**Vegetation growth models improve surface layer flux simulations of a temperate grassland**
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**Core ideas**

Detailed description of plant growth dynamics improves heat flux simulations.
Harvest cannot be neglected to adequately simulate boundary layer energy fluxes.
Complex plant growth models improve flux exchanges under drought conditions.

**Abstract**

Grassland models represent interactions of plant growth with soil and agricultural management based on underlying processes in different degrees of detail. To better understand the impact of these differences on the simulation of energy and matter exchange at the land-surface layer, we compared the ability of five land-surface models with different degrees of complexity to simulate energy fluxes in an intensively managed grassland in Switzerland. The aim was to evaluate the impacts of biomass growth, biomass harvest, soil profile characterization and rooting depth on the dynamics of simulated near-surface soil moisture contents and energy fluxes. The case study included a comparison of model results to continuous observations of latent heat, sensible heat, and net radiation for a site-year. Energy fluxes were simulated more accurately by including a biomass growth model, encompassing the abrupt decline in leaf area caused by harvest. Site-specific soil parametrization in combination with the absence of restrictions on rooting depth also improved the simulation results. The simulated energy fluxes of the five models differed significantly in the hot, dry month of July 2010 but were negligible under moist conditions in May. We conclude that the application of dynamic vegetation growth models improves energy flux simulations at field scale in intensively managed grasslands during summer, if biomass harvest dates and site-specific soil profile descriptions are considered. Our results imply that regional scale simulations of grasslands will benefit significantly from high resolution input information on soil properties, land use, as well as management.

