guo, Z., Bonan, G., Chan, E., Cox, P., Gordon, C.T., Kanae, S.,
853 Kowalczyk, E., Lawrence, D., Liu, P., Lu, C.-H., Malyshev, S., McAvaney, B., Mitchell,
854 K., Mocko, D., Oki, T., Oleson, K., Pitman, A., Sud, Y.C., Taylor, C.M., Verseghy, D.,
855 Vasic, R., Xue, Y. & Yamada, T. (2004a). Regions of Strong Coupling Between Soil
856 Moisture and Precipitation. *Science*, 305, 1138-1140
- 857 Koster, R.D., Guo, Z., Yang, R., Dirmeyer, P.A., Mitchell, K. & Puma, M.J. (2009). On the
858 Nature of Soil Moisture in Land Surface Models. *Journal of Climate*, 22, 4322-4335
- 859 Koster, R.D., Mahanama, S.P.P., Livneh, B., Lettenmaier, D.P. & Reichle, R.H. (2010). Skill in
860 streamflow forecasts derived from large-scale estimates of soil moisture and snow.
861 *Nature Geosci*, 3, 613-616
- 862 Koster, R.D., Suarez, M.J., Liu, P., Jambor, U., Berg, A., Kistler, M., Reichle, R., Rodell, M. &
863 Famiglietti, J. (2004b). Realistic Initialization of Land Surface States: Impacts on
864 Subseasonal Forecast Skill. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 5, 1049-1063
- 865 Koster, R.D., Sud, Y.C., Guo, Z., Dirmeyer, P.A., Bonan, G., Oleson, K.W., Chan, E., Verseghy,
866 D., Cox, P., Davies, H., Kowalczyk, E., Gordon, C.T., Kanae, S., Lawrence, D., Liu, P.,
867 Mocko, D., Lu, C.-H., Mitchell, K., Malyshev, S., McAvaney, B., Oki, T., Yamada, T.,
868 Pitman, A., Taylor, C.M., Vasic, R. & Xue, Y. (2006). GLACE: The Global Land-
869 Atmosphere Coupling Experiment. Part I: Overview. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7,
870 590-610
- 871 Lacava, T., Matgen, P., Brocca, L., Bittelli, M., Pergola, N., Moramarco, T. & Tramutoli, V.
872 (2012). A First Assessment of the SMOS Soil Moisture Product With In Situ and
873 Modeled Data in Italy and Luxembourg. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE*
874 *Transactions on*, 50, 1612-1622

