Interactive comment on “Investigating the usefulness of satellite derived fluorescence data in inferring gross primary productivity within the carbon cycle data assimilation system”
by E. N. Koffi et al.

General comments

We thank the 3 reviewers for their constructive comments, which undoubtedly improve the clarity of the manuscript. In what follows, we first describe the main objectives of the project with an emphasis on the specific work presented in the paper. We then summarize the main findings. Finally, we reply to the major criticisms of the reviewers. For the specific comments, our responses are given after the comments of each reviewer.

Our ultimate goal is to use the solar induced fluorescence (SIF) observed by satellite to constrain the gross primary productivity (GPP) within the Carbon-Cycle Data assimilation System (CCDAS) framework. We ingest SIF measurements into the CCDAS built around the Soil Canopy Observations, Photometry and Energy fluxes (SCOPE) model. The formulations of both the GPP and SIF in SCOPE utilize the maximum carboxylation rate V_{cmax}, which is expected to mediate information from SIF to GPP within the CCDAS. This specific work mainly investigates the sensitivity of both SIF and GPP to the environmental conditions (mainly the short wave radiation R_{in} and the integrated absorbed photosynthetically active radiation aPAR) and the biochemical parameters of the SCOPE model (mainly V_{cmax} and the leaf chlorophyll concentration C_{ab}), with a focus on V_{cmax}. The tests are performed along with various values of the leaf area index (LAI) and for both C3 and C4 vegetation types. In addition, we examine the sensitivity of both GPP and SIF to aPAR, which integrates both the LAI and the incoming radiation. The paper starts by an assessment of these sensitivities by using the model SCOPE alone. Then, the CCDAS built around SCOPE is forced by monthly climate data to investigate the ability of the CCDAS to reproduce SIF measurements at the frequency 755 nm over 2009-2010 period.

In summary, the idealized tests with SCOPE standalone confirm the strong sensitivity of GPP to both V_{cmax} and aPAR (also to R_{in}). However, the current version of SCOPE model does not show any sensitivity of GPP to C_{ab}. Simulated SIF is insensitive to V_{cmax} under low light conditions and the sensitivity slightly increases under high light conditions, but it is strongly sensitive to both C_{ab} and aPAR (also to the incoming radiation). The built CCDAS simulates well the patterns of SIF suggesting that the combined model is able to ingest these measurements. Within the CCDAS SIF is sensitive to aPAR and C_{ab}, but it is insensitive to $V_{cmax.}$

The major criticisms of the submitted manuscript by the reviewers concern:

1) The weak sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} that contradicts the strong sensitivity reported in the study of Zhang et al. (2014)
2) The lack of the sensitivity of GPP to C_{ab} in the SCOPE model that contradicts the published positive relationship between the two variables
3) The lack of the comparison of SCOPE modelled GPP to observed GPP such as those from FLUXNET to illustrate the diurnal variations of SCOPE simulations
4) The lack of sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} within the CCDAS
5) The lack of clarity of the abstract

1. As already acknowledged in the discussions of the submitted version of the paper, to understand the differences between our results and those from Zhang et al. (2014), we carefully made detailed analysis by using the SCOPE model alone and SCOPE settings reported in Zhang et al. (2014). For the environmental input (temperature and short wave radiation), we used their values over a large range. Thus, we made simulations of SIF by using the C4 crop (here corn and soybean) with SIF retrieved at the frequency 740 nm. The tests are carried out by using the SCOPE model with the fluorescence model choice “0” (i.e., the parameter K_n is obtained by an empirical fit to Flexas’data; version 1.53 of SCOPE model). In detail, the relevant settings of SCOPE used in our study can be described as follows: the radiation varies from 1 to 1200 W/m^2; V_{cmax} varies from 1 to 350 $\mu mol\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$; temperature varies from 10^oC to 30^oC; C_{ab} values from 1 to 80 $\mu g\ cm^{-2}$. Several values of LAI (between 0.1 and 6) are also considered.