**List of abbreviations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| abbreviation | unit | description |
| *CH* | (-) | surface exchange coefficient for heat |
| *cp*  | (MJ kg⁻¹ K⁻¹) | specific heat of air |
| *D* | (m s⁻¹) | soil water diffusivity |
| *do*  | (m) | zero plane displacement height |
| *ea*  | (kPa) | actual vapor pressure |
| *Eact*  | (mm h⁻¹) | actual evaporation |
| *Ec* | (W m⁻²) | evaporation of precipitation |
| *Edir*  | (W m⁻²) | sum of soil evaporation |
| *Epot*  | (mm h⁻¹) | potential evaporation |
| *Epot,max* | (mm h⁻¹) | maximum of water, which can be evaporated from the soil |
| *es* | (kPa) | saturated vapor pressure  |
| *Et* | (W m⁻²) | canopy transpiration  |
| ETact | (mm h⁻¹) | actual evapotranspiration |
| ETpot | (mm h⁻¹) | potential Evapotranspiration |
| *fc* | (-) | fractional vegetation cover |
| *fcd*  | (-) | cloudiness factor |
| *flam* | (-) | fraction of the leaf area |
| *G*  | (W m⁻²) | ground heat flux |
| *gs*  | (m s⁻¹) | stomatal conductance |
| *gs,max* | (m s⁻¹) | maximum conductance |
| *gs,min* | (m s⁻¹) | a minimum conductance |
| *Gsh* | (kg m⁻² day⁻¹) | growth rate of the shoot |
| *h* | (m) | matric potential |
| *hcan* | (m) | plant height  |
| *Hs* | (W m⁻²) | sensible heat flux |
| *Hs,pot* | (W m⁻²) |  |
| *IiLAI* | (m² m⁻² day⁻¹) | LAI input rate |
| *k* | (-) | von Kármán constant |
| *K* | (m day⁻¹) | soil conductivity |
| *kcan*  | (m² m⁻²) | leaf extinction coefficient |
| *kdeg*  | (day⁻¹) | degradation rate |
| *kturn* | (day⁻¹) | turnover rate |
| *L* | (W m⁻²) | latent heat flux |
| LAI | (m² m⁻²) | leaf area index |
| LAIact | (m² m⁻²) | active (sunlit) leaf area index |
| *Levap*  | (MJ kg⁻¹) | latent heat factor |
| *LMO* | (m) | Obukhov length |
| NSE |  | Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency |
| *Ō* |  | mean observation |
| *Oi* |  | observation value |
| *OiLAI, an* | (m² m⁻² day⁻¹) | animal grazing rate |
| *OiLAI, hv* | (m² m⁻² day⁻¹) | harvesting rate |
| *Pc* | (-) | plant coefficient |
| *Pi*  |  | prediction value |
| *ra*  | (s m⁻¹) | aerodynamic resistance |
| RMSE |  | Root mean square error |
| *Rn*  | (W m⁻²) | net amount of radiant energy  |
| *Rnl*  | (W m⁻²) | net long-wave radiation |
| Rns | (W m⁻²) | the non-reflected part of the incoming solar radiation |
| *Rp* | (MJ m⁻² day⁻¹) | photosynthetic active radiation |
| *rs* | (s m⁻¹) | surface resistance  |
| *rs* | (s m⁻¹) | plant surface resistance |
| *Rs*  | (W m⁻²) | incoming solar radiation |
| *S* | (m³ m⁻³ day⁻¹ ) | loss of soil water due to root water uptake |
| *S* | m³ m⁻³s  | sink term |
| *t* | (day) | time |
| *Tact* | (mm h⁻¹) | actual transpiration |
| *TK*  | (K) | surface air temperature |
| *Tpot*  | (mm h⁻¹) | potential transpiration |
| *Ts1* | (K) | mid-point temperature of the first soil layer  |
| *Tskin* | (K) | surface temperature |
| *uz* | (m s⁻¹) | wind speed |
| WFPS | (-) | water filled pore space |
| *Wsh* | (mm h⁻¹) | maximum of water, which can be transpired from the plant |
| z0h | (m) | roughness length of heat |
| *z0m* | (m) | momentum |
| *zw* | (m) | height of the wind measurements |
| α | (-) | albedo  |
| γ | (kPa K⁻¹) | psychometric constant |
| Δ | (kPa K⁻¹) | slope of the saturation vapor pressure temperature curve |
| θcan | (kg m⁻²) | actual canopy moisture content  |
| θcan,max | (kg m⁻²) | maximum canopy moisture content  |
| θgs,max | (m³ m⁻³) | max relative shoot water contents |
| θgs,min | (m³ m⁻³) | min relative shoot water contents |
| θsh | (m³ m⁻³) | relative shoot water content |
| θsoil | (m³ m⁻³) | volumetric soil water content |
| *θsoil,1*  | (-) | volumetric water content (upper soil) |
| κt | (W m⁻² K⁻¹) | thermal conductivity |
| κ | (m s⁻¹) | hydraulic conductivity |
| ν | (m² kg⁻¹) | specific leaf area |
| *ρa*  | (kg m⁻³) | actual vapor pressure |
| *ρw* | (Mg m⁻³) | density of water |
| σ | (W K⁻⁴ m⁻²) | Stefan-Boltzmann constant |
| τair | (K) | potential air temperature |
| Ψh | (-) | stability function |
| Ψm | (-) | stability function |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Introduction**Grasslands cover more than 25 % of the Earth’s surface area and about 70 % of the agricultural land area (FAO, 2015). Therefore, a good representation of grassland systems in models plays a crucial role to reliably estimate energy and matter exchange between the land surface and the atmosphere at regional and global scales. During the last decades increasingly improved terrestrial ecosystem models have been developed and applied to simulate energy, water and carbon fluxes between biosphere and atmosphere (Ma et al., 2015; Ershadi et al., 2014) and to estimate crop production under expected climate change (Asseng et al., 2013).
However, compared to the numerous accessible forest and crop system models and in spite of the widespread surface area occupied by grassland, only a few grassland-specific models are available (Chang et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2015; Senapati et al., 2016), which for their part additionally address specific research questions. Among others, these are the CENTURY model built to quantify C, N, P and S turnover on a monthly basis (Parton et al., 1998) and rebuilt for daily time steps under the name DAYCENT, the grassland model GEM (Chen et al., 1996a) focusing on natural grasslands, the LINGRA model (Schapendonk et al., 1998) to particularly predict biomass productivity of perennial rye-grass, the Hurley Pasture Model (HPM) designed to estimate water, C and N fluxes in grazed soil-pasture systems (Thornley, 1998) and the model PASIM (Riedo et al., 1998) derived from HPM to additionally simulate gaseous emissions from the pasture system.
An overview of further grazed pasture system models that consider agricultural management at the whole farm level in contrast to single paddocks is given by Snow et al. (2014) describing strength and weakness of the models APSIM (Holzworth et al., 2014), AgMod (Johnson, 2013), DIESE (Clouaire and Rellier, 2009), FASSET (Hutchings et al., 2007), GRAZPLAN (Donnelly et al., 2002) and IFSM (Rotz et al., 2013). Similar to the APSIM model platform further crop models and model platforms such as STICS (Brisson et al., 2003; Ruget et al., 2009), EPIC (Williams et al., 1989), CropSyst (Stöckle et al., 2003), DNDC (Li et al., 1992, 1994), DSSAT (Jones et al., 2003) and Expert-N (Priesack, 2006) have been extended to simulate grassland ecosystems. They strongly contribute to the development of grassland models, often by providing more detailed or different process descriptions including for example soil freezing and thawing, soil water flow in macro-pores, soil gas transport and adaption to CO2 fertilization, though the more detailed process models may for daily time steps need to be parameterized and tested for grassland system simulations. Furthermore, during the last years mainly for crop and grasslands a better representation of land use management was introduced to global dynamic vegetation models, for example LPjmL (Bondeau et al., 2007; Strengers et al., 2010; Fader et al., 2015), BIOME-BGC (Hidy et al., 2012; Keller et al., 2014), ORCHIDEE-GM (Chang et al., 2013, 2015) and JULES-SUCROS (den Hoof et al., 2011; Williams and Falloon, 2015).
Land surface models (LSM) which are implemented in global or regional models for representing the surface layer mostly use simple soil and vegetation models that lack descriptions of dynamic vegetation growth, land-use management and soil physics. Studies (Song et al., 2013; den Hoof et al., 2011; Casanova and Judge, 2008) show that these model components affect the simulations of soil water content, nutrient availability for plant growth, canopy properties, and plant biomass growth. Falge et al. (2005) determined that vegetation type and the accurate description of leaf physiology is more important to the surface energy balance, which is the most relevant part of a LSM in weather models, than the LAI of a system. However, they did not discuss the influence of soil types and physical properties. In contrast, Calanca et al. (2016) concluded by simulating managed grassland sites in Switzerland that especially the description of soil and mechanistic plant growth is very important for simulating droughts. Also Zeeman et al. (2010) showed that management practices can strongly influence the carbon fluxes triggered by climate conditions from three grassland sites in Switzerland. Another study confirmed that human activities in steppe ecosystems resulted in a rapid shift between latent and sensible heat and had a strong impact on the carbon budget (Chen et al., 2009). Even two adjunct grassland fields under different management regimes (fertilization and cutting frequency) can have significantly different carbon budgets (Ammann et al., 2007).
LSMs impact the soil water content, canopy height, plant biomass and soil cover. Thus, simple LSMs might be biased by incompletely describing surface energy fluxes and by neglecting processes that consider water and nutrient availabilities for plant growth. The impact of growing roots and rooting depth on soil water storage and surface energy fluxes is well known but rarely realized in LSMs. Gayler et al. (2014) therefore analyzed the importance of an adequate representation of crops on surface energy flux simulations. Compared to field crops, the rooting depth of permanent grasslands does not change much throughout the year (Sindhøj et al., 2000; Fiala, 2010). In contrast, the above-ground biomass of grasslands may change rapidly throughout the year due to sudden harvest events and thus affect the site-specific or regional micro-climate (Gigante et al., 2009; Zeeman et al., 2010).
Grassland management systems can strongly differ between sites due to different climatic and soil conditions, different species compositions, and different grassland and feed quality requirements. Examples are hay, forage, silage and bioenergy production, livestock grazing, fallowing, restrictions due to nature protection, or the rapid overgrowth of unmanaged grasslands by trees (Silva et al., 2008). These differences result in varying frequencies of harvest and cutting heights, fertilizer applications, livestock densities and irrigation and thus affect surface energy fluxes. In spite of these differences, only a few simulation studies have considered the influence of management on water and energy fluxes in grasslands (Fatichi et al., 2014; Kirschbaum et al., 2015).
The objective of this study was therefore to assess the ability of five models with different levels of complexity to simulate energy fluxes in a grassland-dominated region of Switzerland based on flux tower measurements at one intensively managed temperate grassland site in 2006. The applied models were the widely applied LSM Noah, (Chen et al., 1996b, 1997; Koren et al., 1999; Chen and Dudhia, 2001; Ek et al., 2003) and four different model configurations of the LSM Expert-N (Priesack et al., 2006; Priesack, 2006; Biernath et al., 2011). We use the Noah model as a reference model, which was developed as a LSM for the regional scale and which is used in couplings with weather and climate models (Skamarock et al., 2008).
In particular, we assessed the influence of
i) different descriptions of plant growth
ii) a more site-specific vs. a more general description of soil properties and site-specific harvest management
iii) different rooting depths on the simulation results and their relevance to descriptions of flux exchanges
2. **Material and methods**
	1. **Field site description and underlying data**
	The examined field site at Chamau (47°12′37′′ N, 8°24′38′′ E, 393 m a.s.l.) is an intensively managed grassland comprising around approximately 20 grass and herb species in the Swiss Lowlands (Roth 2006).The simulation period covered the entire year 2006 and no fertilizers were applied during this time period. Due to the focus of this work on the effects of plant growth and harvest management on the near-surface flux exchanges, we evaluated the vegetation period from May to August, as well as two extreme periods: a temperate and moist period in May and a hot and dry period in July. Forage was harvested on May 4, June 9, July 10, September 5 and October 19, 2006, with a cutting height of 0.07 m. The species composition, site, experimental design, biomass and grassland management have been described in detail by Gilgen and Buchmann (2009); Roth (2006) and Zeeman et al. (2010). The ecosystem variables relevant for the simulations were used as documented in Gilgen and Buchmann (2009) (plant variables, soil moisture) and Roth (2006) (soil properties). Micrometeorological data were used at 30-min resolution. Fluxes were determined using the eddy covariance (EC) technique. It is well-known that EC - Tower measurements can have high uncertainties. Zeeman et al. (2010) showed that the energy budget closure amounts to 81% at this site station.
	An overview of the soil properties of the models and the measurement setup is given in Tab.1 and Tab. 2, respectively.
	2. **Model approaches**
	We applied the following LSM systems: a) the LSM Noah, which was originally developed to simulate the lower boundary conditions for weather forecast and climate research at the global and regional scales (Skamarock et al., 2008); and b) the Expert-N model system, which was developed to improve process understanding simulating matter fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems and agricultural consultation. In principle, the modularity of Expert-N permits the establishment of numerous models to analyze the impacts of individual functions and processes on the modeled system and the simulation results. Site-specific conditions can be described in great detail depending on the availability of data. We applied the Noah model (model I) and 4 different configurations of Expert-N 5.0 (models II-V):
	Model I: The Noah model was applied as documented in Chen et al. (1996b, 1997); Chen and Dudhia (2001); Ek et al. (2003); Koren et al. (1999) without further modifications. The land-use type ”grassland”, the soil type ”loam” and interpolated leaf area index (LAI) dynamics based on the measurements without explicit harvest management were used. The soil type ’loam’ which is described by Miller and White (1998) was the soil class which best represented the measured top soil horizon parameters in Chamau (Roth, 2006). The 200 cm soil profile comprised 4 horizons with uniform soil properties. The predefined rooting depth was 100 cm.
	Model II: The Noah parameters of the soil type ”loam” were directly applied or translated to establish an Expert-N model soil to mimic the soil properties of model I. For this purpose, a 200 cm deep soil profile comprising 40 numerical layers with identical soil properties was supposed. The rooting depth was set to 100 cm like in model I. The soil texture was obtained from the State Soil Geographic Database (STATSGO) (Miller and White, 1998). Because of difficulties of transferring all the parameters hydraulic properties were estimated using the Rosetta software (Schaap et al., 2001). Organic matter, rock fraction and pH values were taken from Roth (2006). Soil properties were applied as presented in Tab. 1. Grassland growth was simulated using the Hurley Pasture Model (HPM) including harvest management.
	Models III-V: Expert-N was applied using the site-specific soil description by Roth (2006) comprising a soil profile depth of 130 cm and 5 horizons with 26 equidistant numerical layers and different soil basic parameters. Hydraulic properties were estimated using the Rosetta software (Tab. 1). Grassland growth was simulated using the HPM adapted to the Expert-N framework. Using this basic setup, the model was executed with three configurations to test the impacts of site-specific harvest management and different rooting depths on the simulated energy fluxes.
	Model III: The rooting depth was limited to 130 cm. Harvest management was inactive.
	Model IV: Harvest management was active, and the rooting depth was limited to 30 cm.
	Model V: Harvest management was active, and the rooting depth was limited to 130 cm.
	An overview of models I-V is presented in Tab. 3. The individual sub-model choices of models II-V are provided in Tab. 4.
	Model I accounts for vegetation growth dynamics using monthly mean values of the measured LAI on the 15th day of each month with linear interpolations. The monthly mean LAI values were applied on measurements presented by Gilgen and Buchmann (2009).
	In models II-V the HPM was applied using the parameter values of the original model as documented by (Thornley, 1998). Minor parameter adjustments were required to account for the site-specific species composition and to simulate realistic vegetation growth (see Tab. 5). The changes were made either using measured data or by adjusting these parameters by comparing the simulated with the measured biomass. All models were applied without further calibration.
	3. **Energy Flux Model Descriptions**
	In the following, we present the general model concepts. More detailed model descriptions can be found in the appendix (Appendix A) and the associated literature. The sub-model choices of Expert-N 5.0 are shown in Tab. 4.
	All five models used the energy conservation equation to describe the energy fluxes at the surface layer:

 (1)

**Net radiation flux (*Rn*)***Rn* is the net amount of radiant energy available at the vegetation surface. Thus, it is the difference between the net short-wave radiation and net long-wave radiation. The net short-wave radiation is the non-reflected part of the short-wave radiation and can be calculated from the incoming short-wave radiation and the albedo (α). In model I, α was derived using measured values. In models II-V, α was estimated from the LAI (m² m⁻²) dynamics computed by the plant growth submodel HPM (section 2.2) and from the albedo of the uncovered soil, which was calculated using the soil properties and the volumetric soil water content of the upper soil layer. Long-wave radiation was calculated according to the Stefan-Boltzmann law in all five models. For more details, see eq. A.1 to eq. A.3.
**Sensible heat flux (*Hs*)**Model I used bulk transfer relationships (Garratt, 1993) for the calculation of *Hs* (eq. A.25). In models II-V, *Hs* was calculated using a Penman-like approach. The residual energy of potential and actual latent heat was added to the sensible heat to close the energy balance and to take plant and soil water stress into account (eq. A.14).
**Latent heat flux (*L*)**In model I, *L* was computed as the sum of soil evaporation, evaporation of the intercepted precipitation, and transpiration through the stomata (eq. A.20 – eq. A.23). In models II-V, *L* (eq. A.5) was computed from the potential evapotranspiration using a Penman–Monteith approach (Monteith, 1965, 1981). The potential evapotranspiration was then reduced depending on the water content in plants and soil, stomatal conductance (eq. A.18), and leaf area index (eq. A.16)). **Ground heat flux (***G***)**In model I, *G* (eq: A.24) was calculated using the temperature gradient between the surface temperature and the mid-point temperature of the first soil layer multiplied by the thermal conductivity. In models II-V, *G* (eq. A.4) was calculated using the formulation of Choudhury (1989), which assumes that *G* depends on *Rn* and the LAI. The proportionality factor used in this formula differs between day and night.
**Plant growth**

In models II-V, vegetation dynamics, such as growth, C and N cycles and water flow in the plant, were simulated using the HPM (eq.: A.16 – A.18) (Thornley and Cannell, 1997; Thornley, 2001, 1998). The HPM assumes proportionality between the canopy height and the LAI (*hcan* ∝ LAI). The root water uptake was computed using the Feddes model (Feddes et al., 2001). The root biomass distribution declined exponentially with the rooting depth in the soil profile. The rooting depth of the simulated grasslands was assumed to be constant throughout the simulation period. Model I neglected mechanistic plant growth dynamics. To compute the net radiation flux, the canopy was represented by LAI dynamics with linear interpolation between the measured monthly mean values following Pan and Mahrt (1987).
**Soil water**Model I described the soil profile by four numerical layers with identical soil properties for each layer (Mahrt and Pan, 1984; Schaake et al., 1996). The soil water transport was computed using the diffusivity form of the Richards’ equation. The diffusivity form was defined by the formulation of Cosby et al. (1984b) for nine different soil types (see also Appendix A.2).
Models II-V computed the water transport using the HYDRUS submodel, i.e. the mixed form of the Richards’ equation, to account for the hydraulic properties of the soil horizons (Simunek et al., 1998).

* 1. **Data analysis**
	The performance of the different model approaches was tested by comparing the simulated energy fluxes (*L*, *Hs*, *Rn*) with the hourly mean flux tower measurements using the Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) and the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). The NSE was defined as:

 (2)

The NSE can range from -∞ to 1. If NSE = 1 the predicted data perfectly match the observed data. An NSE > 0 indicates that the predicted values are better representing the observations than the mean of the observed values. (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970).

The RMSE was computed as:

 (3)

In both equations *Pi* is the prediction, *Oi* is the observation and *Ō* is the mean of the observations.