- 875 Leroux, D.J., Kerr, Y.H., Richaume, P. & Berthelot, B. (2011). Estimating SMOS error structure
876 using triple collocation. In, *Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), 2011*
877 *IEEE International* (pp. 24-27)
- 878 Li, L., Njoku, E.G., Im, E., Chang, P.S. & Germain, K.S. (2004). A preliminary survey of radio-
879 frequency interference over the U.S. in Aqua AMSR-E data. *Geoscience and Remote*
880 *Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 42, 380-390
- 881 Mironov, V., Kerr, Y., Wigneron, J.P., Kosolapova, L. & Demontoux, F. (2012). Temperature-
882 and Texture-Dependent Dielectric Model for Moist Soils at 1.4 GHz. *Geoscience and*
883 *Remote Sensing Letters, IEEE*, 10, 419-423
- 884 Mladenova, I., Lakshmi, V., Jackson, T.J., Walker, J.P., Merlin, O. & de Jeu, R.A.M. (2011).
885 Validation of AMSR-E soil moisture using L-band airborne radiometer data from
886 National Airborne Field Experiment 2006. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115, 2096-
887 2103
- 888 Muñoz-Sabater, J., Jarlan, L., Calvet, J.-C., Bouyssel, F. & De Rosnay, P. (2007). From Near-
889 Surface to Root-Zone Soil Moisture Using Different Assimilation Techniques. *Journal of*
890 *Hydrometeorology*, 8, 194-206
- 891 Njoku, E.G., Ashcroft, P., Chan, T.K. & Li, L. (2005). Global Survey and Statistics of Radio-
892 Frequency Interference in AMSR-E Land Observations. *IEEE Transactions on*
893 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 46
- 894 Njoku, E.G. & Chan, S.K. (2006). Vegetation and surface roughness effects on AMSR-E land
895 observations. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 100, 190-199
- 896 Njoku, E.G., Jackson, T.J., Lakshmi, V., Chan, T.K. & Nghiem, S.V. (2003). Soil moisture
897 retrieval from AMSR-E. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 41,
898 215-229
- 899 Njoku, E.G. & Li, L. (1999). Retrieval of land surface parameters using passive microwave
900 measurements at 6-18 GHz. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 37,
901 79-93
- 902 Oliva, R., Daganzo, E., Kerr, Y.H., Mecklenburg, S., Nieto, S., Richaume, P. & Gruhier, C.
903 (2012). SMOS Radio Frequency Interference Scenario: Status and Actions Taken to
904 Improve the RFI Environment in the 1400–1427-MHz Passive Band. *Geoscience and*
905 *Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 50, 1427-1439
- 906 Owe, M., de Jeu, R. & Holmes, T. (2008). Multisensor historical climatology of satellite-derived
907 global land surface moisture. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 113,
908 F01002
- 909 Owe, M., de Jeu, R. & Walker, J. (2001). A methodology for surface soil moisture and
910 vegetation optical depth retrieval using the microwave polarization difference index.
911 *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 39, 1643-1654
- 912 Parinussa, R., Meesters, A., Liu, Y., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W. & de Jeu, R. (2011a). An
913 Analytical Solution to Estimate the Error Structure of a Global Soil Moisture Dataset.
914 *IEEE Geoscience and remote sensing letters*, 8, 779-783
- 915 Parinussa, R.M., Meesters, A.G.C.A., Liu, Y.Y., Dorigo, W., Wagner, W. & de Jeu, R.A.M.
916 (2011b). Error Estimates for Near-Real-Time Satellite Soil Moisture as Derived From the
917 Land Parameter Retrieval Model. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters, IEEE*, 8, 779-
918 783