   The strongest sensitivity for SIF was found for a temperature input of 28^oC, a LAI of 6 (See Figure S41 in the Section S4 of the Supplementary material). This optimal simulation sensitivity does not reach the magnitude seen in Zhang et al. (2014). Using these inputs, SIF almost double between V_{cmax} values of 10 and 200 $\mu mol\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$, whereas Zhang et al. (2014) sees SIF increases by a factor greater than three (See Figure 3 in Zhang et al., 2014). Again, with the current version of SCOPE we are using, we do not find such a strong sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} as obtained from Zhang et al. (2014). Our results do show a weak sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} under low light condition and this sensitivity slightly increases with the increase of the radiation , but only for a large proportional increase of V_{cmax} (e.g., between 10 and 75$\mu mol\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$) related to the growing period of the crops (Figure S41 in the Supplementary material).

   In addition, we also investigated the sensitivity of SIF to both C_{ab} and LAI and as already reported in the paper, SIF is strongly sensitive to these two parameters (Figure S41 in the Supplementary material).

2. The version of SCOPE used in this study shows a very weak sensitivity of GPP to the chlorophyll content (C_{ab}), which is obtained only for small C_{ab}. Effectively, this contradicts established positive relationship between the two variables as reported in Fleischer (1935) and more recently in Gitelson et al. (2006). As already mentioned in the discussions of the submitted version of the manuscript, in the current version of the SCOPE model, C_{ab} and V_{cmax} are independent parameters, but in reality they are correlated. A nitrogen scheme as a more explicit link between C_{ab} and GPP may be required in the model. Moreover, as stated in van der Tol et al. (2014), the computation of the fluorescence yield Φ_{Fm} (Eq.2 in this paper) depends on the parameter K_n, which is unknown and there is no theoretical basis to constrain it. Thus, an empirical relationship of K_n is used to calculate Φ_{Fm}. In the current version of the model SCOPE, there are two parameterizations of K_n. In this paper, we use the parameterization of K_n from a Flexas’ dataset that includes drought stress, as noted within the model. Nevertheless, we have tested the other parameterization and large differences are found from their SIF output. Consequently, more research is needed to consolidate SIF modeling in SCOPE biochemistry model as there can be a notable effect of different models for K_n on the photosystem yields and subsequent sensitivity of SIF.

These comments are now used in the discussions at the relevant part.

3. The photosynthesis equations within SCOPE are in common use within the land-surface modeling community. They are based upon Farquhar et al. (1980) and Collatz et al. (1992) photosynthesis models for C3 and C4 plants respectively (see van der Tol et al., 2009). SIF calculations are performed after the calculation of photosynthetic yield in the biochemical module. Thus we may assume these photosynthesis equations have been tested extensively in the past. Additionally, any comparison of SCOPE GPP to observed (e.g. fluxnet) would likely require an in depth analysis of the canopy radiative transfer and other “new” aspects of the model which is outside the aims of the current study.

   Nevertheless, we have now made SCOPE simulations using temperature and incoming short wave radiation observed at two FLUXNET stations: Hyytiala (acronym FI-Hyy, longitude/latitude of 24.295^o/61.847^o) and Roccarespampani 1 (acronym IT-Ro1 11.93^o/42.408^o). The FLUXNET data is described in e.g., Baldocchi (2003) and Papale et al. (2006) with the dedicated website from: http://www.fluxnet.ornl.gov. Unfortunately, we do not have any observed LAI data at these selected stations. We have then used the monthly LAIs of the biosphere model BETHY, which are relevant for the vegetation of the FLUXNET station. Note that we used these BETHY LAIs in the CCDAS built around SCOPE in this study. For this exercise, we keep constant the V_{cmax}. The modelled GPPs are compared against the FLUXNET ones. Note also that these stations have no observed SIF.