1. **Results**
The simulation results were compared to flux tower measurements of an intensively managed grassland site in Switzerland in 2006 and were evaluated for three different periods: i) the main vegetation growth period (May - September); ii) a period in May during which the measured water-filled pore space (WFPS) at a depth of 5 cm exceeded 0.80 (May); and iii) a period in July during which the driest soil conditions at a depth of 5 cm were observed and WFPS ranged between 0.40 - 0.60.
	1. **Plant growth simulations**
	Models II-V simulated daily average above-ground biomass growth rates of 4 - 7 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ from May to August 2006, with maximal rates of 20 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ and minimal values of 0.1 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹. Since model I did not have a dynamic growth model, no growth rates were calculated.
	Statistical evaluations (root mean square error: RMSE) indicated that the ability of the models to simulate the measured LAI dynamics declines in the order: I>IV>II>V>III. Model III, the model with the highest RMSE (1.1 m² m⁻²), underestimated the LAI in June but overestimated it twofold in July, reaching LAI values of greater than 7 m² m⁻² at the end of August. Such high LAI values together with canopy heights of up to 1.2 m are realistic for extensively managed hay fields at low alpine altitudes (Körner, 2003). Under the intensively managed conditions of the pasture examined in the present study, the measured late-season values are overestimated almost three-fold. In the simulations by models II, IV, and V the LAI values declined to 0.5 after harvest events, due to the model assumption by Thornley (1998) that the LAI is proportional to the canopy height, which declined due to cutting. The measured LAI values were underestimated by 20–55 %. In agreement with the measurements, a maximum LAI of approximately 2.5 m² m⁻² was simulated in mid-July before the third harvest event. Based on its RMSE value (RMSE=0.31 m² m⁻²), model I best simulated the LAI dynamics via linear interpolations between monthly mean measurements. However, model I failed to capture the abrupt declines of LAI at harvest followed by the increase in LAI due to canopy re-growth (Fig. 1).
	2. **Soil water storage simulations**
	In the simulations by model II, the near-surface soil moisture in 5 cm soil depth was mostly near saturation (WFPS > 0.75) (Fig. 2). Only during two drier periods in mid-June and end-July the WFPS declined to values between 0.60 and 0.55. During both periods, the WFPS was mostly overestimated, particularly after the short mid-June drought period and during the rewetting phase (Fig. 2) at the beginning of August, when the measured WFPS was mostly less than 0.5 but the simulated values were larger than 0.90.
	Model I well simulated the dynamics of the two drier periods, which were separated by a short re-wetting event. However, the simulations strongly underestimated WFPS by approximately 25 % during the more moist periods from May to mid-June and in August. Consequently, lower amplitudes of WFPS dynamics were simulated, ranging from maximum values of less than 0.70 to minimum values greater than 0.45.
	On average, model IV underestimated the WFPS measurements by 0.05. The largest underestimations occurred with the onset of top-soil drying in June and peaked in end-July with WFPS values of less than 0.20 when the measurements were still higher than 0.40. This underestimation is due to the shallow rooting depth of 30 cm, which was assumed following the documentation by Roth (2006). In the simulations, this limitation of rooting depth caused stronger top soil drying because water resources from deeper soil layers were not available to fulfill the transpiration demands of the vegetation. After re-wetting at the end of August, the WFPS in the upper 5 cm matched the measured dynamics.
	The WFPS simulations by models V and III underestimated the measured values until mid-June due the possibly too deep rooting depth assumptions in the models. Both models surprisingly overestimated the WFPS in the top soil during the re-wetting event by 0.20. This overestimation might be due to lateral runoff in the field, which was not considered in the simulations. Model V captured the soil drought peak in end-July (WFPS=0.42), while the simulations by the model without biomass harvest (model III) obtained a higher top soil moisture of 0.50. The lower top soil moisture obtained by model V (compared to model III) is due to a decrease in the simulated LAI to 0.5 m² m⁻² by harvest, which abruptly increased the evaporation rates from bare soil and consequently dried the top-soil, which did not occur using model III. Without harvest, the simulated LAI values exceeded 4.0 m² m⁻² and prevented any evaporation. Water was thus extracted by deep roots (130 cm) and the top-soil remained more moist (WFPS = 0.50) due to the prevention of evaporation. Strong topsoil drying was observed in simulations by model II after harvest when the LAI values were small because of the rapid dehydration of the soil profile, which in this case was assumed to be homogeneous.
	3. **Dynamic of the energy fluxes**
	Energy fluxes related to the land-surface layer, comprise the ground heat flux, *G*, the latent heat flux, *L*, which is proportional to the sum of transpiration and evaporation (Fig. 3), the sensible heat flux, *Hs* (Fig. 4), and the net radiation, *Rn*. We analyzed the ability of the five different models to simulate the dynamics of the sensible and latent heat fluxes. The net radiation fluxes are well described in all models (models II-V (NSE > 0.94) and model I (NSE = 0.85)) and no deeper analysis or discussion is needed. The net radiation flux simulations and corresponding measurements including the ground heat fluxes are provided in the supplementary material section.
	**Latent heat**In May (moist and temperate), four models (II-V) overestimated the measured values by approximately 110 W m⁻² on the day after harvest (Fig. 3). Model I simulated the latent heat flux dynamics very well after harvest but underestimated the daily peak values before harvest by 50%. The harvest (models II, IV, V) had no significant impact on the latent heat flux simulations. Fig. 3c shows that energies between 110-130 W m⁻² were on average well simulated by all examined models. All models tended to underestimate higher energies and overestimate lower energies. This pattern was most evident in simulations by model I. Only small differences among the simulations of models II-V in May (no water stress) were observed, and the simulated LAI values were low, approximately 1.0 m² m⁻². The consequence was that the latent heat flux depended largely on the evaporated soil water.
	Around the beginning of July, the latent heat flux simulations by models II-V did not differ significantly. After harvest, the latent heat flux simulations of model III exceeded the simulation results of all other models by up to 150 W m⁻² (Fig. 3b and Fig. 3d) due to the simulation of excessively high LAI values (Fig. 1). Until four days after harvest, the latent heat flux simulations did not differ significantly between models I, II, IV, and V. On July 17, the simulation results of all models varied strongly, particularly when the fluxes exceeded 200 W m⁻² (Fig. 3b). Among all five models, the fluxes were simulated with declining highest daily peak values in the order II>I>IV>V>III. The main reason for this apparent delay was the different levels of water stress (amounts of plant-available water) experienced by the vegetation in the five different simulations. The daily mean fluxes exhibited an identical trend (Fig. 6). The simulated differences in latent heat fluxes between the models continued until soil re-wetting in August. The strongest underestimations of high energies were observed in simulations by model I.

**Sensible heat**In May (moist and temperate), no significant differences among the simulations of the models II-V (harvest management, rooting depth and different descriptions of soil properties) were observed (Fig. 4a). These models systematically overestimated the sensible heat by between 10 W m⁻² and 30 W m⁻² for small energies (below 0 W m⁻²) and high energies (above 100 W m⁻²), respectively. The fitted mean line was nearly parallel to the bisector of the first quadrant (Fig. 4c). The amplitudes in sensible heat flux simulations by model I were lower than those in the simulations by all other models (Fig. 4a) in May, July (Fig. 4b) and throughout the simulation period (Fig. 6b).
Model I underestimated the fluxes above 100 W m⁻² by up to 50% and also overestimated the negative fluxes by up to 50% at 25 W m⁻² (Fig. 4c). Energies between 25 W m⁻² and 0 W m⁻² exhibited small deviations between the simulations and measurements.
In July (dry and hot) before the harvest event, no significant differences among the sensible heat flux simulations of models II-V were observed (Fig. 4b). After the harvest, model III (the model without harvest management) simulated between 50%-100% higher fluxes than the models that included harvest management for a period of 6 days (model II; Fig. 4b) and until the end of the simulation period compared to simulations by models IV and V. The increasing bias of latent heat flux simulations by model III compared to the simulations by models IV and V after the subsequent harvest event in August was significant. Moreover, due to the assumption of proportionality in LAI and canopy height in the HPM submodel, a higher LAI increased the surface roughness length, which decreased the aerodynamic resistance, generating turbulence and consequently higher *Hs* (Park et al., 2011).
Our simulation results and the underlying model assumptions emphasize the strong impact of abrupt changes in canopy height and leaf area in harvest-managed grassland ecosystems during drought periods. The strong soil drying of the soil profile with homogeneous soil properties in simulations by model II after harvest in July resulted in an abrupt increase in sensible heat fluxes, reaching daily average values of 80 W m⁻² (Fig. 6b). This abrupt increase occurred due to rapid soil drying of the homogeneous soil profile after harvest and consequently limited plant-available water for transpiration. Throughout the growing season, the lowest daily mean (< 25 W m⁻²) sensible heat fluxes (during the day) were simulated by model I.
The sensible heat flux dynamics did not respond to water stress because in model I, the sensible heat fluxes were computed as the residuum from the energy balance (eq. 1) after the elimination of *Rn*, *L* and *G*. The lower simulated latent heat fluxes (up to 50% compared to simulations by models II-V, Fig. 4a,b) were compensated by the higher ground heat fluxes (up to 60%).
The maximal differences observed among the simulated dynamics of the net radiation fluxes of the five models were less than 50 W m⁻², which was less than 7% of the net radiation flux. Fig. 4c) and d) demonstrate the small response of the sensible heat flux simulations by model I. However, overestimations of the sensible heat fluxes were observed in the simulations by models II and III. The sensible heat flux simulations by models IV and V had high accuracy (NSE ≈ 0.65). We conclude that model I does not respond to the limited soil water availability in the permanent grassland simulations. The most accurate water stress responses were simulated by models IV and V, for which the measured and simulated *Hs* values in July nearly matched the 1:1 line (Fig. 4d). High energies were often overestimated by III and II and underestimated by I.