- 919 Quesada, B., Vautard, R., Yiou, P., Hirschi, M. & Seneviratne, S.I. (2012). Asymmetric
920 European summer heat predictability from wet and dry southern winters and springs.
921 *Nature Clim. Change*, 2, 736-741
- 922 Reichle, R.H., Crow, W.T. & Keppenne, C.L. (2008). An adaptive ensemble Kalman filter for
923 soil moisture data assimilation. *Water Resources Research*, 44, W03423
- 924 Reichle, R.H., Koster, R.D., Liu, P., Mahanama, S.P.P., Njoku, E.G. & Owe, M. (2007).
925 Comparison and assimilation of global soil moisture retrievals from the Advanced
926 Microwave Scanning Radiometer for the Earth Observing System (AMSR-E) and the
927 Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR). *Journal of Geophysical*
928 *Research: Atmospheres*, 112, D09108
- 929 Rüdiger, C., Calvet, J.-C., Gruhier, C., Holmes, T.R.H., de Jeu, R.A.M. & Wagner, W. (2009).
930 An Intercomparison of ERS-Scat and AMSR-E Soil Moisture Observations with Model
931 Simulations over France. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 10
- 932 Sahoo, A.K., Houser, P.R., Ferguson, C., Wood, E.F., Dirmeyer, P.A. & Kafatos, M. (2008).
933 Evaluation of AMSR-E soil moisture results using the in-situ data over the Little River
934 Experimental Watershed, Georgia. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112, 3142-3152
- 935 Saleh, K., Kerr, Y.H., Richaume, P., Escorihuela, M.J., Panciera, R., Delwart, S., Boulet, G.,
936 Maisongrande, P., Walker, J.P., Wursteisen, P. & Wigneron, J.P. (2009). Soil moisture
937 retrievals at L-band using a two-step inversion approach (COSMOS/NAFE'05
938 Experiment). *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113, 1304-1312
- 939 Sanchez, N., Martinez-Fernandez, J., Scaini, A. & Perez-Gutierrez, C. (2012). Validation of the
940 SMOS L2 Soil Moisture Data in the REMEDHUS Network (Spain). *Geoscience and*
941 *Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 50, 1602-1611
- 942 Scipal, K., Drusch, M. & Wagner, W. (2008). Assimilation of a ERS scatterometer derived soil
943 moisture index in the ECMWF numerical weather prediction system. *Advances in Water*
944 *Resources*, 31, 1101-1112
- 945 Seneviratne, S., Wilhelm M, Stanelle T, van den Hurk B, Hagemann S, Berg A, Cheruy F,
946 Higgins ME, Meier A, Brovkin V, Claussen M, Ducharne A, Dufresne JL, Findell K,
947 Ghattas J, Lawrence DM, Malyshev S, Rumukainen M & B, S. (2013). Impact of soil
948 moisture-climate feedbacks on CMIP5 projections: First results from the GLACE-CMIP5
949 experiment. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40
- 950 Su, Z., Wen, J., Dente, L., van der Velde, R., Wang, L., Ma, Y., Yang, K. & Hu, Z. (2011). The
951 Tibetan Plateau observatory of plateau scale soil moisture and soil temperature (Tibet-
952 Obs) for quantifying uncertainties in coarse resolution satellite and model products
953 *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 15
- 954 Taylor, C.M., de Jeu, R.A.M., Guichard, F., Harris, P.P. & Dorigo, W.A. (2012). Afternoon rain
955 more likely over drier soils. *Nature*, 489, 423-426
- 956 Teuling, A.J., Seneviratne, S.I., Stockli, R., Reichstein, M., Moors, E., Ciais, P., Luyssaert, S.,
957 van den Hurk, B., Ammann, C., Bernhofer, C., Dellwik, E., Gianelle, D., Gielen, B.,
958 Grunwald, T., Klumpp, K., Montagnani, L., Moureaux, C., Sottocornola, M. &
959 Wohlfahrt, G. (2010). Contrasting response of European forest and grassland energy
960 exchange to heatwaves. *Nature Geosci*, 3, 722-727
- 961 Thirel, G., Martin, E., Mahfouf, J.F., Massart, S., Ricci, S., Regimbeau, F. & Habets, F. (2010).
962 A past discharge assimilation system for ensemble streamflow forecasts over France –
963 Part 2: Impact on the ensemble streamflow forecasts. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 1639-
964 1653