   As an illustration of the diurnal variations of both the simulated and observed GPP together with the input variables and also the simulated SIF at the station Hyytiala are shown in Figure 4 in the revised version of the paper. This new Figure replaces the one in the submitted version of the paper (i.e., diurnal variations at Cabauw). Overall, results obtained from these two stations clearly show that SCOPE model can nicely reproduce the diurnal observed GPP with meaningful choices of both LAI and V_{cmax} values (See Figure 4 in the revised version of the paper and also Figure S21 in the Supplementary material).

   The seasonal variations of these quantities are computed for some years at each of the two selected sites and shown in Figures S22 and S23. The model reproduces quite well the observed GPP. However, the simulated SCOPE GPP peak over a year occurs earlier (within 1-2 months) than observed ones. This result is maybe caused by both LAI and V_{cmax} of BETHY which seem apparently large during the growing season of the vegetation at these sites. Note that in these simulations, the LAIs are kept constant during a whole month and V_{cmax} is set constant for each BETHY PFT. The results of these preliminary analyses can be then reinforced by using e.g., the satellite MODIS weekly LAI data relevant for these stations.

   Since the detailed evaluation of the SCOPE GPP is beyond the scope of this study, we do not repeat the exercise for either other FLUXNET stations or compute any metrics that quantify the performance of the model in reproducing GPP. These preliminary analyses reinforce our aim to use the CCDAS to optimize the V_{cmax} given the climate data (including meteo, LAI). Indeed, the differences between SCOPE modelled GPP and FLUXNET one depend on both LAI and V_{cmax}.

4. The reviewer #4 argues that the lack of the sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} in the CCDAS is mainly due to the fact that the simulations are performed under low light conditions. As an illustration of the effect of incoming radiation on the SIF to V_{cmax} sensitivity, we show the SIF-V_{cmax} relationship under six radiation conditions ranging from 10 to 1200 Wm^{-2}, with a chlorophyll content of 40 ug cm^{-2} and LAI of 3 (See Section 1 of Supplementary material Figure S12). This shows that even under very high radiation conditions the sensitivity may still be considered low to moderate. We have examined in detailed the values of the short wave radiation (R_{in}) used in the CCDAS simulations. We derived the mean, median, and quartiles together with the minimum and maximum values of these R_{in} at global and regional (North Hemisphere, Tropics, and South Hemisphere) scales (See Figure S31 in the Section S3 of the Supplementary material for details). Overall, R_{in} values used in the CCDAS are mostly under moderate light conditions (around 400-600 W/m^2), but at some pixels R_{in} values can be larger than 800 W/m^2. Also, as described in the Section 3.2 of the paper, the CCDAS simulates hourly SIF and GPP for one representative day in a month. We do that because the computation of fluorescence SIF is time demanding. We then compute both SIF and GPP only at 12 h local time, i.e., around the time of their peaks during a sunny day. Thus, in accordance with the idealized tests, these light conditions used to force the CCDAS can explain only a small part of the lack of sensitivity of SIF to $_{Vcmax}$. The range of V_{cmax} used in the CCDAS does explain the great part of the lack of the sensitivity. Indeed, as clearly shown in Figure 3 of the paper (also Figure S13 in the Supplementary material) dealing with the sensitivity of simulated SIF to V_{cmax} for various R_{in} values, even under high light conditions (i.e., R_{in}> 600 W/m^2), the sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} is still low between two consecutive V_{cmax} values. As an example, at R_{in} value of 800 W/m^2, we see little difference in SIF between V_{cmax} 75 and 125 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}. The largest difference in SIF of about 1 W m^{-2} μm^{-1} sr^{-1} is found for V_{cmax} between 10 and 250 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}. Such a rapid increase of V_{cmax} may occur only during the growing season. Thus, except during the growing period of the vegetation, simulated SIF is insensitive to $V_{cmax.}$

   Moreover, the SCOPE simulations using FLUXNET data for high light conditions do not also show any sensitivity of SIF to V_{cmax} (see Figure 4 of the revised paper and other results described in the Section S2 of the Supplementary material).

