



HAL
open science

Correcting land surface temperature data for elevation and illumination effects in mountainous areas: A case study using ASTER data over a steep-sided valley in Morocco

Yoann Malbêteau, Olivier Merlin, Simon Gascoin, Jean-Philippe Gastellu-Etchegorry, C Mattar, Luis Enrique Olivera-Guerra, S P Khabba, Lionel Jarlan

► To cite this version:

Yoann Malbêteau, Olivier Merlin, Simon Gascoin, Jean-Philippe Gastellu-Etchegorry, C Mattar, et al.. Correcting land surface temperature data for elevation and illumination effects in mountainous areas: A case study using ASTER data over a steep-sided valley in Morocco. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2017, 189, pp.25 - 39. 10.1016/j.rse.2016.11.010 . hal-01407593

HAL Id: hal-01407593

<https://hal.science/hal-01407593v1>

Submitted on 6 Dec 2016

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.

Copyright

Correcting land surface temperature data for elevation and illumination effects in mountainous areas: a case study using ASTER data over a steep-sided valley in Morocco

Malbêteau Y.¹, O. Merlin^{1,2}, S. Gascoin¹, J.P. Gastellu¹, C. Mattar³, L. Olivera-Guerra³, S. Khabba², L. Jarlan¹

¹ Centre d'Etudes Spatiales de la Biosphère (CESBIO), 18 Avenue, Edouard Belin, bpi 2801, 31401 Toulouse Cedex 9, France

² Faculté des Sciences Semlalia, Université Cadi Ayyad (UCAM), Avenue Prince Moulay Abdellah, BP 2390, Marrakech 40000, Morocco

³ Laboratory for Analysis of the Biosphere (LAB), University of Chile, Avenidad Santa Rosa 11315, La Pintana, Santiago, Chile

yoann.malbetreau@cesbio.cnes.fr; +212 5 24 43 16 26

Abstract

The remotely sensed land surface temperature (LST) is a key parameter to monitor surface energy and water fluxes but the strong impact of topography on LST has limited its use to mostly flat areas. To fill the gap, this study proposes a physically-based method to correct LST data for topographic -namely illumination and elevation- effects over mountainous areas. Both topographic effects are first quantified by inverting a dual-source soil/vegetation energy balance (EB) model forced by 1) the solar radiation simulated by a 3D radiative transfer model named DART (Discrete Anisotropic Radiative Transfer) that uses a Digital Elevation Model (DEM), 2) a satellite-derived vegetation index, and 3) local meteorological (air temperature, air relative humidity and wind speed) data available at a given location. The satellite LST is then corrected for topography by simulating the LST using both pixel- and image-scale DART solar radiation and elevation data. The approach is tested on three ASTER (Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer) overpass dates over a steep-sided 6 km by 6 km area in the Atlas Mountain in Morocco. The mean correlation coefficient and root mean square difference (RMSD) between EB-simulated and ASTER LST is 0.80 and 3°C, respectively. Moreover, the EB-based method is found to be more accurate than a more classical approach based on a multi-linear regression with DART solar radiation and elevation data. The EB-simulated LST is also evaluated against an extensive ground dataset of 135 autonomous 1-cm depth temperature sensors deployed over the study area. While the mean RMSD between 90 m resolution ASTER LST and localized ibutton measurements is 6.1°C, the RMSD between EB-simulated LST and ibutton soil temperature is 5.4 and 5.3°C for a DEM at 90 m and 8 m resolution, respectively. The proposed topographic correction is self-calibrated from (LST, DEM, vegetation index and in situ meteorological data) data available over large extents. and could potentially be used in conjunction with evapotranspiration retrieval methods based on LST.

Keywords: Land surface temperature, topographic correction, ASTER, Energy Balance, DART, DEM

1. Introduction

The radiative skin temperature over land or land surface temperature (LST) plays an important role in the physics of surface-atmosphere interactions. It is at the same time a driver and a signature of the energy and mass exchanges over land (Anderson et al., 2008; Brunsell and Gillies, 2003; Karnieli et al., 2010; Kustas and Anderson, 2009; Zhang et al., 2008). LST is highly variable in both space and time (Prata et al., 1995), mainly as a result of the heterogeneity of the meteorological forcing, land cover, soil water availability, surface radiative properties and topography. Therefore, satellite-derived LST is widely used in a variety of applications including evapotranspiration monitoring (Bastiaanssen et al., 1998; Boulet et al., 2007), climate change studies (Hansen et al., 2010), soil moisture estimation (Sandholt et al., 2002; Merlin et al., 2010a), vegetation monitoring (Kogan, 2001), urban climate studies (Voogt and Oke, 2003) and forest fire detection (Eckmann et al., 2008).

Since LST and soil water availability are coupled under non energy-limited conditions, LST has been used as a proxy of the surface water status in combination with energy balance modeling (Norman et al., 1995; Anderson et al., 2008; Kustas and Anderson, 2009; Merlin et al., 2010a; Bastiaanssen et al., 1998; Allen et al., 2007; Boulet et al., 2007; Mattar et al., 2014; Cammalleri and Vogt, 2015). All those studies have focused on relatively flat regions to facilitate the interpretation of the LST variability associated with the surface parameters, fluxes or processes of interest. Over hilly areas, the application of such approaches is limited because the signature of the surface water status on LST is masked by topography effects, namely the pixel-scale impact of illumination (solar radiation) and elevation (air temperature) on LST. Especially, temperature differences between south-facing and north-facing slope can reach 30°C (Shreve, 1924; Raz-Yaseef et al., 2010) due to illumination effects. Globally, about 20% of continental surfaces consist of mountainous terrain (Meybeck et al., 2001) where LST is significantly impacted by topography. However, to our knowledge, there is no method to correct the remotely sensed LST for the topography-induced atmospheric forcing variability, that is to derive the LST that would be observed under uniform solar radiation and air temperature conditions.

Note that the retrieval of LST from satellite observations over mountainous areas is subject to uncertainties associated with viewing geometry i.e. GIFOV (ground instantaneous field of view) and the anisotropic nature of emissivity. Modeling, experimental, and case studies have reported an anisotropic effect on LST typically ranging from 1 to 2°C depending on the pixel-scale radiometer viewing angle and up to 3°C for extreme viewing angles (Lagouarde et al., 1995; Sobrino and Cuenca, 1999; Minnis and Khaiyer, 2000; Coret et al., 2004; Rasmussen et al., 2010; Proy et al., 1989; Liu et al., 2006, 2009). The LST retrieval errors due to viewing geometry are thus much smaller (<10%) than the potential impact of topography-induced atmospheric forcing variability on LST. At the subpixel scale, current LST retrieval methods overlook the (commonly unresolved) fine-scale surface roughness (Danilina et al., 2012, 2013).

To assess the impact of topography on remotely sensed LST, previous studies have attempted to simulate LST over mountainous areas. For example, Hais and Kučera (2009) simulated LST using linear regressions with the hillshade computed by the spatial analyst toolbox of ArcGis based on a DEM (Digital Elevation Model). The surface energy balance (EB) equation has also been used over mountainous terrain to simulate LST (Dozier and Outcalt, 1979). Originally, this approach was designed for bare soil or low grassy vegetation with a single source EB model using a topographic map and a set of ancillary (incoming solar radiation, albedo, wind speed, air temperature, surface roughness length and relative air humidity) measurements. The variability of albedo was estimated with soil wetness and illumination angle information, while the variation of air temperature with elevation was estimated using the standard environmental lapse rate of $-6.5^{\circ}\text{C}\cdot\text{km}^{-1}$. In Dozier and Outcalt (1979), wind speed and relative air humidity were assumed to be homogeneous over the study area. The incoming solar radiation was computed for each grid cell according to the local solar incidence angle and a diffuse radiation factor. However, the solar radiation in their model did not include the diffuse reflection from adjacent terrain.

Later Rigon et al. (2006) developed a distributed hydrological model that accounts for complex topography. This model named GEOTop describes the energy and mass exchanges at the surface/atmosphere interface by taking into account 1) the impact of elevation on air temperature, 2) the effects of slope/exposure on solar radiation and 3) the spatial distribution of vegetation and soil water content. In that study, the EB model of GEOTop is single source. It is forced by temperature and wind speed measurements, which are regionalized over the study area. The incoming direct shortwave radiation is computed for each grid cell according to the local solar incidence angle, including the diffuse radiation due to atmospheric and cloud transmissivity. This model also includes shadowing effects of direct solar radiation by the surrounding mountains. In that paper, shadowing was basically expressed as a factor ranging

52 from 0 if the grid cell is completely in shadow (no direct radiation) to 1 if the sun radiation hits the surface. More
53 recently Bertoldi et al. (2010) and Endrizzi et al. (2013) used the same (GEOtop) model to estimate the topographical
54 effects on soil temperature simulations for different applications including ecohydrology, soil freezing and snow cover
55 assessment.

56 To simulate LST accurately using an EB model, the incoming solar radiation should be represented at the pixel
57 scale (Allen et al., 2006). The solar radiation (noted R_g in $W.m^{-2}$) reaching the surface at a given location is the sum of
58 direct solar radiation, diffuse sky radiation, and the direct and diffuse radiations reflected by nearby terrains (Dubayah,
59 1994). R_g mainly depends on the cloud cover, the turbidity of the clean air, the time of year, latitude, albedo of the
60 surrounding terrain and surface geometry (Essery and Marks, 2007). Estimating the R_g variability over mountainous
61 areas is challenging due to the irregular topographic geometry of the surface and to the multiple reflections that occur
62 in such conditions. At high resolution, the variability in slope angles and slope orientations, as well as the shadows cast
63 by topographic agents can lead to strong local gradients in R_g (Dozier, 1980; Dubayah, 1992). Moreover, since the
64 in situ monitoring network ineffectively covers the complex heterogeneity of mountainous areas, simple geostatistical
65 methods for spatial interpolation of solar radiation are not always representative enough. Consequently, algorithms
66 that explicitly or implicitly account for the features creating strong local gradients in the incoming radiation must be
67 applied (Susong et al., 1999; Garen and Marks, 2005). The most advanced method to compute the distributed R_g
68 over a landscape is to use a 3D radiative transfer model, which explicitly simulates its three components: direct solar
69 radiation, diffuse sky radiation and reflected radiations. Here we used DART model (Discrete Anisotropic Radiative
70 Transfer, Gastellu-Etchegorry et al. (1996)) as one of the most comprehensive physically based 3D models simulating
71 the Earth-atmosphere radiation interaction from visible to thermal infrared wavelengths.