- 965 van den Hurk, B. & Viterbo, P. (2003). The Torne-Kalix PILPS 2(e) experiment as a test bed for
966 modifications to the ECMWF land surface scheme. *Global and Planetary Change*, 38,
967 165-173
- 968 Vivoni, E.R., Gebremichael, M., Watts, C.J., Bindlish, R. & Jackson, T.J. (2008). Comparison of
969 ground-based and remotely-sensed surface soil moisture estimates over complex terrain
970 during SMEX04. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112, 314-325
- 971 Wagner, W., Bloeschl, G., Pampaloni, P., Calvet, J.-C., Bizzarri, B., Wigneron, J.-P. & Kerr, Y.
972 (2007). Operational readiness of microwave remote sensing of soil moisture for
973 hydrologic applications. *Nordic Hydrology*, 38, 1-20
- 974 Walker, J.P., Willgoose, G.R. & Kalma, J.D. (2004). In situ measurement of soil moisture: a
975 comparison of techniques. *Journal of Hydrology*, 293, 85-99
- 976 Wang, J.R. (1985). Effect of vegetation on soil moisture sensing observed from orbiting
977 microwave radiometers. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 17, 141-151
- 978 Wigneron, J.-P., Schwank, M., Baeza, E.L., Kerr, Y., Novello, N., Millan, C., Moisy, C.,
979 Richaume, P., Mialon, A., Al Bitar, A., Cabot, F., Lawrence, H., Guyon, D., Calvet, J.-C.,
980 Grant, J.P., Casal, T., de Rosnay, P., Saleh, K., Mahmoodi, A., Delwart, S. &
981 Mecklenburg, S. (2012). First evaluation of the simultaneous SMOS and ELBARA-II
982 observations in the Mediterranean region. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 124, 26-37
- 983 Wigneron, J.P., Calvet, J.C., Kerr, Y., Chanzy, A. & Lopes, A. (1993). Microwave emission of
984 vegetation: sensitivity to leaf characteristics. *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE*
985 *Transactions on*, 31, 716-726
- 986 Wigneron, J.P., Calvet, J.C., Pellarin, T., Van de Griend, A.A., Berger, M. & Ferrazzoli, P.
987 (2003). Retrieving near-surface soil moisture from microwave radiometric observations:
988 current status and future plans. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 85, 489-506
- 989 Wigneron, J.P., Kerr, Y., Waldteufel, P., Saleh, K., Escorihuela, M.J., Richaume, P., Ferrazzoli,
990 P., de Rosnay, P., Gurney, R., Calvet, J.C., Grant, J.P., Guglielmetti, M., Hornbuckle, B.,
991 Mätzler, C., Pellarin, T. & Schwank, M. (2007). L-band Microwave Emission of the
992 Biosphere (L-MEB) Model: Description and calibration against experimental data sets
993 over crop fields. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 107, 639-655
- 994 Wigneron, J.P., Waldteufel, P., Chanzy, A., Calvet, J.C. & Kerr, Y. (2000). Two-Dimensional
995 Microwave Interferometer Retrieval Capabilities over Land Surfaces (SMOS Mission).
996 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 73, 270-282

997
998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010 **Table 1** Main characteristics of the surface soil moisture datasets used in this study. Note that all products
 1011 are daily and global products re-sampled to 0.25° ($\sim 25\text{km}$).

Soil moisture datasets	Incidence angle ($^\circ$)	Data type and frequency	Sampling depth and unit	Temporal coverage	Reference
SMOS level 3 (SMOSL3)	0 - 55	Remotely sensed (L-band, passive)	$\sim 0\text{-}3\text{ cm (m}^3/\text{m}^3)$	2010 - Present	Jacquette et al. (2010)
AMSR-E , NASA-VUA Algorithm (AMSRM)	55	Remotely sensed (C-band, passive)	$\sim 0\text{-}1\text{ cm (m}^3/\text{m}^3)$	2002 - 2011	Owe et al. (2008)
ECMWF SM-DAS-2 (DAS2)	-	Land Data Assimilation System	$0\text{-}7\text{ cm (m}^3/\text{m}^3)$	2010 - Present	de Rosnay et al. (2013) Drusch et al. (2009)

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032 **Table 2** Locations and type of biome of the eight sites selected to evaluate the SSM time series (Fig. 2).
 1033 All sites have the same surface area (i.e., ~ 360000 km²).
 1034

	Region	Coordinates (centre) (longitude – latitude)	Biome (vegetation)	Köppen-Geiger Climate classification
1	Brazil, Amazon Basin	(-53 ° W – -8 ° S)	Tropical humid (evergreen rain forest)	Af & Am
2	Deccan Plateau Region of India	(78 ° E – 21 ° N)	Tropical semi-arid (Isolated trees and bush in open grassland)	BSk, Aw, & BSh
3	Central Australia	(133 ° E – -23 ° S)	Desert temperate	BWh
4	North-West America, Great Basin Region (Nevada, Utah, Idaho and Washington)	(-114 ° W – 40 ° N)	Desert temperate	BWh & BWk
5	North-East America, Interior Plains Region (Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin)	(-94 ° W – 43 ° N)	Temperate humid (forest, grass land, agriculture)	Aw & Dfa
6	Sahel, Savanna Region of Nigeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic and Chad	(18 ° E – 89 ° N)	Tropical semi-arid (Isolated trees and bush in open grassland)	Aw
7	Central Europe (Austria, France, Germany and Italy)	(4 ° E – 47 ° N)	Temperate forest (Deciduous broadleaf forest)	Cfb
8	Argentina, Pampas Region	(-53 ° W – -26 ° S)	Temperate humid (grass land)	Cfa

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040 **Figure captions**1041 **Fig. 1.** Probability of Radio Frequency Interference (RFI) occurrences in the L-band SMOS observations.