   In conclusion, we still think that SCOPE SIF is not enough sensitive to V_{cmax} in its current version. Hence, we do not amend our conclusions about the sensitivity of SCOPE SIF to V_{cmax}.

5. The abstract has been revised as follows:

   Simulations of carbon fluxes with terrestrial biosphere models still exhibit significant uncertainties, in part due to the uncertainty in model parameter values. With the advent satellite measurements of solar induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF), there exists a novel pathway for constraining simulated carbon fluxes and parameter values. We investigate the utility of SIF in constraining gross primary productivity (GPP), the downward flux of carbon into the terrestrial biosphere. As a first test we assess whether SIF simulations are sensitive to important parameters in a biosphere model. SIF measurements at the wavelength of 755 nm are simulated by the Carbon-Cycle Data Assimilation System (CCDAS) which has been augmented by the fluorescence component of the Soil Canopy Observation, Photochemistry and Energy fluxes (SCOPE) model.

Idealized sensitivity tests of the SCOPE model stand-alone indicate strong sensitivity of GPP to the carboxylation capacity (V_{cmax}) and of SIF to the chlorophyll content (C_{ab}) and incoming radiation. Low sensitivity is found of SIF to V_{cmax}, however the relationship is subtle, with increased sensitivity under high radiation conditions and lower V_{cmax} ranges.

CCDAS simulates well the patterns of satellite measured SIF suggesting the combined model is capable of ingesting the data. CCDAS supports the idealized sensitivity tests of SCOPE, with SIF exhibiting sensitivity to C_{ab} and incoming radiation, both of which are treated as perfectly known in previous CCDAS versions. These results demonstrate the need for careful consideration of C_{ab} and incoming radiation when interpreting SIF, and the limitations of utilizing SIF to constrain V_{cmax} in the present set-up.

References

Baldocchi, D. D. (2003), Assessing the eddy covariance technique for evaluating carbon dioxide exchange rates of ecosystems: past, present and future. Global Change Biology, 9, 479–492.

Gitelson, A. A., A. Vin˜a, S. B. Verma, D. C. Rundquist, T. J. Arkebauer, G. Keydan, B. Leavitt, V. Ciganda, G. G. Burba,and A. E. Suyker (2006), Relationship between gross primary production and chlorophyll content in crops: Implications for the synoptic monitoring of vegetation productivity, J. Geophys. Res., 111, D08S11, doi:10.1029/2005JD006017

Papale D., Reichstein, M., Aubinet, M., Canfora, E., Bernhofer, C., Kutsch, W., Longdoz, B., Rambal, S., Valentini, R., Vesala, T., and Yakir, D.: Towards a standardized processing of Net Ecosystem Exchange measured with eddy covariance technique: algorithms and uncertainty estimation. Biogeosciences, 3, 571–583, 2006.

Interactive comment on “Investigating the usefulness of satellite derived fluorescence data in inferring gross primary productivity within the carbon cycle data assimilation system” by E. N. Koffi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 8 February 2015

In what follows, the comments of the reviewer are in italic and our reply in normal face. The pages and lines indicated in our responses are those in the revised version of the manuscript, otherwise it is specified.

General comments

The opportunity of using solar induced fluorescence (SIF) data obtained from satellites opens new perspectives in the study of vegetation-atmosphere interaction. In fact, differently from reflectance, fluorescence is produced by plants as direct result of their biological activity, so it has the potential of being a direct measure of photosynthesis. The efforts aimed at implementing SIF data into biogeochemical modeling have therefore a great potential in global carbon cycle studies. The CCDAS model used in the present work by Koffi and colleagues, with his prognostic capabilities, is apparently an adequate tool for testing SIF data potential.

In the current study, the Authors tried to implement into CCDAS a module coming from another model, SCOPE, and to derive fluorescence and gross primary productivity at regional and global scale, essentially moving from absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (aPAR) data and chlorophyll content information.