* 1. **Statistical analysis**Latent heat flux dynamics simulations revealed NSEs between 0.8 (V and IV) and 0.7 (I) between May and August. Overall, averaging the NSE of *Rn*, *L* and *Hs* shows that NSEaverage of each model was higher than 0.4 (Fig. 5c). The largest variations among the models between May and August were observed for sensible heat flux dynamics: the NSEs were 0.6 for model V and 0.5 for models IV and I, but 0.1 and -0.4 for the simulations by models II and III, respectively.
	At the beginning of the vegetation period in May, when the weather conditions were moist, models III and II performed better at simulating the dynamics of the measured energy fluxes (latent heat: NSE ≈ 0.8; sensible heat: NSE > 0.25). In July, their average performances decreased to approximately 0.5 (latent heat: NSE ≈ 0.8; sensible heat: NSE < 0.0). Models II and III could not accurately represent the sensible heat because the ground heat flux was five times lower than that of the other models, due to an unrealistic high LAI (III) and an overly simplistic description of the soil properties causing topsoil drought (II).
	Models V, IV and I produced similar results in May and July. Dryness did not affect the performance of these models (latent heat: NSE ≈ 0.8; sensible heat: NSE > 0.4). In particular, the sensible heat flux appears to be very sensitive to soil properties and harvest management, which is correlated to the LAI.
	Fig. 5c) presents the time range from May to September. Overall, all models produced an almost identical NSE for the net radiation (≈ 0.9). The latent heat was best represented by models V and IV (≈ 0.8). The other NSE values ranged between 0.8 and 0.6. The sensible heat was the most sensitive variable in the models: whereas the performance of models V, IV and I behaved stable, with values between 0.45 and 0.50, models III (the model with no harvest) and II (the model with homogeneous soil properties) had low NSE values (III:-0.4; II: 0.1). In summary, the simulations by the models without harvest and with a simplified representation of the soil properties had difficulties to reproduce the measured values. Comparing the average NSEs (latent heat, sensible heat and net radiation) leads to the conclusion that models V and IV best simulated the measured values, closely followed by model I. Models III and II did not satisfactorily simulate the fluxes, particularly in view of the complexity of these models.
	The RMSE results are shown in Fig. 7. Over the complete time range (May - September) the RMSE averages are between 48 and 59 W m⁻². Comparing the RMSEs of latent heat, sensible heat and net radiation leads to the conclusion that models V and IV best simulated the measured values. Models I, II and III performed not as good and had almost similar results.
1. **Discussion
Plant growth**Simulated growth rate is a good indicator to evaluate the overall model performance. This was only possible using the models II-V based on Expert-N The simulated maximal growth rates were about 38 % lower than those simulated by Hurtado-Uria et al. (2012) using a stand-alone model version of the HPM to simulate 27 years of permanent grassland growth in Ireland. They observed daily average values between 3 and 32 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹, but also systematically overestimated the measured values, particularly during summer drought. Such overestimations of growth rates were not observed in our simulations, in part due to the more detailed description of the soil water flow using the HYDRUS model and the Feddes root water uptake model (see Tab. 4) as well as, due to the different parametrization of plant growth (Tab. 5). This is in contrast to the soil water flow model originally applied in the HPM, which uses a simple bucket approach based only on one numerical soil layer. Therefore the original HPM often fails to simulate dry conditions at the soil surface and hence plant water stress at the top soil. The accuracy of the five models in simulating plant growth and LAI dynamics was evaluated. In May, Hurtado-Uria et al. (2012) observed growth rates between 6 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ and 12 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹. In our simulations, we observed growth rates between 3.7 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ and 5.3 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹. These differences are probably due to differences in the weather conditions, the soil properties, the site management, and the species compositions in Switzerland and Ireland. The observed declines in growth rates were simulated by model III, in which the growth rates declined from 9 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ to 3 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ in July as response to summer drought. No drought depression was observed in the simulations by model II, and the growth rates even increased from 6 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹ to 8 g ⋅ m⁻² day⁻¹.
All the models reacted to drought events and it is known that drought can elicit changes in grassland dynamics through a variety of other mechanisms (Thomas et al., 1989). Most of these mechanisms are not considered in our models yet, but they could be potentially important to understand the disparity of responses observed in field studies. The responses can be physical which was shown by Thomas et al. (1989) and Chaves (2002). Some species can also resist or avoid water stress through enhanced water uptake at low soil water potentials (Volaire and Lelièvre, 2001; Volaire, 2008). This leads in the long term to shifts related to the composition of the grassland community (e.g., Gilgen et al. (2010); Mariotte et al. (2013), which can not be represented by the considered models I-V.
However, based on the evaluation of the LAI and the energy fluxes, we determined that models IV and V simulated the energy fluxes with high accuracy, because they were able to reflect the changes of the LAI. Compared to the other models, model I uses interpolated LAI values based on measured data as input, which resulted in a lower NSE. The description of the LAI dynamics of model III, which ignored harvest management fails to adequately simulate the sensible and ground heat fluxes during drought periods.
We conclude similar to Tsarouchi et al. (2014), that the implementation of dynamical crop development leads to more accurate evapotranspiration simulations, if the management is correctly represented. The impact of harvest was in particular high during the dry period. In the study of Tsarouchi et al. (2014), the static LAI model overestimated measured values during the dry period, in contrast to our simulation, where the simulated values were mostly underestimated by model I, due to the lack of a dynamical LAI simulation.
**Harvest management and soil properties**The models without harvest (models I and III) and with simplistic description of the soil properties (model I and II) had no problems to simulate the latent and sensible heat fluxes during the wet months, but could not accurately represent the sensible heat and ground heat flux during the dry months. Too high LAIs (III) and an overly simplistic description of the soil properties caused topsoil drought (II). In fact that the harvest frequency is very important when simulating managed grassland was also shown by Ammann et al. (2007). They found that the cutting frequency has strong impact on the carbon dynamics and on the energy fluxes. Mahmood and Hubbard (2003) also came to the conclusion that harvest management can be very important and that especially dynamics of plant growth determines the surface energy exchange dynamics.
If harvesting was completely neglected (III) the LAI rose to unrealistic values. TThe other possibility to avoid a harvest model was to use measured or/and averaged monthly values (II). The results were much better and the energy fluxes were acceptable. The model had problems especially after cutting or subsequently to extreme events like drought, because even if the average of the LAI was right, the dynamic of the LAI was very important, especially during dry periods. This was also a result of Tsarouchi et al. (2014). Lin and Cheng (2016) showed that latent and sensible heat simulations are very sensitive to soil texture and moisture initialization and Mahmood and Hubbard (2003) came to the conclusion that soils with higher water capacities buffer the crops physiology against stress. In wet years these effects were smaller. These results are similar to our findings. Mahmood and Hubbard (2003) assumed that the effects of different soil descriptions are less important than those of the land use and the management.
Our results showed that in a homogeneous soil the differences of surface energy fluxes compared to models with a more detailed soil description (I, II) were negligible small. Only droughts had a huge impact, especially the sensible heat flux was very sensitive. We conclude that the sensible heat was strongly influenced by the rooting depth and the soil parameterization in case the soil was dry. The models with higher complexity of soil descriptions (IV, V) behaved much more stable to drought and to abrupt water content changes in the soils.
**Rooting Depth**To understand the impact of the rooting depth, two models with different rooting depths were analyzed. One model (IV) was configured to the shallow rooting depth of 30 cm, following the site documentations of Roth (2006). The other model (V) considered rooting throughout the entire soil profile (130 cm). Our results shows that the limitation of rooting depth to 30 cm caused stronger top soil drying and in consequencelow NSE values, because water resources from deeper soil layers were not available to satisfy the transpiration demands of the vegetation.
We conclude that at least some of the grassland species rooted in deeper soil layers. Deeper rooting is very likely, because this grassland comprises approximately 25 species (Gilgen and Buchmann, 2009). Dierschke and Briemle (2002) and Herndl et al. (2011) observed that most grass species root in the upper soil layers and rarely root deeper than 30 cm. By contrast Brown et al. (2010) demonstrated that 20 out of 41 grass species root deeper than 70 cm, with 5%-15% of the total root biomass deeper than 68 cm. However, the observations of Brown et al. (2010) might be biased by a pot effect in that specific experiment. Gilgen et al. (2010) described a weed problem with *Rumex obtusifolius* at this site and a high diversity of the grassland community. *Rumex* and other herbs such as *Plantago lanceolata* may easily root in deeper soil layers.
Gayler et al. (2014) showed for field crops that it is possible to improve a model with dynamic root growth and concluded that the root biomass and rooting depths change considerably throughout the vegetation period. In contrast to field crops, the rooting depth of permanent grasslands does not change much throughout the year (Sindhøj et al., 2000; Fiala, 2010). But a dynamic root growth model could react to different environmental triggers with either enhanced root growth or death especially under drought (Monteith, 1991). This could reduce the sensitivity of grassland ecosystem simulations to persistent water stress. This complexity is not fully understood and is discussed controversially. Some responses e.g. to drought were analyzed and found in arid environments (Kalapos et al., 1996; van Wijk, 2010), but could not be found in other experiments (Walter et al., 2012; Prechsl et al., 2014).
Based on our simulations we conclude that especially during droughts it could be an advantage to allow rooting through all horizons. A dynamic root growth model could improve the simulations as it is able to respond to drought or nutrients shortages.
2. **Summary and Conclusions**In this study, we analyzed the ability of five different models to simulate measured energy fluxes in the plant-soil-atmosphere system subject to management. These models included four different Expert-N 5.0 model configurations and the widely applied LSM Noah.
The five model approaches differed in the complexity of their descriptions of the site-specific physical soil properties, the different maximum rooting depths, and the consideration of biomass growth and harvests. The models were evaluated against data for grassland growth and corresponding flux-tower measurements at Chamau, Switzerland, in the year 2006.
We conclude that the abrupt decline of LAI at harvest followed by LAI regeneration due to plant growth cannot be neglected in energy flux simulations. In addition, dynamic vegetation models including root growth and more detailed, site-specific descriptions of physical soil properties can improve simulations of energy fluxes from the land surface to the atmosphere. The degree of improvement, however, depends on the season, the complexity of the soil profile and on the land-use management. During summer, when high temperatures cause drought, the rooting depth may have a strong impact on how much water is extracted from the soil profile and, in particular, from the relevant near-surface soil layers. This influence of the rooting depth in summer strongly affects transpiration and evaporation (in case the LAI values are small) and consequently, strongly impacts the energy flux simulation results.
The performance of more complex models usually increases with the amount of information that is available on the ecosystem of interest, and it is challenging to improve the availability of such data, in particular, as complete ecosystem descriptions at high spatial resolution are rare. In the absence of information, ad hoc assumptions may be helpful, but good descriptions of ecosystem heterogeneity and management timing in a region are needed to significantly improve the energy flux simulations between the land surface and the atmosphere. This could also improve weather forecasts at the regional scale.
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**Appendix A. Model Descriptions**