1042 The map represents the average probability of RFI occurrences for the period 2010 – 2012.

1043 **Fig. 2.** Distribution of major biomes (Chesworth, 2008). The boxes on the map indicate the sites which
1044 were selected to illustrate the main features of the SMOSL3, AMSRM and DAS2 products for a variety of
1045 vegetation and climatic conditions.1046 Fig. 3. Global map of the long term mean LAI in $\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ (Dirmeyer et al., 2006).1047 **Fig. 4.** Spatio-temporal comparison between SMOSL3 ascending (ASC) and SMOSL3 descending

1048 (DESC) products in terms of correlation with respect to the reference (DAS2) product for the period

1049 03/2010 – 09/2011. The map shows the areas where either SMOSL3 ASC (red) or SMOSL3 DESC

1050 (green) correlates better with the reference. Pixels where ASC and DESC have similar performances

1051 (differences in the values of R are lower than 0.05) are shown in blue. Only significant correlations (p-

1052 value < 0.05) are presented.

1053 **Fig. 5.** Comparison of the time series of the mean SSM (site averaged) derived from SMOSL3, AMSRM

1054 and DAS2 for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011 for the eight selected sites shown in Fig. 2.

1055 **Fig. 6.** Pairwise comparison between the AMSRM (left panel) and SMOSL3 (right panel) SSM products

1056 with respect to the reference DAS2 product in terms of the correlation coefficient (R) based on original

1057 SSM data (a and b), the correlation coefficient (R) based on SSM anomalies (c and d), RMSD (m^3/m^3 ; e1058 and f), and Bias (m^3/m^3 ; g and h) for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. Only significant correlations (p-value

1059 < 0.05) are presented.

1060 **Fig. 7.** Pairwise comparison between the SMOSL3 and AMSRM SSM products with respect to the

1061 reference DAS2 SSM product in terms of correlations based on the original SSM data (a) or on SSM

1062 anomalies (b) for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. The map show the areas where either SMOSL3 (red) or

1063 AMSRM (green) correlates better with the reference. Pixels where SMOSL3 and AMSRM have similar

1064 performances (differences in the values of R are lower than 0.05) are shown in blue. Only significant
1065 correlations (p-value < 0.05) are presented.

1066 **Fig. 8.** Distribution of the statistical indicators between SMOSL3 (red) and AMSRM (green) and the
1067 reference as a function of biome types for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. Statistics in terms of correlation
1068 coefficient based on original SSM data (a), correlation coefficient based on SSM anomalies (b), RMSD
1069 (m^3/m^3 ; c), and Bias (m^3/m^3 ; d) are computed at each grid cell and then averaged by biome type. The
1070 biome types are defined from the classification given by Chesworth (2008) shown in Fig. 2. Error bars
1071 represent mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD) and only significant correlations (p-value < 0.05) are
1072 considered in the analysis.

1073 **Fig. 9.** Distribution of the correlation coefficient (R) between SMOSL3 (red), AMSRM (green) and the
1074 reference dataset (DAS2) for the original SSM data (a) and anomalies (b) as a function of LAI for the
1075 period 03/2010 – 09/2011. Statistics are computed at each grid cell and then averaged by LAI intervals.
1076 The values of LAI were extracted from the map of Dirmeyer et al. (2006) shown in Fig. 3. The percentage
1077 value (top of figure) provides the cover fraction (%) over continental surfaces corresponding to each LAI
1078 interval. Error bars represent mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD) and only significant correlations (p-value <
1079 0.05) are considered in the analysis.