Results are realistic in terms of modelled GPP and SIF, but is worth mentioning that both variables are linked with aPAR, so it is not clear what is the real improvement coming from of the current modeling effort. It seems to me instead, that equifinality exists between fluorescence and aPAR (and possibly also with chlorophyll content and Vcmax). I’m possibly biased toward data-oriented semi-empirical models, but I would find more interesting to see model outputs obtained using SIF measured data as an input, possibility mentioned at the end of the paper.

Unfortunately the problem isn't equifinality. Equifinality occurs when many different values of the target variables project onto the same value of the observable. In that case there is information on the target variables available from the observations but it is not independent information on each target variable. If there is little sensitivity of an observable to a target variable we cannot extract much information from the observations, even if the observable is a function of only that variable. The more general question of model structure is an interesting one. Put bluntly we can ask "Is SCOPE a good model?" That's a model evaluation question. It must be addressed but not here.

There are also aspects not fully convincing in the model output, like the relation between chlorophyll content and GPP (Fig. 2d), apparently contradicting the well established positive relationship between the two variables (Fleischer, 1935). This is acknowledged at the end of the

paper, where a potential effect of Nitrogen content is also invoked, but highlights anyway the limits of the current modeling exercise.
We reply to this in the item 2) of our general comments. We now quote this study. See page 18, lines 15-17

What I find to be missing, in order to properly evaluate the results from the current modeling activity, is an independent testing of the results in terms of modelled GPP. Since thousand of site-years of GPP data are available from the FLUXNET database, I strongly recommend to perform model-data comparison in a revised version of the paper, instead of using a single period of a FLUXNET site (probably Cabauw, NL, 2006) in which GPP data were not available, as in the current version of the paper.
We have made SCOPE simulations by using meteorological data (here temperature and incoming short wave radiation) observed at two FLUXNET stations: Hyytiala (acronym FI-Hyy, longitude/latitude of $24.295^{o}/61.847^{o}$) and Roccarespampani1 (acronym IT-Ro1 $11.93^{o}/42.408^{o}$). The diurnal variations of both the simulated and observed GPP together with the input variables and also the simulated SIF at the station Hyytiala during summertime are shown in Figure 4, which replaces the one in the submitted version of the paper (i.e., diurnal variations at Cabauw). For details, see item 3) in our general comments. See page 20 in Section 4.1.3.

Specific comments

The abstract is extremely short and not very informative: which are the main findings from the current study?
The abstract has been revised

Page (P) 708, Line (L) 16-18. The term 'system' is repeated three times, probably with different meanings. As a result, the sentences are somewhat hermetic.
The sentences have been clarified. See page 3, from line 8.

P708 L21: 'Recent work have': Please check grammar. It is p709 L21
OK. Done. See page 4, from line 14

P709 L24, P710 L2: 'data are', 'data is': Please be consistent.
OK. We correct with "data is". See page 4, line 17

P710 L1: The CCDAS model is clearly presented in Scholze et al., 2007, while here information on its structure is missing. I prefer self-standing papers, so I recommend a short overview of that model also here.
The main components of the CCDAS were already defined in the introduction and now clarified when describing the CCDAS built around BETHY. Also, the work of Scholze et al. (2007) has been cited in this paragraph. We still think that enough information is given in the paper for the description of the CCDAS which prevents to lengthen it. For more details, the readers may report to the cited works. See page 3, from line 14

P711L27: 'The vegetation is characterized by different values of the leaf area index (LAI).' I guess the Authors refer to the parameter vector representing vegetation.

We are talking about the idealized tests when using the SCOPE model alone. Thus, the different values of the leaf area index (LAI) concern the single values used in the sensitivity tests as shown in Figure 2. This has been clarified in the text by adding that these LAI values are for the idealized tests. See page 7, line 2.

P713L1: 'from absorbed fluxes': which kind of fluxes?