72 In this context, this study aims to develop an original method to correct the remotely sensed LST for topography-
73 induced atmospheric forcing (solar radiation and air temperature) variability. This method uses an EB model forced
74 by the solar radiation derived from DART and the air temperature gradient derived from elevation data. The approach
75 is tested at 90 m resolution using ASTER (Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer) data
76 over a 6 km by 6 km steep-sided area in the Moroccan Atlas. The LST is corrected for topography by simulating the
77 LST using DART solar radiation and elevation data. Moreover, the EB approach is implemented using a dual source
78 formulation, allowing for a representation of topographic effects on both soil and vegetation components. Three
79 different strategies are proposed to evaluate the correction approach. First, the EB model is compared in terms of
80 simulated LST with two other simpler approaches based on the same input (DART solar radiation and elevation) data.
81 Second, the LST simulated by the EB model is evaluated against a set of soil temperature measurements distributed at
82 45 points within the study area. Third, the quality of corrected LST is analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

83 2. Study materials

84 2.1. Study region

85 The High Atlas is a Moroccan mountain chain of approximately 60 km in width and 800 km in length organized
86 along a NE-SW axis. It culminates at 4167 m above sea level at the Jbel Toubkal, the highest summit of North Africa.
87 The central part of the High-Atlas is the water tower for the northern semi-arid plains of the Tensift catchment,
88 Marrakech region (Chehbouni et al., 2008). The experimental data set was collected over the Imlil valley (31.12°N;
89 7.93°W) part of the Rheraya sub-catchment (Toubkal national park). This valley has an East-West orientation, thus
90 maximizing the solar exposure effects on LST. It covers a surface area of about ~ 9 km² (Fig. 1) and is characterized
91 by a semi-arid and mountainous climate. The annual precipitation is about 600 mm /year with intense events in winter
92 and sparse localized thunderstorms during spring and summer. The vegetation cover is a function of elevation and
93 human activity, so that dense vegetation is observed along the stream valley only. Others areas are characterized by
94 bare or poorly vegetated loam gravelly brown soil. Terrain elevation varies between 1700 and 3150 m and hillslope
95 range between 0 (stream valley) and 70 (highest elevation) degrees. Such conditions offer an interesting test site for
96 developing and testing methods for LST topographic correction . The study region covers an area of 6 km x 6 km
97 including the Rheraya sub-catchment (Fig. 1).




Figure 1: On the left, location of the Rheraya catchment, the Imlil subcatchment, and the study area. On the right, a 8 m resolution 3D DEM over the study area indicating the sun-facing (red) and shaded (blue) slopes at 11:30 am local time (GMT).

2.2. Remote sensing data

2.2.1. ASTER land surface temperature

ASTER is one of the five scientific instruments onboard the satellite platform Terra, part of NASA's Earth Observation System (EOS). ASTER is a high spatial resolution radiometer, which consists of three separate subsystems: the visible and near infrared, the shortwave infrared and the thermal infrared. The multispectral TIR (Thermal Infrared: 5 channels between 8 and 12 μm) allows the retrieval of LST and emissivity spectra at high spatial (90 m) resolution (Abrams, 2000). The LST data used in this study are extracted from the on-demand surface kinetic temperature AST_08 product (Gillespie et al., 1998). This product is derived using the same algorithm as the Surface Emissivity Product. Surface kinetic temperature is determined by applying Planck's Law using the emissivity values from the Temperature-Emissivity Separation algorithm. ASTER surface radiance data are corrected from radiometric (sun spot, shading), atmospheric and geometric effects (Gillespie et al., 1998; Abrams, 2000). Absolute accuracy of LST product is about 2°C (Gillespie et al., 1998; Abrams, 2000; Liu et al., 2006). Note that a major source of error is due to the use of a 1 km DEM for atmospheric correction (Gillespie et al., 1998). ASTER products were acquired specifically on the study area at 11:22 am UTC on 3 dates: April 14th and 30th and September 5th, 2014.

2.2.2. Digital elevation models

In this study two DEMs were used with an original spatial resolution of 30 and 4 m. NASA and the Ministry of economy, Trade and Industry of Japan (METI) produced the global 30 m grid size ASTER GDEM product. The GDEM v2 released in October 2011, it is an improved version of GDEM v1 released in June 2009 with an absolute vertical and horizontal accuracy of 17 and 30 m (Meyer, 2011), respectively. The 4 m resolution Pleiades DEM is also used. The Pleiades 1A and 2B twin satellites were launched 17 December 2011 and 2 December 2012, respectively. The DEM was derived from Pleiades-1A stereoscopic pairs acquired over the Rheraya catchment on the 18th of August 2015 at 11:19 am (within a few tens of seconds due to the agility of the platform). Images are delivered at a ground sampling distance of 0.5 m for the panchromatic channel. The DEM was generated through the Automatic Terrain Extraction algorithm in the ERDAS Imagine 2014 photogrammetry toolbox. Three accurate wide-spread control points were collected in the images area. One of them located near the Imlil valley was used as an absolute horizontal ground control point to improve the horizontal geolocation accuracy. Pixel size is of 4 m, which is a good compromise between processing time and DEM accuracy (Berthier et al., 2014; Marti et al., 2014). The accuracy of the DEM horizontal registration was evaluated based on two other check points obtained by geodesic GPS. The error was lower than 4 m in both cases. The vertical error was evaluated based on all three points and was between 1 m and 5 m. The hillshaded raster generated from the Pleiades DEM was also inspected in the Imlil valley region and we found no artifacts or aberrations due to the stereo-correlation. Note that the 4 m resolution DEM was resampled to

129 8 m using cubic interpolation due to computer memory limitation of DART model when simulating the 3D radiative
130 budget of the whole study area at spatial resolution better than 8 m. This situation will be improved in next DART
131 version with new data format and the possibility to work with pixels that can have different dimensions within the
132 same scene.

133 2.2.3. Remotely sensed vegetation index

134 The vegetation cover is derived over the study area from the 30 m resolution Landsat data collected on dates
135 closest to the three ASTER overpass dates. The Landsat reflectances (Claverie et al. (2015)) were used to compute
136 the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI), defined as the ratio of the difference between near-infrared and
137 red reflectances to their sum. Fractional vegetation cover (fv) is estimated as in Gutman and Ignatov (1998):

$$fv = \frac{NDVI - NDVI_s}{NDVI_{vg} - NDVI_s} \quad (1)$$

138 with $NDVI_{vg}$ corresponding to fully-covering vegetation and $NDVI_s$ to bare soil. In this study, $NDVI_{vg}$ and $NDVI_s$
139 are set to the maximum and minimum value of the NDVI observed within the study domain, respectively. Several
140 studies have investigated the spatial scale dependencies of NDVI and the relationship between NDVI and fv. As a
141 first approximation, we consider that the first-order estimate, proposed by Gutman and Ignatov (1998), adequately
142 describes the relationship.

143 2.3. Ground Data

144 2.3.1. Meteorological data

145 Meteorological data including air temperature, relative air humidity and wind speed have been measured ev-
146 ery minute and the averages have been acquired every half hour since May 2003 at Imlil station (31.124875°N;
147 7.920458°W) located close to the center of the study area at an elevation of 1970 m (Fig. 1). Data have been collected
148 and processed in the frame of the Joint International Laboratory TREMA, Marrakech-Morocco (Jarlan et al., 2015).

149 2.3.2. Temperature sensors/loggers

150 The ibutton sensor (model DS1921G) is a coin size that integrates a micro-controller, 2kB storage, a real-time
151 clock, a temperature sensor, and a battery. The ibutton temperature sensors measure temperature in 0.5°C increments
152 from -30°C to 70°C with ± 1°C accuracy (Hubbart et al., 2005).

153 In 2014, a total of 135 ibuttons were deployed over the Imlil valley to cover a range of solar exposures and
154 elevations (Fig. 2). 102 ibuttons were installed on the 3rd April 2014, set up across both sides of the valley to provide
155 a spatial understanding of illumination effects on LST. To complete the spatial distribution, 33 additional ibuttons were
156 set up on the 7th May 2014 across a third slope. All sensors were removed on the 2nd October 2014 (approximately
157 6 months later) before the first snowfall events in the area. In practice, ibuttons were installed 3 by 3 on a 7 by 7 cm
158 thin transparent plastic plate to prevent spreading down into the slope and variations in placement. They were pinned
159 in a topographic environment that was relatively homogeneous at 90 m scale with different illumination and elevation
160 (Fig. 2). The resulting 45 plates were buried very close (~1 cm) to the soil surface by making sure that ibuttons
161 were not directly exposed to solar radiation. We are aware that plates disturb, at least a little bit, surface moisture and
162 latent heat, however it is difficult to estimate impact on the measures. The recording time resolution (135 minutes)
163 for each sensor was chosen based on the maximum ibutton data storage for a 6 month recording. However, the three
164 ibuttons of a given plate were recording temperature with a 45 minute delay between each acquisition, so that the
165 recording time resolution of each plate (by combining all three ibuttons sensors) was 45 minutes. Each plate was
166 installed along transects at a regular spacing of about 150 m (Fig. 2). The locations were recorded using handheld
167 GPS measurements (accuracy ± 6 m) and were physically marked by a white cairn for easier recovery. Every retrieved
168 ibutton (42/45 plates) recorded valid data; and one plate reappeared on the surface and was excluded from the analysis.
169 In total, 91% of the ibuttons installed data could be used for the analysis.




Figure 2: Locations of the 45 ibutton plates, each of them containing 3 ibutton sensors. Red cross indicate plates not used for the study.

2.4. DART model

DART is one of the most complete 3D models designed for simulating the radiative budget and the satellite observations of the land surface in the visible, near infrared and thermal infrared bands. It simulates the radiative transfer in heterogeneous 3D landscapes with the exact kernel and discrete ordinate methods (Gastellu-Etchegorry et al., 2004). Any landscape is simulated as a rectangular matrix of parallelepipedic cells, i.e. building blocks for simulating larger scenes. In this work, the DART model (version 5.5.3) is used to simulate the solar radiation or illumination (noted R_g in $W.m^{-2}$) at the surface for any location in the study valley. One main advantage of DART is to compute the three components of incoming total solar radiation ($W/m^2/\mu m$) of any rugged terrain surface: direct solar radiation, diffuse sky radiation and the (direct and diffuse) reflected radiations from the adjacent surfaces. The reflected radiation is modulated by the reflectance spectra of the surfaces. In practice, surface irradiance depends on the relative orientation of incident rays and the local slope, which explains why DART uses a DEM, time and geographic coordinates as input parameters. DART simulations were conducted for the visible and near infrared spectral domains ($0.4 \mu m$ to $1.1 \mu m$) that is representative images of R_g . In that spectral band, the irradiance varies between 100 and 1800 $W.m^{-2}$ over the simulated scene (Fig. 3). The capability of the DART has been successfully tested in a number of works in the visible and near-infrared spectral domains (Widlowski et al., 2007, 2008). Then, the DART model has been evaluated in the thermal range, where works have addressed the usefulness of this model (Guillevic et al., 2003; Gastellu-Etchegorry, 2008; Sepulcre-Cantó et al., 2009; Sobrino et al., 2011). However the DART capability has not been evaluated to simulate solar radiation, particularly in mountainous area, due to the difficulty to get such data. Therefore, there is no way to estimate directly the accuracy of DART results.

3. Topographic normalization methods

The methodologies presented in this section aim to correct ASTER LST data for topographic including illumination and elevation- effects. Elevation is derived from the 30 m resolution GDEM and is then aggregated at ASTER (90 m) resolution. The incoming solar radiation received at the surface is simulated by DART at the three ASTER overpass dates. Both elevation and DART-simulated illumination are used as input to topographic correction. The approach is based on the EB equations for soil and vegetation, and compared to two different approaches based on 1) a multi-linear regression between ASTER LST, elevation and DART irradiance map, and 2) the slope of the dry edge of both ASTER LST-E (elevation) and ASTER LST- R_g feature spaces.