1080

1081

1082

1083


1084

1085

1086

1087

1088



1089

1090 **Fig. 1.** Probability of Radio Frequency Interference (RFI) occurrences in the L-band SMOS observations. The map represents the
1091 average probability of RFI occurrences for the period 2010 – 2012.

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103


1104

1105

1106

1107

1108



1109

1110 **Fig. 2.** Distribution of major biomes (Chesworth, 2008). The boxes on the map indicate the sites which were selected to illustrate

1111 the main features of the SMOSL3, AMSRM and DAS2 products for a variety of vegetation and climatic conditions.

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120


1121

1122

1123

1124

1125



1126

1127 **Fig. 3.** Global map of the long term mean LAI in $\text{m}^2.\text{m}^{-2}$ (Dirmeyer et al., 2006).

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133


1134

1135

1136


1137

1138
1139
1140
1141
1142



1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153

Fig. 4. Spatio-temporal comparison between SMOSL3 ascending (ASC) and SMOSL3 descending (DESC) products in terms of correlation with respect to the reference (DAS2) product for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. The map shows the areas where either SMOSL3 ASC (red) or SMOSL3 DESC (green) correlates better with the reference. Pixels where ASC and DESC have similar performances (differences in the values of R are lower than 0.05) are shown in blue. Only significant correlations (p-value < 0.05) are presented.



1154

1155

1156 **Fig. 5.** Comparison of the time series of the mean SSM (site averaged) derived from SMOSL3, AMSRM and DAS2 for the

1157 period 03/2010 – 09/2011 for the eight selected sites shown in Fig. 2.

1158


1159

1160

1161

1162

1163



1164

1165 **Fig. 6.** Pairwise comparison between the AMSRM (left panel) and SMOSL3 (right panel) SSM products with respect to the1166 reference DAS2 product in terms of the correlation coefficient (R) based on original SSM data (a and b), the correlation1167 coefficient (R) based on SSM anomalies (c and d), RMSD (m^3/m^3 ; e and f), and Bias (m^3/m^3 ; g and h) for the period 03/2010–1168 09/2011. Only significant correlations (p -value < 0.05) are presented.


1169

1170

1171

1172

1173




1174

1175 **Fig. 7.** Pairwise comparison between the SMOSL3 and AMSRM SSM products with respect to the reference DAS2 SSM product
 1176 in terms of correlations based on the original SSM data (a) or on SSM anomalies (b) for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. The map
 1177 show the areas where either SMOSL3 (red) or AMSRM (green) correlates better with the reference. Pixels where SMOSL3 and
 1178 AMSRM have similar performances (differences in the values of R are lower than 0.05) are shown in blue. Only significant
 1179 correlations (p -value < 0.05) are presented.

1180

1181



1182

1183 **Fig. 8.** Distribution of the statistical indicators between SMOSL3 (red) and AMSRM (green) and the reference as a function of

1184 biome types for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. Statistics in terms of correlation coefficient based on original SSM data (a),


1185 correlation coefficient based on SSM anomalies (b), RMSD (m^3/m^3 ; c), and Bias (m^3/m^3 ; d) are computed at each grid cell and

1186 then averaged by biome type. The biome types are defined from the classification given by Chesworth (2008) shown in Fig. 2.

1187 Error bars represent mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD) and only significant correlations (p -value < 0.05) are considered in the

1188 analysis.

1189



1190

1191 **Fig. 9.** Distribution of the correlation coefficient (R) between SMOSL3 (red), AMSRM (green) and the reference dataset (DAS2)
 1192 for the original SSM data (a) and anomalies (b) as a function of LAI for the period 03/2010 – 09/2011. Statistics are computed at
 1193 each grid cell and then averaged by LAI intervals. The values of LAI were extracted from the map of Dirmeyer et al. (2006)
 1194 shown in Fig. 3. The percentage value (top of figure) provides the cover fraction (%) over continental surfaces corresponding to
 1195 each LAI interval. Error bars represent mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD) and only significant correlations (p -value < 0.05) are
 1196 considered in the analysis.

1197

1198