Replaced by "radiative fluxes". See page 8, line 9

P716L7: '13 plant functional types (PFT) based on Wilson and Henderson-Sellers (1985)': Unfortunately, these 13 plant functional types are not defined elsewhere in the text, and in the mentioned paper from Wilson and Henderson-Sellers a total of 80 land cover classes and 8 grouped land cover classes were defined.

In fact these 13 PFTs are defined in Table 1. This is clarified by quoting the Table 1 in this sentence. See page 11, line 22.

P718: 'vapour pressure'. It is not clear to me which kind of information the Authors try to capture from vapour pressure information. In plant physiology it is well established a linkage between the vapour pressure deficit (dew point water vapour pressure observed vapour pressure) and stomatal conductance and also GPP (e.g. Duursma et al., 2014), but I'm not aware of a direct link between plant physiological responses and air water pressure. The same at P723L7 and in Fig. 4a.

It is effectively misleading. We are talking about the air vapour pressure at leaf level used to compute the internal CO_2 concentration of the leaf in the biochemical model. This has been clarified where needed in the text. As an example, we clarify this at page 14, line 22

P722L7: Since aPAR appears to be a key variable in this modelling, it is not clear to me why the authors do not show it in the graphs.

This comment concerns the graphs in Figure 2. Effectively, we do not show the aPAR on this Figure because we have the intent here to examine the sensitivity of both GPP and Fs to input data. As already reported in the submitted version of the paper, we also produced the graphs with aPAR. The graphs with aPAR are now given in the Supplementary material (See Section S1).

P725 L20-21: 'regional: : :regions'? Please correct.

The sentence is reformulated as "Correlations are computed at global and regional (southern hemisphere, tropics, and southern hemisphere) scales and over the studied period". See page 23, lines 20-21.

P729L19-20: 'Any model seeking to use Fs should therefore account for chlorophyll concentration.' I think that the Authors are doing a merely inductive reasoning while making this statement. They tested a single model only, indeed.

The sentence is replaced by "This study also shows that the use of Fs measurement in the model should account for chlorophyll concentration". See page 28, lines 19-20.

P 731L15-16: 'We have seen a strong linear relationship between the fluorescence Fs and aPAR.' Is this an observational result or a modeling result?
Both. As an example, the results in Figure 6 show a strong correlation between modelled Fs and aPAR and a good correlation between measured Fs and aPAR from the CCDAS simulations. The sentence is then reformulated as "We have seen a good linear relationship between the fluorescence Fs and aPAR". See page 31, lines 4-5.

Figure 4. Looking at the main x axis and at the represented daily patterns, it seems that both GPP and fluorescence have a peak at midnight in the second day of the time series. It looks strange.
This Figure is replaced by a new Figure (see our comments above).

Captions of Fig. 5 are really unclear, consider rewriting.
The captions have been clarified.

Figure 6 is difficult to be understood, since the colours representing the different PFTs are not defined.
This has been clarified.

Cited References

Duursma R.A., C. V.M. Barton, Y.-S. Lin, B. E. Medlyn, D. Eamus D.T. Tissue, D. S. Ellsworth, R. E. McMurtrie, (2014) The peaked response of transpiration rate to vapour pressure deficit in field conditions can be explained by the temperature optimum of photosynthesis, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 189–190, 2–10.

Fleischer, W. E. (1935). The relation between chlorophyll content and rate of photosynthesis. J. Gen. Physiol., 18: 573-597.

Scholze, M., Kaminski, T., Rayner, P., Knorr, W., and Giering, R. (2007). Propagating uncertainty through prognostic carbon cycle data assimilation system simulations, J. Geophys. Res.,112, D17305, doi:10.1029/2007JD008642.

Interactive comment on "Investigating the usefulness of satellite derived fluorescence data in inferring gross primary productivity within the carbon cycle data assimilation system" by E. N. Koffi et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 February 2015

In what follows, the comments of the reviewer are in italic and our reply in normal face. The pages and lines indicated in our responses are those in the revised version of the manuscript, otherwise it is specified.