3.1. Topographic normalization based on the soil and vegetation Energy balance equations

The proposed correction methodology was originally developed in Merlin et al. (2005) to improve the disaggregation of coarse-scale soil moisture data using LST data available at higher spatial resolution. The correction method was further applied to the disaggregation of kilometric LST data over flat irrigated areas (Merlin et al., 2010b). In




Figure 3: DART simulated irradiance over $[0.4\mu\text{m}- 1.1\mu\text{m}]$ of the whole study area (white square in Fig. 1), with 8m resolution DEM at 11:22 am (UTC) on September 5, 2014. Black lines represent the elevation contour lines between 1800 and 3600 m with a 200 m increment.

201 this paper, the technique is implemented to correct satellite (ASTER) LST data for topographic effects at the spatial
 202 resolution of available DEMs. The correction model is written as:

$$T_{corr,EB} = T_{ASTER} + T_{EB}(E, Rg) - T_{EB}(\langle E \rangle, \langle Rg \rangle) \quad (2)$$

203 With $T_{corr,EB}$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ being the ASTER LST corrected for topographic effects using the EB approach, T_{ASTER} in $^{\circ}\text{C}$
 204 being the ASTER LST, $T_{EB}(E, Rg)$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the LST simulated by the EB equations using pixel-scale elevation (E) in m
 205 and solar radiation (Rg) in W.m^{-2} , and $T_{EB}(\langle E \rangle, \langle Rg \rangle)$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the LST simulated by the EB equations using the average
 206 of E ($\langle E \rangle$) and Rg ($\langle Rg \rangle$) at the image scale. LST is estimated as a linear function of component temperatures (Merlin
 207 and Chehbouni, 2004; Anderson et al., 2008; Long and Singh, 2012).

$$T_{EB} = f_v \times T_{vEB} + (1 - f_v) \times T_{sEB} \quad (3)$$

208 with T_{vEB} in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ being the vegetation temperature and T_{sEB} in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the soil temperature. The soil temperature is
 209 expressed as:

$$T_{sEB} = f_{ss} \times T_{s,dryEB} + (1 - f_{ss}) \times T_{s,wetEB} \quad (4)$$

210 with $T_{s,dryEB}$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the soil temperature in dry condition, $T_{s,wetEB}$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the soil temperature in wet condition and f_{ss} a
 211 dryness index of the soil surface. f_{ss} equals to 1 when the soil is fully dry (surface soil moisture close to the residual
 212 value) and to 0 when the soil is fully wet (surface soil moisture close to the soil moisture at saturation). Similarly, the
 213 vegetation temperature is expressed as:

$$T_{vEB} = f_{sv} \times T_{v,dryEB} + (1 - f_{sv}) \times T_{v,wetEB} \quad (5)$$

with $T_{v,dryEB}$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the temperature of fully stressed (non-transpiring) vegetation, $T_{v,wetEB}$ in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ the temperature of a
 vegetation that is unstressed (transpiring at the potential rate) and f_{sv} a vegetation water stress index. f_{sv} is equal

to 1 when the root zone soil moisture is above field capacity and to 0 when the root zone soil moisture is below the wilting point.

Dry bare soil, wet bare soil, fully stressed and unstressed vegetation extreme temperatures are then derived by solving the EB equation for each case, as described below. The dry bare soil EB equation is written as:

$$Rn_{s,dry} - G_{dry} = H_{s,dry} \quad (6)$$

with $Rn_{s,dry}$ (W.m^{-2}) being the net radiation from dry soil, G_{dry} (W.m^{-2}) the ground heat in dry condition and $H_{s,dry}$ (W.m^{-2}) the sensible heat of dry soil. Similarly the wet bare soil EB equation is written as:

$$Rn_{s,wet} - G_{wet} = H_{s,wet} + LE_{s,wet} \quad (7)$$

with $Rn_{s,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) being the net radiation from wet soil, G_{wet} (W.m^{-2}) the ground heat in wet condition, $H_{s,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) the sensible heat of wet soil and $LE_{s,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) the latent heat of wet soil. The fully-stressed vegetation EB equation is written as:

$$Rn_{v,dry} = H_{v,dry} \quad (8)$$

with $Rn_{v,dry}$ (W.m^{-2}) and $H_{v,dry}$ (W.m^{-2}) being the net radiation and the sensible heat of water-stressed vegetation, respectively. Hence, the unstressed vegetation EB equation is written as:

$$Rn_{v,wet} = H_{v,wet} + LE_{v,wet} \quad (9)$$

with $Rn_{v,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}), $H_{v,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) and $LE_{v,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) being the net radiation, sensible heat, and latent heat flux of unstressed vegetation, respectively. The expressions of each flux component of the above EB equations are detailed in the appendix A .

In EB equations 4 and 5, the air temperature (Ta) at the pixel scale is estimated as:

$$Ta = Ta_{station} + LR \times (E - E_{station}) \quad (10)$$

with $Ta_{station}$ ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) is the air temperature measured at the Imlil meteorological station, E (m) the pixel elevation, $E_{station}$ (m) the elevation of the station, and LR the environmental lapse rate ($^{\circ}\text{C.m}^{-1}$). The latter is defined as the rate at which air temperature decreases with increasing elevation. LR is estimated at image-scale for each ASTER overpass date separately.

The four temperatures ($T_{s,dry}$, $T_{s,wet}$, $T_{v,dry}$ and $T_{v,wet}$) in eq. 4 and 5 are solved numerically using the Newton's method (Bristow, 1987). The convergence of component temperature is assumed to be reached when the absolute temperature difference between two consecutive iterations is lower than a given threshold (set to 0.01°C).

Given that ASTER LST observations are available to calibrate the topographic correction model; three additional constraints are applied to the LST model in eq. 3. The first step consists in removing any possible bias in $T_{EB}(E, Rg)$ and $T_{EB}(\langle E \rangle, \langle Rg \rangle)$:

$$T_{EB} = \langle T_{ASTER} \rangle + T_{EB} - \langle T_{EB} \rangle \quad (11)$$

with $\langle T_{ASTER} \rangle$ and $\langle T_{EB} \rangle$ being the average of T_{ASTER} and T_{EB} over the study area, respectively.

The second step consists in adjusting f_{ss} and f_{sv} in equations 4 and 5 by minimizing the RMSD (Root Mean Square Difference) between ASTER LST and model-derived LST, for each ASTER overpass date separately. The third step consists in adjusting LR in eq. 10 by minimizing the RMSD between ASTER LST and model-derived LST. Note that the two latter steps require running the LST model at the observed LST resolution, which is the ASTER resolution in our case. Once the LST model has been calibrated in mean value and via the LR parameter, it can be applied to any spatial resolution, provided a DEM is available at the target resolution. The above calibration needs initializing LR with a LR first-guess of $-6^{\circ}\text{C.km}^{-1}$, according to Glickman and Zenk (2000). The algorithm is summarized in Fig. 4. The above correction method is based on several assumptions. Air humidity and wind speed (from the Imlil station data) are assumed to be uniform within the study area. The surface parameters ϵ_s , ϵ_v , α_s and α_v are also assumed to be homogeneous within the study area. α_s and α_v are estimated as the mean of the 1 km resolution MODIS-derived albedo (MCD43B3 product) over the study area. ϵ_s , ϵ_v are set up to 0.96 and 0.98, respectively, according to look-up tables from Rubio et al. (2003).




Figure 4: Schematic diagram presenting an overview of the topographic correction approach based on EB equations. The EB model (originally designed for solving mix-pixel problem in lowlands) is adapted to mountainous environment, and changes are highlighted by red boxes and underlined variables.

235 3.2. Topographic normalization based on multi-linear regression

The second proposed correction model is based on multilinear (ML) regression:

$$T_{corr,ML} = T_{ASTER} - (T_{ML} - \langle T_{ML} \rangle) \quad (12)$$

with $T_{corr,ML}$ being the ASTER LST corrected for topographic effects using the ML approach, and T_{ML} the LST simulated by the ML regression using T_{ASTER} , DEM-derived E and DART-simulated Rg :

$$T_{ML} = \langle T_{ASTER} \rangle + A_E(E - \langle E \rangle) + A_{Rg}(Rg - \langle Rg \rangle) \quad (13)$$

236 with A_E and A_{Rg} being two linear regression coefficients associated to E and Rg, respectively. A_E and A_{Rg} are computed
 237 for each image separately. The above correction method is based on several assumptions. Both variables Rg and E
 238 are assumed independent from each other because the ML regression can only fit observed data (LST ASTER) using
 239 a linear combination of independent variables (E and Rg). However, the latter assumption is considered valid only
 240 if the scene has the whole aspect range (between 0 to 360° slope orientation). The ML approach also assumes that
 241 each pixel of the scene has the same behavior in term of illumination and elevation. In other words, the ML approach
 242 represents identically the topographic effects on both soil and vegetation components.

243 3.3. Topographic normalization based on the slope of dry edges

244 Originally proposed by [Goward et al. \(1985\)](#), the space-based approach, also known as the triangle/trapezoidal
245 method, uses the contextual information contained in remotely sensed LST and a vegetation index to estimate evap-
246 otranspiration. This method was subsequently utilized to monitor soil water content ([Sandholt et al., 2002](#); [Merlin
et al., 2008](#); [Kim and Hogue, 2012](#); [Sobrino et al., 2012](#)), surface resistance ([Nemani and Running, 1989](#)), land use
248 and land cover change ([Julien and Sobrino, 2009](#)) and drought ([Wan et al., 2004](#)). Recently, [Merlin \(2013\)](#) combined
249 the LST-albedo space and the LST-NDVI spaces, by taking advantage of the complementarity of NDVI and albedo
250 data for evapotranspiration estimation. ([Merlin, 2013](#)).

251 Following this study, both LST-E and LST-Rg spaces provide complementary information on the spatial variation
252 of LST in mountainous areas. The space-based approach thus potentially offers an interesting alternative method to
253 correct LST for topographic effects. In space-based methods, usually implemented over flat areas, the lower edge
254 corresponds to mostly wet pixels, while the upper edge is associated with dry pixels. In mountainous areas, it is
255 often observed that vegetation occupies specific locations, such as the valley bottom and/or the lowest elevations.
256 The Imlil valley includes contrasted conditions between the irrigated crops at the relatively flat valley bottom, and
257 the surrounding dry bare soil slopes. Therefore, it is expected that vegetated areas do not cover a large range of
258 illumination and elevation conditions. For this reason, the third proposed topographic correction model is based on
259 the dry edge (upper limit) of the LST-E and LST-Rg spaces (Fig. 5). In the same way as for the EB and ML method,
260 the correction model is written as:

$$T_{corr,DE} = T_{ASTER} - (T_{DE} - \langle T_{DE} \rangle) \quad (14)$$

with $T_{corr,DE}$ being the ASTER LST corrected for topographic effects based on the slope of dry edges (DE), and T_{DE}
the LST simulated by the DE approach using T_{ASTER} , DEM-derived E and DART-simulated Rg :

$$T_{DE} = \langle T_{ASTER} \rangle + B_E(E - \langle E \rangle) + B_{Rg}(Rg - \langle Rg \rangle) \quad (15)$$

261 with B_E being the slope of the DE in the LST-E space, and B_{Rg} the slope of the DE in the LST-Rg space. B_E and B_{Rg}
262 are computed for each image separately.