This section gives an overview of the governing model equations that were applied to simulate surface energy fluxes, plant growth, and soil water transport. Model I is the original Noah model. The only change was the use of adjusted LAI values to simulate realistic site-specific LAI dynamics (Appendix A.2). Models II-V are all applications of the model system Expert-N (Appendix A.1). In these four models, the soils are described using different levels of detail (site-specific or more general). Plant growth is described using the HPM model using the same parametrization in all models. The differences in observed plant growth dynamics are due to different rooting depth constraints and whether harvest management is considered or not.

**Appendix A.1. Expert-N 5.0**

The model system Expert-N 5.0 comprises mechanistic ecosystem submodels to simulate matter, water and energy fluxes in the soil-plant-atmosphere system. The system consists of various submodels for the water cycle, heat transfer, plant growth, and the nitrogen cycle. The description presented in this study refers to the respective submodel choices shown in Tab. 4, which were used for the simulations in this manuscript. The mathematical description could be different for other submodule choices.

**Surface Energy**

In the energy balance (eq. 1), *Rn* is the net amount of radiant energy available at the vegetation surface and is given by

 (A.1)

as the difference between the net short-wave radiation, *Rns* (W m⁻²) and net long-wave radiation, *Rnl* (W m⁻²).

 (A.2)

*Rns* (eq. A.2) is the non-reflected part of the incoming solar radiation, *Rs* (W m⁻²). The reflected part is described as α ⋅ *Rs*, where α (-) is the albedo. α depends on the leaf area index, LAI (m² m⁻²), and the volumetric water content of the upper soil layer, *θsoil,1* (-). *Rnl* is calculated according to the Stefan-Boltzmann law, which was introduced by Brunt (Brunt, 1932, 2011) as

 (A.3)

This equation uses the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, σ (W K⁻⁴ m⁻²); the calculated cloudiness factor, *fcd* (-); the actual vapor pressure; *ea* (kPa); and the surface air temperature, *TK* (K).

*G* (W m⁻²), (eq. A.4) is assumed to be proportional to *Rn* for constant LAI values (Choudhury, 1989; Choudhury et al., 1987). The proportionality factor differs between day and night. Hence *G* is given by

 (A.4)

*L* is given by

 (A.5)

where *Levap* (MJ kg⁻¹) is the latent heat factor (Allen, 2005; Allen et al., 2006); *ρw* (Mg m⁻³) is the density of water; 10 ⁶ ⋅ 3600⁻¹ (h J s⁻¹ MJ) is a conversion factor; and ETact (mm h⁻¹) is the actual evapotranspiration, that is, the sum of the actual evaporation, *Eact* (mm h⁻¹), and the actual transpiration, *Tact*, (mm h⁻¹):

 (A.6)

The calculation of ETact is based on the hourly potential evapotranspiration, ETpot (mm h⁻¹), from Penman-Monteith (Monteith, 1965, 1981):

 (A.7)

where Δ (kPa K⁻¹) is the slope of the saturation vapor pressure temperature curve; γ (kPa K⁻¹) is a psychometric constant; *es* (kPa) is the saturated vapor pressure; and *ea* (kPa) is the actual vapor pressure. *ρa* (kg m⁻³) and *cp* (MJ kg⁻¹ K⁻¹) are the mean air density and the specific heat of air, respectively. The factors 3600 (s h⁻¹) and 10-6 (MJ J⁻¹) are conversion factors. *ra* (s m⁻¹) is the aerodynamic resistance and *rs* (s m⁻¹) is the surface resistance. Following Cheng and Brutsaert (2005); Brutsaert (1982), *ra* is calculated by

 (A.8)

from the height of the wind measurements, *zw* (m); the zero plane displacement height, *do* (m); the roughness length of heat, *z0h* (m); and momentum, *z0m* (m), the Obukhov length; *LMO* (m); the von Kármán constant, *k* (-); and the wind speed, *uz* (m s⁻¹). The stability functions Ψm (-) and Ψh (-) are described by Brutsaert (1982) and Chen et al. (1997). The plant surface resistance, *rs* (s m⁻¹), is computed using the stomatal conductance, *gs* (m s⁻¹), and the active (sunlit) leaf area index, LAIact (m² m⁻²), which is assumed as 0.5 ⋅ LAI:

 (A.9)

The potential evaporation, *Epot* (mm h⁻¹), is calculated as ETpot reduced by the area of bare soil (not covered by plant biomass):

 (A.10)

where the plant cover fraction is given by 1 - exp(-*kcan* ⋅LAI) following Raes et al. (1986). Here *kcan* (m² m⁻²) is the leaf extinction coefficient. With the help of this plant cover fraction, the potential transpiration, *Tpot* (mm h⁻¹) can be derived:

 (A.11)

For a given *Epot,max* (mm h⁻¹) (maximum of water, which can be evaporated from the soil) and *Wsh* (mm h⁻¹) (maximum of water, which can be transpired from the plant), the actual evaporation *Eact* and transpiration *Tact* can be calculated using eq. A.12 and eq. A.13:

 (A.12)

 (A.13)

The shoot water content *Wsh* is a function of the relative shoot water content θsh of the plant (Thornley, 1998).