General Comments

The paper by Koffi et al. investigates the utility of satellite SIF measurements in constraining GPP. The motivation is that the relationship between SIF and photosynthesis is complex and that a common parameter linking the 2 together is needed to use this constraint effectively. The primary finding that simulated SIF is less sensitive to Vcmax than aPAR and chlorophyll concentration (Cab) is an important one both for the assimilation of SIF as well as advancing our understanding of the SIF-GPP relationship. The authors note in the conclusion that this finding directly contradicts Zhang et al. [2014] and even address this inconsistency with a couple experiments. However, the most important factor the authors forgot to consider was that the Zhang result was based on cropland vegetation. The authors mention C4 vegetation in general but I feel a more thorough analysis of SCOPE cropland SIF sensitivity to Vcmax, Cab, and aPAR is needed to reconcile this important result. Otherwise, the paper is well written and the methods/results mostly convincing. I would recommend this paper for publication after these and other revisions.

Our responses on the differences between our results and those from Zhang et al. (2014) are given in the item 1) of our general comments. As Zhang et al. (2014), we use the same biochemical scheme in SCOPE for C4 vegetation, which is called C4 crop (i.e., corn and soybean).

Specific Comments

The author's reasoning to investigate diurnal variations at a site (as described on P719, L20) that did not observe SIF or GPP is unclear. It would be more useful to investigate one of the hundreds of global FLUXNET flux tower sites that measure GPP. If it's due to lack of driver data this reason should be explained in the text. If it's not much extra work, it would be interesting to see if model and observed SIF and GPP show similar day-to-day changes in diurnal amplitude.

We have made SCOPE simulations by using meteorological data (here temperature and incoming short wave radiation) observed at two FLUXNET stations: Hyytiala (acronym FI-Hyy, longitude/latitude of $24.295^o/61.847^o$) and Roccarespampani1 (acronym IT-Ro1 $11.93^o/42.408^o$).

The diurnal variations of both the simulated and observed GPP together with the input variables and also the simulated SIF at the station Hyytiala during summertime are shown in Figure 4, which replaces the one in the submitted version of the paper (i.e., diurnal variations at Cabauw). For details, see item 3) in our general comments. See page 20 in Section 4.1.3.

There are a couple issues in the calculation of Person correlation coefficient described on P724. (1) please clarify if the pair of data chosen is based on monthly averages or single measurements; (2) negative values are signals and should be included in computation of monthly average and in correlations to avoid high bias in SIF observations; (3) the definition of "linear correlation is significant" on L18 is confusing; (4) be more specific in definition of "small" correlation on L20; (5) for the low correlation pixels, please state explicitly that the reason for low correlation are the list of cases described starting at the end of P724. In general, in Section 4.2.1 please state that filtering analysis uses two sets of criteria: high correlation and S4 model set up)

1) The satellite data we are using is the monthly averages (Frankenberg et al., 2011). The CCDAS simulates hourly SIF and GPP for one representative day in a month. We do that because the computation of fluorescence SIF is time demanding. Thus, we compute both SIF and GPP only at 12 h local time, i.e., around the time of their peaks during a sunny day.
2) We agree with reviewer that measured negative values of SIF are signal. However, the SCOPE model does not simulate such SIF negative values. Hence, considering the observed negative values of SIF will systematic bias the result. To avoid this, we only consider only positive measured SIF in the comparison. This is now clarified in the text
3) Here, we say that for the 14 pair of data, the linear correlation is significant at the 10% level of significance with Pearson coefficient (R) greater than 0.43. This is now clarified in the text
4) The term "small " has been replaced by "smaller than 0.43"
5) Yes, we now clarify the text by explicitly stating that the reason for low correlation (here R< 0.43) are the list of cases

See Section 4.2.1, from page 21

The result that Cab controls SIF but not GPP (P729, L16-20) is an important result that may help better quantify and interpret the statistics describing the relationship between SIF and GPP. Please discuss.