263 The approach proposed by [Menenti et al. \(1989\)](#) is used to determine the slope of the DE in the LST-E space. It is
264 computed as the slope of the linear regression of the maximum LST determined for each E class and by excluding the
265 E values below a threshold which does not take into account the LST variation due to the Rg effects. The threshold
266 of E is constrained as the maximum LST simulated by the third order polynomial, estimated by using the maximum
267 LST value of each E class (Fig. 5). Similarly, the slope of the DE in the LST-Rg space is computed as the slope of the
268 linear regression of the maximum LST determined for each Rg class and by excluding Rg above a threshold which
269 does not take into account the LST variation due to elevation effects (Fig. 5). The threshold of Rg is constrained as
270 the maximum LST simulated by the third order polynomial, estimated by using the maximum LST value of each Rg
271 class. Note that the number of class is estimated as 1% of the number of pixels.

272 4. Results and discussion

273 The three (EB, ML and DE) correction approaches are applied to ASTER LST data. As a first assessment of
274 the performance of correction methods, the LST simulated by each model is compared to the ASTER LST and to
275 the 1-cm depth soil temperature measurements. Then, the LST corrected by the EB method is qualitatively and
276 quantitatively evaluated by visual inspection of the corrected images, statistical analyses of the spatial correlation
277 between (uncorrected and corrected) LST and topography indicators, and the physical interpretation of the LST-fv
278 feature space before and after correction .

279 4.1. Intercomparison and validation of LST models

280 4.1.1. Comparison between modeled and ASTER LST

281 The model-derived LST from the three methods are compared to the remotely sensed ASTER LST. The objective
282 of this comparison is to examine the potential of EB method, compare to both ML and DE methods, to simulate LST




Figure 5: Example of the DE estimation (red lines) in a) LST-Rg space and b) LST-E space for September 5th, 2014. Blue points correspond to the maximum temperature of each class. Red dashed curves are the 3rd order polynomial curves of the maximum temperatures of each class. Red diamonds are the maximum temperatures of the 3rd order polynomials that correspond to the thresholds for estimating DE

283 in a range of surface and topographic conditions by using pixel scale E and Rg. As LST is greatly controlled by
 284 topography effects over the study area, a high R value and a low RMSD value would indicate satisfactory results.

285 Fig. 6 plots simulated LST versus ASTER LST and Table 1 lists the correlation coefficient (R), bias, slope of
 286 linear regression (S) and RMSD between model-derived and ASTER LST for each of the three ASTER overpass
 287 dates separately. All biases are equal to zero due to the calibration procedure of the correction models using ASTER
 288 LST observations. Regarding the ML regression approach, Fig. 6 a,d,g and Table 1 shows satisfying results with an
 289 R of 0.76 and a RMSD of about 3.6°C. The statistical regularity obtained between the three dates reflects a certain
 290 robustness of the ML regression technique. Its performance can be explained by the relatively simple context of the
 291 study area including mostly wet vegetation at the valley bottom and mostly dry bare soil everywhere else. A poorer
 292 efficiency of the ML regression method would be expected in more heterogeneous conditions including the presence
 293 of vegetation on the slopes. Regarding the DE approach, Fig. 6 b,e,h indicate significant underestimation of LST
 294 estimates in the lower range of ASTER LST values and an overestimation in the higher range. Although the slope
 295 between model-derived LST and ASTER LST is generally close to 1, the RMSD (5.8°C) is significantly larger than
 296 for the ML case (see statistical results in Table 1) due to an overestimation of topographic effects by the DE correction
 297 method. In fact, the DE approach assumes that all pixels have the same sensitivity to topography as dry bare soil,
 298 although dry bare soil is much more affected by Rg than wet bare soil or vegetated surfaces. This is the reason why
 299 the LST simulated by the DE approach covers a larger range of values than ASTER LST (see Fig. 6). In fact, the
 300 main issue with this approach is the non representation of other conditions than dry bare soil, thus the need for taking
 301 into account the different behaviors of soil and vegetation components.

302 The statistics presented in Table 1 and the scatterplots in Fig. 6 c,f,i indicate that the dual-source EB model
 303 performs relatively better than the simpler ML and DE methods. The mean R and RMSD between model-derived
 304 and ASTER LST is 0.82 and 3°C, respectively. The consistency of the results obtained between the three dates
 305 reveals the robustness of the EB equations, as for the ML method. Moreover, the EB approach is able to retrieve
 306 a physically consistent temperature lapse rate based on ASTER and simulated LST (Table 2). The LR obtained
 307 through the minimization of the cost function in eq. 10, is close to the values found in the literature. Under standard
 308 atmospheric conditions the mean atmospheric LR is -6.4°C.km⁻¹ (Glickman and Zenk, 2000). However it is affected
 309 by the moisture content of air: in dry condition, a LR of -10°C.km⁻¹ is often used to calculate temperature changes
 310 (Glickman and Zenk, 2000) while in wet condition, the LR is close -5°C.km⁻¹ in a saturated air. Regarding the
 311 values obtained here (Table 2), the 5th September image has a LR of -8.9°C.km⁻¹ near the LR in dry condition found
 312 in literature. This result is consistent with the fact that this date has the drier air condition (air humidity of 17%).
 313 Likewise, the image with the higher air humidity (30th of April) has the lower LR estimated as -5.3°C.km⁻¹.

314 Regarding the dryness index of the surface soil (Table 2, f_{ss}) estimated by inversion of the soil EB, results
 315 illustrate a relatively dry soil (f_{ss} larger than 0.5) for the three dates as expected given the semi-arid climate of the

316 area . For example the retrieved f_{ss} is 0.95 on the 14th April. Regarding the inverted vegetation water stress index
 317 (Table 2, f_{sv}), dryness indices are generally close to 1. For example, the retrieved f_{sv} is equal to 0.85 on the 30th
 318 April. Although the vegetation in the stream valley is expected to be well-watered (i.e. not undergoing water stress)
 319 such results can be explained by the presence of sparse vegetation over the whole area. Such (potentially stressed)
 320 vegetation has a strong impact on the f_{sv} inversion.

321 When analyzing the results obtained for each model, the EB approach gives generally the best statistical results
 322 in terms of R and RMSD between simulated and ASTER LST. In particular, the EB model is able to reproduce the
 323 spatial patterns of the LST estimated from ASTER with an R of 0.85 on the 5th of September. The soil/vegetation
 324 partitioning and the physical representation of the nonlinear relationship between LST and Rg (as expressed by the
 325 net radiation of EB equations) both explain the superiority of the EB approach. (Table 1).

Table 1: Statistical results of the spatial comparison between simulated and ASTER LST for each model and each ASTER overpass date separately. The correlation coefficient (R), bias, slope of linear regression (S) and root mean square difference (RMSD) are listed. LR , f_{ss} and f_{sv} are the environmental lapse rate, dryness index and vegetation water stress index, respectively.

date		ML	DE	EB
14/04/2014	R (-)	0.74	0.52	0.79
	bias (°C)	0	0	0
	S (-)	0.85	0.61	0.62
	RMSD (°C)	3.94	5.49	3.14
30/04/2014	R (-)	0.76	0.68	0.82
	bias (°C)	0	0	0
	S (-)	0.73	0.99	0.65
	RMSD (°C)	3.26	5.22	2.79
05/09/2014	R (-)	0.79	0.82	0.85
	bias (°C)	0	0	0
	S (-)	0.77	1.34	0.74
	RMSD (°C)	3.8	5.95	3.18

Table 2: LR , f_{ss} and f_{sv} are the environmental lapse rate, dryness index and vegetation water stress index, respectively.

Date	fss	fsv	LR (°C.km ⁻¹)
14/04/2014	0.95	1	-5.9
30/04/2014	1	0.85	-5.3
05/09/2014	0.93	0.89	-8.9

326 4.1.2. Comparison between modeled LST and in situ soil temperature

327 The performance of the EB model is also assessed by comparing both the ASTER and simulated LST to the
 328 measured surface soil temperature (ibutton sensors). The EB model is implemented at both 8 m and 90 m resolution
 329 using the corresponding DEMs. The 90 m resolution LST is simulated as previously. The 8 m resolution LST is
 330 simulated by running the EB model using the LR, fss and fsv parameters retrieved from 90 m resolution ASTER data.
 331 Comparisons are made by extracting the LST pixels where temperature sensors are located.

332 The error statistics between LST and ground measurement are presented in Table 3 and scatterplots are displayed
 333 at Fig. 7. Note that the 14th April has fewer points due to snow and clouds cover. When comparing the set of results, it
 334 is clear that the model-derived LST and ASTER LST give similar results in terms of both R and RMSD. For example,
 335 regarding the 30th April, the simulated LST compares slightly better with ibutton measurements than with the ASTER
 336 LST. At the same (90 m) resolution, the EB simulation reduces the RMSD between LST and ibutton temperature by
 337 approximately 0.57°C. Regarding the bias, the obtained results are contrasted between the two first dates (bias is about
 338 2.5°C) and the 5th of September (bias is approaching the accuracy limit of the ibutton sensors; this is a limitation of
 339 using low cost temperature sensors). This could be due to the soil thermal inertia capacity since ibutton measurements




Figure 6: Scatterplots of simulated LST versus ASTER LST for the three dates and for the ML (left), DE (middle) and EB (right column) models separately. Red lines represent the slope of linear regression. Dashed lines represent the 1:1 line.

340 are made at a 1 cm depth whereas the simulated LST is the skin surface temperature. For example, the two first dates
 341 (14th and 30th April) have a positive bias, which means that the mean ibutton temperature is about 3°C colder than the
 342 remotely sensed LST. This phenomenon could be explained by the rapid morning heating of the immediate surface
 343 after a cold night. The air temperature before sunrise was 10°C and 8°C for the 14th and 30th of April, respectively.
 344 This characteristic is less noticeable for the 5th of September because on that date, the air temperature is less variable
 345 between day and night . Higher temperatures (22.3°C before sunrise) were indeed recorded during the night before
 346 with a diurnal temperature variation of ~5°C.

347 Fig. 7 plots ASTER and simulated LST versus ibutton measurements and Table 3 lists the R, bias and RMSD
 348 between model-derived and ASTER LST versus ibutton measurements for each of the three ASTER overpass dates
 349 separately. Results indicate that the LST simulated for the warmer pixels are systematically lower than remotely
 350 sensed LST. This could be explained by the static (instantaneous) nature of the EB model, as the LST is simulated at
 351 a specific instant and, thus neglecting the heat storage. By contrast, ASTER provides information about the real state
 352 of the surface skin, which is potentially affected by the heat accumulation over the slopes that have been exposed to
 353 the sun for a period of time prior to the ASTER overpass.

354 The improvement between the LST simulated at 90 m and 8 m resolution are not as great as expected due to the
 355 topography variability around ibutton sensors. Actually, the ibuttons were set up in a topographic environment that
 356 was relatively homogeneous at the 90 m scale, given that the primary objective of the study was to correct topographic
 357 effects at the ASTER resolution. In consequence, the LSTs simulated at 90 m and 8 m resolution compare similarly
 358 with the 1-cm depth soil temperature measurements.