The sensible heat flux *Hs* is calculated as the residual component of the surface energy balance (eq. 1):

 (A.14)

The potential sensible heat flux (*Hs,pot*) can be written in a similar form to ETpot (eq. A.7):

 (A.15)

**Plant**

Vegetation growth dynamics were simulated using the Hurley Pasture Model (HPM) (Thornley and Cannell, 1997; Thornley, 2001, 1998). The most important plant parameters related to the flux exchange model are the leaf area index, LAI (m² m⁻²), and the stomatal conductance, *gs* (m s⁻¹). In the HPM, the LAI is divided into four age classes (Thornley, 1998). These LAI age classes sum to the LAI (eq. A.16).

 (A.16)

Each leaf area age class is calculated using an independent pool (eq. A.17).

 (A.17)

Every equation of the pools (i) consists of four terms. The input rate *IiLAI* (m² m⁻² day⁻¹) is the leaf area input for each part. For i = 1, *IiLAI* is the product of the specific leaf area, ν (m² kg⁻¹); the fraction of the leaf area, *flam* (-); and the actual growth rate of the shoot, *Gsh* (kg m⁻² day⁻¹). For i≠1, *IiLAI* is the LAI flow from the younger leaf area age class (i-1). The amount of flow is regulated by the turnover rate, *kturn* (day⁻¹). The degeneration of the LAI is controlled by the degradation rate, *kdeg* (day⁻¹); the LAI is also decreased by animal grazing, *OiLAI, an* (m² m⁻² day⁻¹), and harvesting, *OiLAI, hv* (m² m⁻² day⁻¹). The HPM animal model is not used in any part of this study. The stomatal conductance, *gs* (m s⁻¹), is calculated by a linear function, depending on the relative water content of the shoot, θsh (m³ m⁻³):

 (A.18)

*gs* is limited by a minimum conductance, *gs,min* (m s⁻¹), and a maximum conductance, *gs,max* (m s⁻¹), which exhibit the corresponding relative shoot water contents θgs,min (m³ m⁻³) and θgs,max (m³ m⁻³). The equation also depends on the day and night cycles, which are determined by the photosynthetic active radiation *Rp* (MJ m⁻² day⁻¹). The HPM assumes that the plant height is proportional to the LAI (*hcan* ∝ LAI). In other words, the harvest management option removes aboveground biomass and decreases the leaf area. Thus, harvest affects the actual transpiration, which significantly changes the latent and sensible heat fluxes.

The root water uptake was computed using the simple Feddes root model (Feddes et al., 2001). In this model, root biomass declines exponentially with rooting depth in the soil profile. The rooting depth of the simulated grasslands was assumed to be constant throughout the simulation period. Dynamic root growth affects energy fluxes due to plant water stress (Gayler et al., 2014), but the root distribution of all species is not known for this site.

**Soil water flow**

The volumetric soil water content, θsoil (m³ m⁻³) was simulated with the HYDRUS submodel (Simunek et al., 1998):

 (A.19)

In this equation, *S* (m³ m⁻³ day⁻¹) is the loss of soil water due to root water uptake; *K* (m day⁻¹) is the soil conductivity; *h* (m) describes the matric potential in the specific soil layer; *t* (day) is the time; and *z* (m) is the soil layer depth. Finite element discretization was used to calculate the water transport. The hydraulic properties were calculated using the van Genuchten - Mualem parametrization of the soil hydraulic properties (van Genuchten, 1980; Mualem, 1976). With the help of the site-specific soil properties (Roth, 2006) and the Rosetta software (Schaap et al., 2001), the van Genuchten parameters for the retention curve were estimated.

**Appendix A.2. Noah**

Noah (Chen and Dudhia, 2001) is a well-established LSM that is implemented in the Weather Research and Forecasting model (WRF) (Skamarock et al., 2008). A stand-alone 1-D model version of Noah can be used in an offline mode, This version employs atmospheric forcing at a temporal resolution of 30 min obtained from field measurements of short-wave and long-wave radiation, wind speed, temperature, precipitation, relative humidity, and air pressure (Chen et al., 1996b). Noah simulates several biophysical and hydrological processes. These processes control the latent and sensible heat fluxes between the land surface and the atmosphere.

**Surface energy**

The computation of the surface energy budget and the net radiation, R (W m⁻²), are similar to Expert-N 5.0 eq. 1 and eq. A.1, respectively. For more details, see van der Velde et al. (2009). The latent heat, *L* (W m⁻²), is the sum of soil evaporation, *Edir* (W m⁻²), evaporation of precipitation intercepted by the canopy, *Ec* (W m⁻²), and transpiration through the stomata, *Et* (W m⁻²):

 (A.20)

The soil evaporation, *Edir* (W m⁻²), follows the linear method of Mahfouf and Noilhan (1991):

 (A.21)

where *fc* (-) is the fractional vegetation cover; θsoil (m³ m⁻³) is the soil water content; *Levap* (MJ kg⁻¹) is the latent heat factor; *ρw* (Mg m⁻³) is the density of water; 106 ⋅ 3600-1 (h J s⁻¹ MJ) is a conversion factor; and ETpot (mm h⁻¹) is the potential evapotranspiration, which is obtained using the Penman-based diurnally dependent potential evaporation approach by Mahrt and Ek (1984). The subscripts “1,” “sat” and “dry” indicate the soil moisture content of the first soil layer, the saturated soil moisture content and the wilting point, respectively. The canopy evaporation, *Ec* (W m⁻²), is calculated by

 (A.22)

where θcan (kg m⁻²) and θcan,max (kg m⁻²) are the actual and maximum canopy moisture contents, respectively. The canopy transpiration *Et* (W m⁻²) is defined as

 (A.23)

where *Pc* (-) is the plant coefficient, which depends on wind speed, air temperature, surface pressure, and surface resistance.

The ground heat flux, *G* (W m⁻²), is calculated using the temperature gradient between the surface temperature, *Tskin* (K), and the mid-point temperature of the first soil layer, *Ts1* (K), multiplied by the thermal conductivity, κt (W m⁻² K⁻¹):

 (A.24)

κt is reduced compared to the bare soil κt by an exponential function of the LAI. The sensible heat flux, *Hs* (W m⁻²), is computed through the application of the bulk transfer relationships (e.g., Garratt (1993)):

 (A.25)

where *ρa* (kg m⁻³) is the mean air density; *cp* (MJ kg⁻¹ K⁻¹) is the specific heat of air; *CH* (-) is the surface exchange coefficient for heat; and τair (K) is the potential air temperature.

**Soil water flow**

Assuming a homogenous soil profile, the soil water content, θsoil (m³ m⁻³), is simulated using the diffusivity form of the Richards’ equation, which can be formulated as

 (A.26)

where κ (m s⁻¹) is the hydraulic conductivity; *D* (m s⁻¹) is the soil water diffusivity; *S* (m³ m⁻³s) represents sinks; and sources; and *z* (m) is the soil layer depth. The model works with four numerical layers and assumes a constant soil profile (Mahrt and Pan, 1984; Schaake et al., 1996). The relationship between the hydraulic conductivity, κ (m s⁻¹), and the soil water diffusivity, *D* (m s⁻¹), is defined by the formulation of Cosby et al. (1984b) for nine different soil types.

**Appendix B. Used Software**

* Expert - N Version: 5.0 Rev 605
* Noah Version 3.4.1 (Chen et al., 1996b, 1997; Chen and Dudhia, 2001; Ek et al., 2003; Koren et al., 1999)
* Rosetta Version 1.2 (Schaap et al., 2001)
* Matplotlib Version 1.3.1 (Hunter, 2007)
* NumPy 1.5 (Jones et al., 2001)

**Appendix C. Supplementary Material**

**Appendix C.1. Ground heat flux**

Ground heat fluxes are not unimportant for grassland systems compared to forest areas (Park et al., 2011) and cannot be neglected. For example, in tundra regions, *G* could amount to 25% of *Rn* during 1986-2004 (Park et al., 2008). The comparison of *G* and *Rn* from our simulations produced similar results.