Table 3: Statistics of the comparison between ASTER or simulated LST and the 1-cm depth soil temperature measurements by the ibutton sensors. The correlation coefficient (R), bias, root mean square difference (RMSD) and standard deviation (σ) are listed. (-) means dimensionless unit.

date		ASTER	Model 90 m	Model 8 m
14/04/2014	σ (°C)	7.31	4.20	3.57
	R (-)	0.64	0.75	0.68
	bias (°C)	3.04	1.48	3.41
	RMSD (°C)	6.28	3.41	3.53
30/04/2014	σ (°C)	6.05	4.11	3.90
	R (-)	0.68	0.68	0.70
	bias (°C)	3.38	2.74	2.74
	RMSD (°C)	5.98	5.41	5.32
05/09/2014	σ (°C)	6.22	4.74	5.06
	R (-)	0.67	0.64	0.65
	bias (°C)	0.78	-0.43	-0.91
	RMSD (°C)	5.31	5.19	5.22




Figure 7: Scatterplots of ASTER and simulated LST at 90m resolution versus ibutton measurements for each ASTER overpass date, separately. Red squares are simulated LST and black dots are ASTER LST. Red lines represent the slope of linear regression for simulated LST and black lines represent the slope of linear regression for ASTER LST. Dashed lines represent the 1:1 line.

359 4.2. Assessment of LST topographic correction

360 In order to evaluate the performance of the topographic correction method based on the dual-source EB equations,
 361 the LST data before and after correction are analyzed. The visual inspection of LST images and the interpretation of
 362 the LST-fv feature space before and after correction can help assess the goodness of the correction . If the correction
 363 is efficient, temperature difference between sun and shadow exposed slopes should be reduced. Temperature at high
 364 elevation should also be reduced. Nevertheless, vegetation and soil moisture should be still apparent.

365 Visual comparisons of the images before and after topographic correction shown in Fig. 8 suggest that the topo-
 366 graphic effects are much reduced after correction . The black patches in the images for April 14th and 30th correspond
 367 to snow cover and clouds. The remaining temperature differences after correction for elevation effects are expected to
 368 be small. Indeed, these differences should be related to vegetation and soil moisture conditions only and those condi-
 369 tions are quite homogeneous in the study area apart from some localized spots in the valley. Interestingly enough, the
 370 ridgeline (located at the top left of the scene) is still conspicuous after correction . This under-correction of ridgelines
 371 is probably attributed to a problem with the or ASTER data geo-referencing, as a pixel shift could affect results.
 372 (Nuth and Käab, 2011).

373 In Fig. 8, the sun facing slope on the top left of the scene is still noticeable certainly as a result of the underes-
 374 timation of LST simulated over this area. As mentioned in the previous section, this effect could be due to the soil
 375 thermal inertia capacity, which is not taken into account by the instantaneous EB model.




Figure 8: Images of the LST observed by ASTER before (up) and after (down) correction for topographic effects on the three ASTER overpass dates separately. Black lines represent the elevation contour lines between 1800 and 3600 m with a 200 m increment.

376 According to Reeder (2002), a successful topographic correction should remove or greatly reduce the correlation
 377 between LST and the topographic variables, especially the solar radiation (Zhang and Gao, 2011). As shown in Table
 378 4, strong correlations are found between LST and Rg over rugged terrain before correction . The correlation coeffi-
 379 cients after topographic correction are greatly reduced (from 0.76 to 0.11 for the April 30th, for example) consistent
 380 with the study in Reeder (2002). Negative correlations are obtained on the 14th of April and the 05th of September.
 381 This could be due to the artifact observed over the ridge line, which is particularly visible on those dates (see Fig. 8)
 382 or a coregistration error between DEM and the LST images.

383 As an additional assessment of the correction performance, we compare the LST-fv space patterns before and
 384 after correction. As topographic correction aims at removing the topographic influence by deriving the LST that
 385 would be observed in a flat terrain, the LST-fv feature space after correction should be similar to the LST-fv feature
 386 spaces classically observed in flat conditions. In flat terrain all LST pixels are contained in the polygon defined by the
 387 temperature endmembers corresponding to fully dry and wet conditions for both soil/vegetation components (Fig. 9).
 388 The four temperature endmembers ($T_{s, dry}$, $T_{v, dry}$, $T_{s, wet}$ and $T_{v, wet}$) were simulated by the EB equations using the
 389 average of $E(\langle E \rangle)$ and $Rg(\langle Rg \rangle)$ at the image scale. In practice, the LST-fv space was defined in a two step procedure.
 390 First, the temperature endmembers were estimated from EB equations and were located within the space defined by

Table 4: Correlation coefficient (R) between Rg and LST before and after topographic normalization on the three ASTER overpass dates separately.

	R between Rg and LST		
	14/04/2014	30/04/2014	05/09/2014
before normalization	0.75	0.76	0.67
after normalization	-0.05	0.11	-0.11

391 LST and fv (Long and Singh, 2012; Merlin, 2013). Then, the vertices of the obtained polygons were connected by
 392 straight lines (Moran et al., 1994) to interpolate the dry and wet boundaries over the full range of vegetation cover.
 393 The analysis of the LST-fv space after correction (Fig. 9) exhibits a distribution similar to that typically obtained in
 394 flat region (e.g. Stefan et al. (2015)). Specifically the topographic correction method has removed or greatly reduced
 395 the number of pixels outside the LST-fv space meaning above or below the dry and wet edges. An interesting feature
 396 is that the pixels that remain outside the polygon (above the dry edge) after correction systematically correspond
 397 to pixels located near the ridge lines. Such results are fully consistent with the previous comparison between the
 398 simulated LST and 1 cm depth soil temperature measurements.




Figure 9: The LST-fv feature space is plotted on September the 5th before (a) and after (b) topographic correction .

399 5. Summary and conclusion

400 This paper develops a physically-based method to correct the satellite-derived land surface temperature (LST)
 401 for topography-induced variations of solar radiation and air temperature over mountainous areas. Both topographic
 402 effects on LST are first quantified by inverting a dual-source soil/vegetation energy balance (EB) model forced by 1)
 403 the solar radiation (Rg) simulated by DART model that uses a DEM as input, 2) a satellite-derived vegetation index
 404 fv, and 3) meteorological data available at a given location. The topographic correction model is calibrated in two
 405 main steps using ASTER LST observations. The first step removes any possible bias in modeled LST. The second
 406 step adjusts environmental lapse rate (LR), surface soil dryness index (fss) and vegetation water stress index (fsv)
 407 by minimizing the RMSD between ASTER LST and model-derived LST, for each ASTER overpass date separately.
 408 Once the LST model has been calibrated, it can be applied to any spatial resolution, provided a DEM is available at
 409 the target resolution. Satellite LST is then corrected for topography by subtracting the simulated illumination (DART-
 410 simulated solar radiation) and elevation (LR-derived air temperature) effects. The approach is tested on three ASTER
 411 overpass dates over a 6 km by 6 km area in the Atlas Mountain (Morocco): April 14th, April 30th and September 05th,
 412 2014.

413 For this rugged test site, the mean correlation coefficient and RMSD between EB-simulated and ASTER LST are
 414 estimated as 0.80 and 3°C , respectively. The EB-based approach is more accurate in terms of LST estimates than

415 the multi-linear (ML) regression based on DART solar radiation and elevation data. It is also more accurate than a
416 semi-empirical model built from the dry edge of the LST-illumination and LST-elevation feature spaces. Such results
417 are explained by the fact that the EB model explicitly represents both soil and vegetation components, whose surface
418 fluxes are very differently affected by topography. Moreover, the EB approach is able to physically represent the
419 nonlinearity between LST and Rg via the net radiation component. As a further advantage of the physically-based
420 method, the EB equation can be used to retrieve the LR at the time of ASTER overpass. It is important to note that
421 the obtained LR is close to the values found in the literature, with a LR of $-8.9^{\circ}\text{C}\cdot\text{km}^{-1}$ (5th of September) in dry air
422 condition; while a LR of $-5.3^{\circ}\text{C}\cdot\text{km}^{-1}$ has been estimated for the 30th of April corresponding to the highest observed
423 relative air humidity.

424 The LST simulated by the EB approach is also evaluated against an extensive ground dataset of 135 autonomous
425 1-cm depth temperature sensors deployed over the steep-sided study area. The EB model is applied to both 8 m and
426 90 m resolution DEMs. While the mean RMSD between 90 m resolution ASTER LST and ibutton measurements
427 is 6.1°C , the RMSD between EB LST and localized ibutton measurements is 5.4 and 5.3°C for a DEM at 90 m
428 and 8 m resolution, respectively. Last, the topography-corrected ASTER LST is analyzed both qualitatively and
429 quantitatively. The visual comparison before and after correction suggests that the topography-induced variations of
430 solar radiation and air temperature are a much reduced impact on LST after correction. Especially, the LST spatial
431 distribution is similar to that typically observed over a flat area where the solar radiation reaching the surface can
432 be considered uniform. Moreover, the LST-fv feature space after correction is similar to the LST-fv feature space
433 classically observed in flat conditions. Quantitatively, the strong correlations found between LST and Rg over rugged
434 terrain before correction are greatly reduced after topographic correction (from 0.76 to 0.11 for the April 30th).

435 For the first time, a correction method for topography-induced variations of solar radiation and air temperature has
436 been applied to satellite LST. While LST data are widely used over relatively flat areas, this new approach offers the
437 opportunity for new applications over mountainous areas. such a correction method could potentially be used in con-
438 junction with LST-based evapotranspiration methods over agricultural (Merlin et al., 2010b; Mattar et al., 2014) and
439 complex terrain (Olivera-Guerra et al., 2014), soil moisture disaggregation methods (Merlin et al., 2012; Malbêteau
440 et al., 2016) and forest fire prediction models (Leblon, 2005), among others. Note that the operational utility of the
441 EB correction method over wide areas relies on the availability of ancillary data composed of meteorological forcing.
442 Moreover, Integrating heat storage variation in a dynamic version of the EB model (Danilina et al., 2012) would
443 improve the simulation of LST over the slopes exposed to the sun prior to the satellite overpass. Such developments
444 could be fostered by the future availability of LST data at high spatial and temporal resolution (Wu et al., 2015).

445 Acknowledgements

446 This study was carried out within the frame of the Joint International Laboratory TREMA [http://trema.ucam.
447 ac.ma](http://trema.ucam.ac.ma) and was supported by the MIXMOD-E project (ANR-13-JS06-0003-01) funded by the French agency ANR
448 (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) and the REC project (RISE-2014-645642- REC) funded by the European H2020
449 program. The acquisition of the Pliades images was supported by the CNES through the ISIS program. Mohamed
450 Kasbani, participant of the experiment, is gratefully acknowledged.

451 References

- 452 Abrams, M., 2000. The Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER): Data products for the high spatial resolution
453 imager on NASA's Terra platform. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 21 (5), 847–859.
- 454 Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop evapotranspiration- guidelines fo computing crop water requirements. *FAO Irrigation
455 and Drainage Paper* 56, 1–15.
- 456 Allen, R. G., Tasumi, M., Morse, A., Trezza, R., Wright, J. L., Bastiaanssen, W., Kramber, W., Lorite, I., Robison, C. W., Morse, A., Trezza,
457 R., Wright, J. L., Bastiaanssen, W., Kramber, W., Lorite, I., Robison, C. W., Morse, A., Trezza, R., Wright, J. L., Bastiaanssen, W., Kramber,
458 W., Lorite, I., Robison, C. W., 2007. Satellite-Based Energy Balance for Mapping Evapotranspiration with Internalized Calibration (MET-
459 RIC)Applications. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 133 (4), 395–406.
- 460 Allen, R. G., Trezza, R., Tasumi, M., 2006. Analytical integrated functions for daily solar radiation on slopes. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
461 139 (1-2), 55–73.
- 462 Anderson, M. C., Norman, J. M., Kustas, W., Houborg, R., Starks, P., Agam, N., dec 2008. A thermal-based remote sensing technique for routine
463 mapping of land-surface carbon, water and energy fluxes from field to regional scales. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 112 (12), 4227–4241.

- 464 Bastiaanssen, W., Menenti, M., Feddes, R., Holtslag, A., 1998. A remote sensing surface energy balance algorithm for land (SEBAL). 1. Formula-
465 tion. *Journal of Hydrology* 212-213, 198–212.
- 466 Berthier, E., Vincent, C., Magnússon, E., Gunnlaugsson, Á. ., Pitte, P., Le Meur, E., Masiokas, M., Ruiz, L., Pálsson, F., Belart, J. M. C., Wagnon,
467 P., dec 2014. Glacier topography and elevation changes derived from Pléiades sub-meter stereo images. *The Cryosphere* 8 (6), 2275–2291.
- 468 Bertoldi, G., Notarnicola, C., Leitinger, G., Endrizzi, S., Zebisch, M., Della Chiesa, S., Tappeiner, U., 2010. Topographical and ecohydrological
469 controls on land surface temperature in an alpine catchment. *Ecohydrology* 3, 189–204.
- 470 Boulet, G., Chehbouni, A., Gentine, P., Duchemin, B., Ezzahar, J., Hadria, R., 2007. Monitoring water stress using time series of observed to
471 unstressed surface temperature difference. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 146 (3-4), 159–172.
- 472 Bristow, K. L., jan 1987. On solving the surface energy balance equation for surface temperature. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 39 (1),
473 49–54.
- 474 Brunsell, N. a., Gillies, R. R., dec 2003. Length Scale Analysis of Surface Energy Fluxes Derived from Remote Sensing. *Journal of Hydrometeo-*
475 *rology* 4 (6), 1212–1219.
- 476 Brutsaert, W., oct 1975. On a derivable formula for long-wave radiation from clear skies. *Water Resources Research* 11 (5), 742–744.
- 477 Cammalleri, C., Vogt, J., 2015. On the Role of Land Surface Temperature as Proxy of Soil Moisture Status for Drought Monitoring in Europe.
478 *Remote Sensing* 7 (12), 16849–16864.
- 479 Chehbouni, A., Escadafal, R., Duchemin, B., Boulet, G., Simonneaux, V., Dedieu, G., Mougnot, B., Khabba, S., Kharrou, H., Maisongrande, P.,
480 Merlin, O., Chaponnière, A., Ezzahar, J., ErRaki, S., Hoedjes, J., Hadria, R., Abourida, A., Cheggour, A., Raibi, F., Boudhar, A., Benhadj, I.,
481 Hanich, L., Benkaddour, A., Guemouria, N., Chehbouni, A. H., Lahrouni, A., Olioso, A., Jacob, F., Williams, D. G., Sobrino, J. A., 2008. An
482 integrated modelling and remote sensing approach for hydrological study in arid and semiarid regions: the SUDMED Programme. *International*
483 *Journal of Remote Sensing* 29 (17-18), 5161–5181.
- 484 Choudhury, B., Reginato, R., Idso, S., may 1986. An analysis of infrared temperature observations over wheat and calculation of latent heat flux.
485 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 37 (1), 75–88.
- 486 Claverie, M., Vermote, E. F., Franch, B., Masek, J. G., 2015. Evaluation of the Landsat-5 TM and Landsat-7 ETM+ surface reflectance products.
487 *Remote Sensing of Environment* 169, 390–403.
- 488 Coret, L., Briottet, X., Kerr, Y., Chehbouni, A., 2004. Simulation Study of View Angle Effects on Thermal Infrared Measurements Over Heteroge-
489 neous Surfaces. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 42 (3), 664–672.
- 490 Danilina, I., Gillespie, A. R., Balick, L., Mushkin, A., Smith, M., Blumberg, D., 2013. Compensation for subpixel roughness effects in thermal
491 infrared images. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 34 (9-10), 3425–3436.
- 492 Danilina, I., Gillespie, A. R., Balick, L. K., Mushkin, A., O’Neal, M. A., 2012. Performance of a thermal-infrared radiosity and heat-diffusion
493 model for estimating sub-pixel radiant temperatures over the course of a day. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 124, 492–501.
- 494 Dozier, J., 1980. A Clear-Sky Spectral Solar Radiation Model. *Water Resources Research* 16 (4), 709–718.
- 495 Dozier, J., Outcalt, S. I., 1979. An Approach toward Energy Balance Simulation over Rugged Terrain. *Geographical Analysis* 11 (1), 65–85.
- 496 Dubayah, R., sep 1992. Estimating net solar radiation using Landsat Thematic Mapper and digital elevation data. *Water Resources Research* 28 (9),
497 2469–2484.
- 498 Dubayah, R. C., 1994. Modeling a solar radiation topoeclimatology for the Rio Grande River Basin. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 5 (5), 627–640.
- 499 Eckmann, T. C., Roberts, D. A., Still, C. J., 2008. Using multiple endmember spectral mixture analysis to retrieve subpixel fire properties from
500 MODIS. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 112 (10), 3773–3783.
- 501 Endrizzi, S., Gruber, S., Amico, M. D., Rigon, R., 2013. GEOtop 2 . 0 : simulating the combined energy and water balance at and below the land
502 surface accounting for soil freezing , snow cover and terrain e f f e c t s . *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss. (ii)*, 6279–6341.
- 503 Essery, R., Marks, D., 2007. Scaling and parametrization of clear-sky solar radiation over complex topography. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
504 *Atmospheres* 112 (10), 1–12.
- 505 Garen, D. C., Marks, D., 2005. Spatially distributed energy balance snowmelt modelling in a mountainous river basin: Estimation of meteorological
506 inputs and verification of model results. *Journal of Hydrology* 315, 126–153.
- 507 Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., 2008. 3D modeling of satellite spectral images, radiation budget and energy budget of urban landscapes. *Meteorology*
508 *and Atmospheric Physics* 102 (3-4), 187–207.
- 509 Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., Demarez, V., Pinel, V., Zagolski, F., 1996. Modeling radiative transfer in heterogeneous 3-D vegetation canopies. *Remote*
510 *Sensing of Environment* 58 (November 1995), 131–156.
- 511 Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., Martin, E., Gascon, F., jan 2004. DART: a 3D model for simulating satellite images and studying surface radiation
512 budget. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 25 (1), 73–96.
- 513 Gillespie, A., Rokugawa, S., Matsunaga, T., Steven Cothern, J., Hook, S., Kahle, A. B., 1998. A temperature and emissivity separation algorithm
514 for advanced spaceborne thermal emission and reflection radiometer (ASTER) images. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*
515 36 (4), 1113–1126.
- 516 Glickman, T. S., Zenk, W., 2000. *Glossary of Meteorology* (2nd ed.). American Meteorological Society, Boston.
- 517 Goward, S. N., Cruickshanks, G. D., Hope, A. S., 1985. Observed relation between thermal emission and reflected spectral radiance of a complex
518 vegetated landscape. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 18 (2), 137–146.
- 519 Guillevic, P., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.-P., Demarty, J., Prévot, L., 2003. Thermal infrared radiative transfer within three-dimensional vegetation
520 covers. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 108 (D8), 4248.
- 521 Gutman, G., Ignatov, A., 1998. The derivation of the green vegetation fraction from NOAA/AVHRR data for use in numerical weather prediction
522 models. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 19 (8), 1533–1543.
- 523 Hais, M., Kučera, T., nov 2009. The influence of topography on the forest surface temperature retrieved from Landsat TM, ETM + and ASTER
524 thermal channels. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 64 (6), 585–591.
- 525 Hall, F. G., Huemmrich, K. F., Goetz, S. J., Sellers, P. J., Nickeson, J. E., 1992. Satellite remote sensing of surface energy balance: Success, failures,
526 and unresolved issues in FIFE. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 97 (D17), 19061–19089.
- 527 Hansen, J., Ruedy, R., Sato, M., Lo, K., 2010. Global surface temperature change. *Rev. Geophys.* 48 (4), RG4004.
- 528 Herrero, J., Polo, M. J., 2012. Parameterization of atmospheric longwave emissivity in a mountainous site for all sky conditions. *Hydrology and*

529 Earth System Sciences 16 (9), 3139–3147.

530 Hubbart, J., Link, T., Campbell, C., Cobos, D., 2005. Evaluation of a low-cost temperature measurement system for environmental applications.

531 Hydrological Processes 19 (7), 1517–1523.

532 Iziomon, M. G., Mayer, H., Matzarakis, A., 2003. Downward atmospheric longwave irradiance under clear and cloudy skies: Measurement and

533 parameterization. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics 65 (10), 1107–1116.

534 Jarlan, L., Khabba, S., Er-Raki, S., Le Page, M., Hanich, L., Fakir, Y., Merlin, O., Mangiarotti, S., Gascoin, S., Ezzahar, J., Kharrou, M., Berjamy,

535 B., Saaïdi, A., Boudhar, A., Benkaddour, A., Laftouhi, N., Abaoui, J., Tavernier, A., Boulet, G., Simonneaux, V., Driouech, F., El Adnani, M.,

536 El Fazziki, A., Amenou, N., Raïbi, F., El Mandour, A., Ibouh, H., Le Dantec, V., Habets, F., Trambly, Y., Mougénot, B., Leblanc, M., El Faïz,

537 M., Drapeau, L., Coudert, B., Hagolle, O., Filali, N., Belaqqiz, S., Marchane, A., Szczypta, C., Toumi, J., Diarra, A., Aouade, G., Hajhouji,

538 Y., Nassah, H., Bigeard, G., Chirouze, J., Boukhari, K., Abourida, A., Richard, B., Fanise, P., Kasbani, M., Chakir, A., Zribi, M., Marah, H.,

539 Naimi, A., Mokssit, A., Kerr, Y., Escadafal, R., oct 2015. Remote Sensing of Water Resources in Semi-Arid Mediterranean Areas: the joint

540 international laboratory TREMA. International Journal of Remote Sensing 36 (19-20), 4879–4917.

541 Julien, Y., Sobrino, J. a., feb 2009. The Yearly Land Cover Dynamics (YLCD) method: An analysis of global vegetation from NDVI and LST

542 parameters. Remote Sensing of Environment 113 (2), 329–334.

543 Karnieli, A., Agam, N., Pinker, R. T., Anderson, M., Imhoff, M. L., Gutman, G. G., Panov, N., Goldberg, A., feb 2010. Use of NDVI and Land

544 Surface Temperature for Drought Assessment: Merits and Limitations. Journal of Climate 23 (3), 618–633.

545 Kim, J., Hogue, T. S., feb 2012. Improving Spatial Soil Moisture Representation Through Integration of AMSR-E and MODIS Products. IEEE

546 Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing 50 (2), 446–460.

547 Kogan, F. N., 2001. Operational space technology for global vegetation assessment. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 82 (9),

548 1949–1964.

549 Kustas, W., Anderson, M., dec 2009. Advances in thermal infrared remote sensing for land surface modeling. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology

550 149 (12), 2071–2081.

551 Kustas, W. P., Daughtry, C. S., feb 1990. Estimation of the soil heat flux/net radiation ratio from spectral data. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology

552 49 (3), 205–223.

553 Kustas, W. P., Rango, A., Uijlenhoet, R., 1994. A simple energy budget algorithm for the snowmelt runoff model. Water Resources Research 30 (5),

554 1515–1527.