The ground heat flux of the five models is presented in Fig. C.8. Due to the lack of measurements, the dynamics of ground heat fluxes could only be evaluated by comparisons between the simulations of the different model approaches.

In May during the day, the ground heat flux values of all models were mostly negative and reached values up to -190 W m⁻². (Fig. C.8a). Model I exhibited fluxes of approximately 50 W m⁻² during the night. No night time fluxes were observed in the other models.

In July (dry and hot), the amplitudes of ground heat flux dynamics were significantly lower in simulations by model III due to the overestimation of the LAI. (Fig. C.8b). Harvesting had an impact on models III-V: the minimum daily energy decreased from approximately -50 W m⁻² to approximately -200 W m⁻².

**Appendix C.2. Net radiation flux**

The net radiation flux of the five models is presented in Fig. C.9. In May, the measured diurnal dynamics of the net radiation fluxes were well simulated by all models and did not significantly differ (Fig. C.9 a).

In the scatter plot (Fig. C.9 c), the fitted mean lines of all models were parallel to the bisector of the first quadrant. The energies of models II-V were lower than the simulated values of model I, but all models overestimated the measured values.

In July (dry and hot), the results were almost identical to the results for May (Fig. C.9 a and Fig. C.9 b).
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**Figure captions**

Figure 1: Measured (asterisks) and simulated (solid lines) dynamics of the leaf area index (LAI) from March 1 - September 1, 2006. I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

Figure 2: Measured (dashed line) and simulated (solid lines) dynamics of the water-filled pore space (WFPS) at a soil depth of 0.05 m from March 1 - September 1, 2006. I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue).

Figure 3: Measured (dots) and simulated (solid lines) dynamics of latent heat flux (*L*) from a) May 2 - 13 (temperate, moist) and b) July 8 - 19 (hot, dry); c) and d) measured vs. simulated values. I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

Figure 4: Measured (dots) and simulated (solid lines) dynamics of sensible heat flux (*Hs*) from a) May 2 - 13 (temperate, moist) and b) July 8 - 19 (hot, dry); c) and d) measured vs. simulated values. I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

Figure 5: Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiencies (NSE; vertical bars) for the simulations of latent heat (*L*), sensible heat (*Hs*), net radiation (*Rn*) fluxes, and the averaged NSE (∅). The evaluated periods are May 2 - 13 (panel a), July 8 - 19 (panel b), and May 1 to September 1 (panel c); I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue).

Figure 6: Simulated (solid lines) daily dynamics of latent heat flux (panel a) and sensible heat flux (panel b) from March 1 to September 1, 2006; I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

Figure 7: Root mean square errors (RMSE; vertical bars) for the simulations of latent heat (*L*), sensible heat (*Hs*), net radiation (*Rn*) fluxes, and the averaged RMSE (∅). The evaluated periods are May 2 - 13 (panel a), July 8 - 19 (panel b), and May 1 to September 1 (panel c); I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue).

Figure C.8: Simulated (solid lines) dynamics of ground heat flux (*G*) from a) May 2 - 13 (temperate, moist) and b) July 8 - 19 (hot, dry). I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

Figure C.9: Measured (dots) and simulated (solid lines) dynamics of net radiation flux (*Rn*) from a) May 2 - 13 (temperate, moist) and b) July 8 - 19 (hot, dry); c) and d) measured vs. simulated values. I (pink), II (orange), III (red), IV (green) and V (blue). Vertical arrows are biomass harvest events.

**Tables**

Table 1. Description of the physical soil parameters for models II-V, which were executed in the Expert-N model environment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Property** | **Model II**† | **Models III-V**‡ |
|  | **Horizon** |
|  | **Ah** | **Bv** | **Go** | **Gr** | **elCv** |
| Thickness, cm | 200 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 20 | 50 |
| Numerical layers | 40 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 10 |
| Clay, % | 18.0 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 25.6 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Silt, % | 39.0 | 50.2 | 50.9 | 24.3 | 20.5 | 20.5 |
| Sand, % | 43.0 | 25.4 | 24.6 | 50.1 | 62.3 | 62.3 |
| Bulk density, g cm⁻³ | 1.39 | 1.11 | 1.33 | 1.57 | 1.57 | 1.57 |
| Porosity, % | 47.7 | 50.8 | 41.15 | 30.53 | 30.53 | 30.53 |
| Field capacity, % | 38.3 | 45.8 | 41.0 | 30.0 | 22.1 | 17.4 |
| Wilting point, % | 8.4 | 15.9 | 16.9 | 16.4 | 8.7 | 8.14 |
| Sat conductivity, mm day⁻¹ | 242.8 | 210 | 210 | 100 | 130 | 130 |
| Organic matter (%) | 1.98 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Rock fraction (%) | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 45.0 | 55.0 | 60.0 |
| pH (-) | 6.2 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 7.8 |

† following Cosby et al. (1984a) for soil-type ”loam”‡ following Roth (2006) for soil-type “Cambisol”

Table 2. Measurement devices of the site station in Chamau.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Instruments** | **Height** |
|  |  | m |
| Wind (three-dimensional sonic anemometer) | Solent R3, Gill Instruments  | 2.41 |
| H2O (open path infrared gas analyzer)  | IRGA, Li-7500, Li-Cor  | 2.41 |
| Air temperature and relative humidity  | HydroClip S3, Rotronic AG  | 2 |
| Photosynthetic photon flux density  | K&Z PARlite, Kipp & Zonen B.V.  | 2 |
| Short and long wave radiation  | CNR1 ventilated CNR1, Kipp & Zonen B.V. | 2 |
| Soil humidity  | ML2x, Delta-T Devices Ltd.  | -0.5 |

Table 3. Summary of the main differences among the five land-surface model approaches.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model name** | **Numerical layers** | **Horizons** | **Rooting depth** | **Profile depth** | **Harvest management** |
|  |  |  | cm | cm |  |
| I  | 4 | 1 | 100 | 200 | no† |
| II  | 40 | 1 | 100 | 200 | yes |
| III  | 26 | 5 | 130 | 130 | no |
| IV  | 26 | 5 | 30 | 130 | yes |
| V  | 26 | 5 | 130 | 130 | yes |

† monthly interpolated measured LAI values

Table 4. Submodel configuration of Expert-N 5.0.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Submodel name**  | **Operation** | **Reference** |
| DAYCENT | soil: carbon, nitrogen turnover  | Parton et al. (1998) |
| ADE LEACHN | soil: nitrogen transport  | Hutson and Wagenet (1992) |
| HYDRUS | soil: water transport  | Simunek et al. (1998) |
| van Genuchten & Mualem | hydraulic functions  | van Genuchten (1980); Mualem (1976) |
| Daisy heat transfer | soil: heat flux  | Hansen et al. (1991) |
| Hurley Pasture Model (HPM) | aboveground plant growth  | Thornley and Cannell (1997); Thornley (2001, 1998) |
| Feddes root model | root water transport  | Feddes et al. (2001) |

Table 5. List of adjusted HPM parameters. Original values by Thornley (2001, 1998) are in parentheses. The 324 remaining plant model parameters were applied as presented in Thornley (2001, 1998).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of the parameter** | **Value** | **Reference** |
| Maximum stomatal conductance, m s⁻¹ (leaf m⁻²) | 0.010 (0.005) | Schulze (1994); Kelliher et al. (1995); Monteith (1993) |
| Proportional factor of LAI to canopy height, m (leaf m⁻²) (ground m⁻²)  | 0.15 (0.026) | measured† |
| Conversion yield factor for structural plant growth | 0.78 (0.75) | Amthor (2000) |
| Lamina partition factor | 0.83 (0.7) | Robson (1973) |
| Michaelis-Menten constant for nitrogen uptake, kgN m⁻² | 0.002 (0.003) | Alt (2000); Peuke etal. (1996) |
| Nitrogen uptake inhibition parameter, kg N kg⁻¹ | 0.01 (0.005) | Thornley (1998) |

† adjusted to match C and N concentrations in soil and plant substrates