555 Lagouarde, J. P., Kerr, Y. H., Brunet, Y., 1995. An experimental study of angular effects on surface temperature for various plant canopies and bare

556 soils. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 77 (3-4), 167–190.

557 Leblon, B., 2005. Monitoring forest fire danger with remote sensing. Natural Hazards 35 (3), 343–359.

558 Li, F., Jackson, T. J., Kustas, P., Schmugge, T. J., French, A. N., Cosh, H., Bindlish, R., 2004. Deriving land surface temperature from Landsat 5

559 and 7 during Smacex/Smex. Remote Sensing of Environment 92 (4), 521 – 534.

560 Liu, Y., Hiyama, T., Yamaguchi, Y., nov 2006. Scaling of land surface temperature using satellite data: A case examination on ASTER and MODIS

561 products over a heterogeneous terrain area. Remote Sensing of Environment 105 (2), 115–128.

562 Liu, Y., Noumi, Y., Yamaguchi, Y., 2009. Discrepancy between ASTER- and MODIS- derived land surface temperatures: Terrain effects. Sensors

563 9 (2), 1054–1066.

564 Long, D., Singh, V. P., jun 2012. A Two-source Trapezoid Model for Evapotranspiration (TTME) from satellite imagery. Remote Sensing of

565 Environment 121, 370–388.

566 Malbêteau, Y., Merlin, O., Molero, B., Rüdiger, C., Bacon, S., mar 2016. DisPATCH as a tool to evaluate coarse-scale remotely sensed soil moisture

567 using localized in situ measurements: Application to SMOS and AMSR-E data in Southeastern Australia. International Journal of Applied Earth

568 Observation and Geoinformation 45, 221–234.

569 Marti, R., Gascoin, S., Houet, T., Laffly, D., René, P., 2014. Evaluation du modèle numérique d'élévation d'une petit glacier de montagne généré à

570 partir d'images stéréoscopiques Pléiades. cas du glacier d'Ossoue, Pyrénées françaises. Revue Française de Photogrammétrie et de Télédétection

571 208, 57–62.

572 Mattar, C., Franch, B., Sobrino, J. a., Corbari, C., Jiménez-Muñoz, J. C., Olivera-Guerra, L., Skokovic, D., Sória, G., Oltra-Carrìo, R., Julien, Y.,

573 Mancini, M., 2014. Impacts of the broadband albedo on actual evapotranspiration estimated by S-SEBI model over an agricultural area. Remote

574 Sensing of Environment 147, 23–42.

575 Menenti, M., Bastiaanssen, W., van Eick, D., Abd el Karim, M., jan 1989. Linear relationships between surface reflectance and temperature and

576 their application to map actual evaporation of groundwater. Advances in Space Research 9 (1), 165–176.

577 Merlin, O., 2013. An original interpretation of the wet edge of the surface temperaturealbedo space to estimate crop evapotranspiration (SEB-1S),

578 and its validation over an irrigated area in northwestern Mexico. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 17 (9), 3623–3637.

579 Merlin, O., Al Bitar, A., Walker, J. P., Kerr, Y., oct 2010a. An improved algorithm for disaggregating microwave-derived soil moisture based on

580 red, near-infrared and thermal-infrared data. Remote Sensing of Environment 114 (10), 2305–2316.

581 Merlin, O., Chehbouni, A., jan 2004. Different approaches in estimating heat flux using dual angle observations of radiative surface temperature.

582 International Journal of Remote Sensing 25 (1), 275–289.

583 Merlin, O., Chehbouni, A., Kerr, Y., Njoku, E., Entekhabi, D., sep 2005. A combined modeling and multispectral/multiresolution remote sensing

584 approach for disaggregation of surface soil moisture: application to SMOS configuration. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing

585 43 (9), 2036–2050.

586 Merlin, O., Duchemin, B., Hagolle, O., Jacob, F., Coudert, B., Chehbouni, G., Dedieu, G., Garatuza, J., Kerr, Y., nov 2010b. Disaggregation of

587 MODIS surface temperature over an agricultural area using a time series of Formosat-2 images. Remote Sensing of Environment 114 (11),

588 2500–2512.

589 Merlin, O., Rudiger, C., Al Bitar, A., Richaume, P., Walker, J. P., Kerr, Y. H., may 2012. Disaggregation of SMOS Soil Moisture in Southeastern

590 Australia. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing 50 (5), 1556–1571.

591 Merlin, O., Walker, J., Chehbouni, A., Kerr, Y., oct 2008. Towards deterministic downscaling of SMOS soil moisture using MODIS derived soil

592 evaporative efficiency. Remote Sensing of Environment 112 (10), 3935–3946.

593 Meybeck, M., Green, P., Vörösmarty, C., 2001. A New Typology for Mountains and Other Relief Classes. Mountain Research and Development

21 (1), 34–45.

595 Meyer, D., 2011. ASTER Global Digital Elevation Model Version 2 Summary of Validation Results. Japan Space Systems, 7.

596 Minnis, P., Khaiyer, M. M., 2000. Anisotropy of Land Surface Skin Temperature Derived from Satellite Data. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 39 (7), 1117–1129.

597

598 Moran, M. S., Clarke, T. R., Inoue, Y., Vidal, A., 1994. Estimating crop water deficit using the relation between surface-air temperature and spectral
599 vegetation index.

600 Nemani, R. R., Running, S. W., 1989. Estimation of regional surface resistance to evapotranspiration from NDVI and thermal-IR AVHRR data.
601 [Normalized Difference Vegetation Index. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 28, 276–284.

602 Norman, J. M., Divakarla, M., Goel, N. S., 1995. Algorithms for extracting information from remote thermal-IR observations of the earth's surface.
603 *Remote Sensing of Environment* 51 (1), 157–168.

604 Nuth, C., Kääb, 2011. Co-registration and bias corrections of satellite elevation data sets for quantifying glacier thickness change. *Cryosphere* 5 (1),
605 271–290.

606 Olivera-Guerra, L., Mattar, C., Galleguillos, M., 2014. Estimation of real evapotranspiration and its variation in Mediterranean landscapes of
607 central-southern Chile. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 28 (1), 160–169.

608 Peres, L. F., DaCamara, C. C., 2004. Land surface temperature and emissivity estimation based on the two-temperature method : sensitivity analysis
609 using simulated MSG / SEVIRI data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 91 (3-4), 377–389.

610 Prata, A. J., Caselles, V., Coll, C., Sobrino, J. A., Otle, C., 1995. Thermal remote sensing of land surface temperature from satellites: Current
611 status and future prospects. *Remote Sensing Reviews* 12 (3-4), 175–224.

612 Proy, C., Tanre, D., Deschamps, P., 1989. Evaluation of topographic effects in remotely sensed data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 30 (1), 21–32.

613 Rasmussen, M. O., Pinheiro, A. C., Proud, S. R., Sandholt, I., 2010. Modeling angular dependences in land surface temperatures from the SEVIRI
614 instrument onboard the geostationary meteosat second generation satellites. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 48 (8),
615 3123–3133.

616 Raz-Yaseef, N., Rotenberg, E., Yakir, D., 2010. Effects of spatial variations in soil evaporation caused by tree shading on water flux partitioning in
617 a semi-arid pine forest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 150 (3), 454–462.

618 Reeder, D. H., 2002. Topographic Correction of Satellite Images: Theory and Application.

619 Rigon, R., Bertoldi, G., Over, T. M., 2006. GEOTop: A Distributed Hydrological Model with Coupled Water and Energy Budgets. *Journal of*
620 *Hydrometeorology* 7 (3), 371–388.

621 Rubio, E., Caselles, V., Coll, C., Valour, E., Sospedra, F., jan 2003. Thermalinfrared emissivities of natural surfaces: improvements on the experi-
622 mental set-up and new measurements. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 24 (24), 5379–5390.

623 Sandholt, I., Rasmussen, K., Andersen, J., feb 2002. A simple interpretation of the surface temperature/vegetation index space for assessment of
624 surface moisture status. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 79 (2-3), 213–224.

625 Schmetz, J., Pili, P., Tjemkes, S., Just, D., Kerkmann, J., Rota, S., Ratier, A., 2002. Supplement to an introduction to Meteosat Second Generation
626 (MSG) SEVIRI calibration. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 83 (7), 992.

627 Sepulcre-Cantó, G., Zarco-Tejada, P. J., Sobrino, J. a., Berni, J. a. J., Jiménez-Muñoz, J. C., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., 2009. Discriminating
628 irrigated and rainfed olive orchards with thermal ASTER imagery and DART 3D simulation. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 149 (6-7),
629 962–975.

630 Shreve, F., apr 1924. Soil Temperature as Influenced by Altitude and Slope Exposure. *Ecology* 5 (2), 128–136.

631 Sobrino, J., Franch, B., Mattar, C., Jiménez-Muñoz, J., Corbari, C., 2012. A method to estimate soil moisture from Airborne Hyperspectral Scanner
632 (AHS) and ASTER data: Application to SEN2FLEX and SEN3EXP campaigns. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 117, 415–428.

633 Sobrino, J. A., Cuenca, J., 1999. Angular variation of thermal infrared emissivity for some natural surfaces from experimental measurements. *Appl.*
634 *Opt.* 38 (18), 3931–3936.

635 Sobrino, J. a., Mattar, C., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., Jiménez-Muñoz, J. C., Grau, E., nov 2011. Evaluation of the DART 3D model in the thermal
636 domain using satellite/airborne imagery and ground-based measurements. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 32 (22), 7453–7477.

637 Stefan, V., Merlin, O., Er-Raki, S., Escorihuela, M.-j., Khabba, S., aug 2015. Consistency between In Situ, Model-Derived and High-Resolution-
638 Image-Based Soil Temperature Endmembers: Towards a Robust Data-Based Model for Multi-Resolution Monitoring of Crop Evapotranspira-
639 tion. *Remote Sensing* 7 (8), 10444–10479.

640 Susong, D., Marks, D., Garen, D., 1999. Methods for developing time-series climate surfaces to drive topographically distributed energy- and
641 water-balance models. *Hydrological Processes* 13 (May 1998), 2003–2021.

642 Voogt, J., Oke, T., 2003. Thermal remote sensing of urban climates. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 86 (3), 370–384.

643 Wan, Z., 2008. New refinements and validation of the MODIS Land-Surface Temperature / Emissivity products. *Remote sensing of Environment*
644 112 (1), 59–74.

645 Wan, Z., Wang, P., Li, X., jan 2004. Using MODIS Land Surface Temperature and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index products for monitoring
646 drought in the southern Great Plains, USA. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 25 (1), 61–72.

647 Widlowski, J.-L., Robustelli, M., Disney, M., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.-P., Lavergne, T., Lewis, P., North, P., Pinty, B., Thompson, R., Verstraete, M.,
648 mar 2008. The RAMI On-line Model Checker (ROMC): A web-based benchmarking facility for canopy reflectance models. *Remote Sensing of*
649 *Environment* 112 (3), 1144–1150.

650 Widlowski, J. L., Taberner, M., Pinty, B., Bruniquel-Pinel, V., Disney, M., Fernandes, R., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J. P., Gobron, N., Kuusk, A.,
651 Lavergne, T., Leblanc, S., Lewis, P. E., Martin, E., Mottus, M., North, P. R. J., Qin, W., Robustelli, M., Rochdi, N., Ruiloba, R., Soler, C.,
652 Thompson, R., Verhoef, W., Verstraete, M. M., Xie, D., 2007. Third Radiation Transfer Model Intercomparison (RAMI) exercise: Documenting
653 progress in canopy reflectance models. *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres* 112 (9), 1–28.

654 Wu, P., Shen, H., Zhang, L., Göttsche, F.-M., 2015. Integrated fusion of multi-scale polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite observations for the
655 mapping of high spatial and temporal resolution land surface temperature. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 156, 169–181.

656 Yang, K., Koike, T., Ishikawa, H., Kim, J., Li, X., Liu, H., Liu, S., Ma, Y., Wang, J., jan 2008. Turbulent Flux Transfer over Bare-Soil Surfaces:
657 Characteristics and Parameterization. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* 47 (1), 276–290.

658 Zhang, R., Tian, J., Su, H., Sun, X., Chen, S., Xia, J., oct 2008. Two Improvements of an Operational Two-Layer Model for Terrestrial Surface

659 Heat Flux Retrieval. Sensors 8 (10), 6165–6187.
660 Zhang, W., Gao, Y., 2011. Topographic correction algorithm for remotely sensed data accounting for indirect irradiance. International Journal of
661 Remote Sensing 32 (7), 1807–1824.

662 **List of Figures**

663	1	On the left, location of the Rheraya catchment, the Imlil subcatchment, and the study area. On the right, a 8 m resolution 3D DEM over the study area indicating the sun-facing (red) and shaded (blue) slopes at 11:30 am local time (GMT).	9
664			
665	2	Locations of the 45 ibutton plates, each of them containing 3 ibutton sensors. Red cross indicate plates not used for the study.	14
666			
667	3	DART simulated irradiance over $[0.4\mu\text{m}- 1.1\mu\text{m}]$ of the whole study area (white square in Fig. 1), with 8m resolution DEM at 11:22 am (UTC) on September 5, 2014. Black lines represent the elevation contour lines between 1800 and 3600 m with a 200 m increment.	16
668			
669	4	Schematic diagram presenting an overview of the topographic correction approach based on EB equations. The EB model (originally designed for solving mix-pixel problem in lowlands) is adapted to mountainous environment, and changes are highlighted by red boxes and underlined variables.	22
670			
671	5	Example of the DE estimation (red lines) in a) LST-Rg space and b) LST-E space for September 5 th , 2014. Blue points correspond to the maximum temperature of each class. Red dashed curves are the 3 rd order polynomial curves of the maximum temperatures of each class. Red diamonds are the maximum temperatures of the 3 rd order polynomials that correspond to the thresholds for estimating DE	25
672			
673	6	Scatterplots of simulated LST versus ASTER LST for the three dates and for the ML (left), DE (middle) and EB (right column) models separately. Red lines represent the slope of linear regression. Dashed lines represent the 1:1 line.	30
674			
675	7	Scatterplots of ASTER and simulated LST at 90m resolution versus ibutton measurements for each ASTER overpass date, separately. Red squares are simulated LST and black dots are ASTER LST. Red lines represent the slope of linear regression for simulated LST and black lines represent the slope of linear regression for ASTER LST. Dashed lines represent the 1:1 line.	35
676			
677	8	Images of the LST observed by ASTER before (up) and after (down) correction for topographic effects on the three ASTER overpass dates separately. Black lines represent the elevation contour lines between 1800 and 3600 m with a 200 m increment.	36
678			
679	9	The LST-fv feature space is plotted on September the 5th before (a) and after (b) topographic correction	39
680			
681			
682			
683			
684			
685			
686			
687			
688			
689			
690			

691 Appendix

692 **Dry bare soil EB equation:**

693 In eq. 6, the dry soil (s_{dry}) net radiation is

Generally, net radiation is expressed as:

$$Rn = K \downarrow - K \uparrow + L \downarrow - L \uparrow \quad (A.1)$$

694 where $K \downarrow$ being the surface downward shortwave radiative flux, $K \uparrow$ the surface upward shortwave flux, $L \downarrow$ the
695 downward longwave flux and $L \uparrow$ the upward longwave flux. $K \uparrow$ is defined as the fraction of $K \downarrow$ at the surface that
696 is reflected (albedo: α). $L \downarrow$ is results from whole atmosphere and clouds irradiance absorbed by the surface (εR_a).
697 $L \uparrow$ is defined by the surface temperature from Stephan-Boltzmann law ($\varepsilon \sigma T^4$). Generally, Rn is calculated as:

$$Rn = (1 - \alpha)Rg + \varepsilon R_a - \varepsilon \sigma T^4 \quad (A.2)$$

698 with α (-, dimensionless) being the albedo, ε (-) the emissivity, R_a (W.m^{-2}) the downward atmospheric radiation, and
699 σ ($\text{W.m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-4}$) the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

Then, $Rn_{s,dry}$ can be expressed as:

$$Rn_{s,dry} = (1 - \alpha_s)Rg + \varepsilon_s R_a - \varepsilon_s \sigma T_{s,dry}^4 \quad (A.3)$$

700 with α_s (-, dimensionless) being the soil albedo and ε_s (-) the soil emissivity. The ground heat is commonly set to
701 a fraction of soil net radiation:

$$Gd = C_G \times Rn_{s,dry} \quad (A.4)$$

with C_G (-) being set to 0.32 (Kustas and Daughtry, 1990). The dry soil sensible heat in eq. 6 is expressed as:

$$H_{s,dry} = \rho C_p \frac{T_{s,dry} - Ta}{rah_{s,dry}} \quad (A.5)$$

702 with ρ (Kg m^{-3}) being the air density, C_p ($\text{J Kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$) the air specific heat, Ta the air temperature (eq. 10) and
703 $rah_{s,dry}$ (s.m^{-1}) the aerodynamic resistance over dry bare soil.

704

Wet bare soil EB equation:

In eq. 7, the wet soil (s_{wet}) net radiation is

$$Rn_{s,wet} = (1 - \alpha_s)Rg + \varepsilon_s R_a - \varepsilon_s \sigma T_{s,wet}^4 \quad (A.6)$$

with the ground heat expressed as:

$$Gw = C_G \times Rn_{s,wet} \quad (A.7)$$

The wet soil sensible heat in eq. 7 is expressed as:

$$H_{s,wet} = \rho C_p \frac{T_{s,wet} - Ta}{rah_{s,wet}} \quad (A.8)$$

with $rah_{s,wet}$ (s.m^{-1}) being the aerodynamic resistance over wet bare soil. In eq. 7, $LE_{s,wet}$ (W.m^{-2}) the wet soil latent
heat is expressed as:

$$LE_{s,wet} = \frac{\rho C_p}{\gamma} \frac{e_{sat}(T_{s,wet}) - (e_{sat}(Ta) \times \frac{Ha}{100})}{rah_{s,wet} + r_{v,min}} \quad (A.9)$$

705 with γ the psychrometric constant (Pa.K^{-1}) that relates the partial pressure of water in air to the air temperature,
706 $e_{sat}(Ta)$ (Pa) the saturated vapor pressure at air temperature, $e_{sat}(T_{s,wet})$ (Pa) the saturated vapor pressure at wet soil
707 temperature, Ha (%) the air relative humidity (set to 25 s.m^{-1} (Moran et al., 1994)).

708

709 **Stressed vegetation EB equation:**

710 In eq. 8, the stressed vegetation (v_{dry}) net radiation is:

$$Rn_{v,dry} = (1 - \alpha_v)Rg + \varepsilon_v R_a - \varepsilon_v \sigma T_{v,dry}^4 \quad (\text{A.10})$$

711 with α_v (-) being the vegetation albedo, and ε_v (-) the vegetation emissivity. The vegetation sensible heat in eq. 8 is
712 expressed as:

$$H_{v,dry} = \rho C p \frac{T_{v,dry} - T_a}{rah_{v,dry}} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

713 with $H_{v,dry}$ ($s.m^{-1}$) the aerodynamic resistance over full-cover vegetation.

714

715 **Well-watered vegetation EB equation:**

716 In eq. 9, the well-watered vegetation (v_{wet}) net radiation is:

$$Rn_{v,wet} = (1 - \alpha_v)Rg + \varepsilon_v R_a - \varepsilon_v \sigma T_{v,wet}^4 \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The vegetation sensible heat in eq. 9 is expressed as:

$$H_{v,wet} = \rho C p \frac{T_{v,wet} - T_a}{rah_{v,wet}} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

with $rah_{v,wet}$ ($s.m^{-1}$) the aerodynamic resistance over full-cover vegetation. In eq. 9, $LE_{v,wet}$ ($W.m^{-2}$) the vegetation latent heat is expressed as:

$$LE_{v,wet} = \frac{\rho C p}{\gamma} \frac{e_{sat}(T_{v,wet}) - (e_{sat}(T_a) \times \frac{H_a}{100})}{rah_{v,wet} + r_{v,min}} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

717 with $e_{sat}(T_{v,wet})$ (Pa) the saturated vapor pressure at vegetation temperature. and $r_{v,min}$ the minimum stomatal resis-
718 tance (set to 25 $s.m^{-1}$ (Moran et al., 1994)).

719 The expressions of R_a , rah_s , rah_v , $e_{sat}(T_a)$, $e_{sat}(T_s)$ and $e_{sat}(T_v)$ are expressed as following:

In eq. A.3, A.6, A.10 and A.12 the downward atmospheric radiation is expressed as:

$$R_a = \varepsilon_a \sigma T_a^4 \quad (\text{A.15})$$

with ε_a (-) being the effective atmospheric emissivity. The emissivity of clear skies is estimated as in Brutsaert (1975) based on Kustas et al. (1994); Iziomon et al. (2003); Herrero and Polo (2012):

$$\varepsilon_a = 0.553(e_a/100)^{1/7} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

with e_a the air vapor pressure computed as:

$$e_a = e_{sat}(T_a)(h_a/100) \quad (\text{A.17})$$

In eq. A.9 and A.14 the saturated vapor pressure at temperature T is expressed as:

$$e_{sat}(T) = 611 \exp[17.27(T - 273.15)/(T - 35.9)] \quad (\text{A.18})$$

In eq. A.5, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.13 and A.14 the component aerodynamic resistance rah for the soil or vegetation is estimated as in Choudhury et al. (1986):

$$rah = \frac{rah_0}{(1 + Ri)^\eta} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

with rah_0 ($s.m^{-1}$) being the neutral aerodynamic resistance, Ri (-) the Richardson number which represents the importance of free versus forced convection, and η (-) a coefficient set to 0.75 in unstable conditions (component temperature

larger than T_a) and 2 in stable conditions (component temperature lower than T_a). The Richardson number is computed as:

$$Ri = \frac{5gZ(T - T_a)}{TaU_a^2} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

with T being the component temperature (T_s for rah_s and T_v for rah_v). The neutral rah_0 is computed as:

$$rah_0 = \frac{1}{k^2 U_a} \left[\ln \left(\frac{Z-d}{Z0h} \right) \right] \left[\ln \left(\frac{Z-d}{Z0m} \right) \right] \quad (\text{A.21})$$

720 with k (-) being the von karman constant, U_a ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) the wind speed measured at the height Z (m) and $Z0m$ (m) the
 721 momentum roughness. $Z0m$ is set to 0.003 m for rah_s (Yang et al., 2008; Stefan et al., 2015) and 0.1 m for rah_v (Allen
 722 et al., 1998). $Z0h$ is expressed as $Z0m$ divided by 10 (Allen et al., 1998).