The variance in the relationship between simulated both SIF and GPP is then dominated by V_{cmax} and C_{ab}. We have already mentioned this in the conclusion of the submitted version of the paper (Section 6). However, we put this sentence in this Section too. See e.g., page 29, lines 16-17

P730, L9-10: The result of variance across vegetation types has been shown by Guanter et al. [2012] and Parazoo et al. [2014] and should be cited.

We already cited Guanter et al. (2012) in page 729, line 25. We now cite the both works where relevant. See e.g., page 29, lines 15-17

Lack of sensitivity of SIF to Vcmax: Zhang et al. [2014] showed high sensitivity in croplands and for very large values of Vcmax. Have the authors considered cropland vegetation types in this study?

Yes, but we have reproduced partly their results. We give more details on these comparisons in our general comments. See also page 30, from line 2

Technical Comments

P710, L15: Reference should be Lee et al. (2013)
Done. See page 5, line 11

P718, L5: Replace workers with investigators
Done. See page 13, line 21.

P724, L6-8: These sentences feel redundant and need rewording
OK. The sentences are simplified. See page 22, from line 1

Cited references

Guanter, L., Frankenberg, C., Dudhia, A et al. (2012) Retrieval and global assessment of terrestrial chlorophyll fluorescence from GOSAT space measurements, RSE, 121, 236-251.

Parazoo, N. C., K. Bowman, J. B. Fisher, et al. (2014) Terrestrial gross primary production inferred from satellite fluorescence and vegetation models, doi:10.1111/gcb.12652

Interactive comment on "Investigating the usefulness of satellite derived fluorescence data in inferring gross primary productivity within the carbon cycle data assimilation system" by E. N. Koffi et al.

Anonymous Referee #4

Received and published: 10 February 2015

In what follows, the comments of the reviewer are in italic and our reply in normal face. The pages and lines indicated in our responses are those in the revised version of the manuscript, otherwise it is specified.

The present study attempts to evaluate the usefulness of space-borne measurements of solar-induced fluorescence (SIF) data in constraining GPP within a Carbon Cycle Data Assimilation System (CCDAS). The recent available satellite SIF data has provided a new perspective on monitoring broad-scale vegetation photosynthesis as chlorophyll fluorescence is central to photosynthesis. In the current study, the authors used CCDAS as an additional tool to investigate the potential of SIF as a complementary to some recent work. The results are quite meaningful. However, there are some major issues which are needed to be addressed.

General comments

In this study, they found that fluorescence is not sensitive to the key parameter (Vcmax) of a coupled photosynthesis-fluorescence model, which directly contradicts with a recent work by Zhang et al. (2014) as they stated in their conclusion. They also found that fluorescence is more sensitive to chlorophyll concentration (Cab) but GPP not. These findings also contradict with the results from FLEX/Sentinel-3 Tandem Mission Photosynthesis Study – FINAL REPORT (Mohammed et al., 2014) in which they showed that fluorescence is more sensitive to Vcmax than Cab both for C3 and C4 plants.

Effectively, the sensitivities reported in Mohammed et al. (2014) show that SIF is more sensitive to V_{cmax} than C_{ab} mostly at the frequency 687 nm and these sensitivities seem depend on the range of the V_{cmax} and C_{ab} values used for the computation of these sensitivities (Pages 79-80 of the report). We have simulated SIF at the frequency 687 nm and effectively SIF is more sensitive to V_{cmax} than C_{ab} over the range of C_{ab} and V_{cmax} used in their study. When simulating at the frequency 687 nm, SIF is found to be more sensitive to C_{ab} for only very low C_{ab} values (< 10 μg cm^{-2}), while SIF is strongly sensitive to V_{cmax} over a large range of V_{cmax} values. Hence, the results from Mohammed et al. (2014) do not contradict our results, but the differences between the two conclusions clearly illustrate the need to specify the settings of SCOPE when making comparison with other studies.

The reason for such a difference between the current study and Zhang et al. (2014), in my opinion, is due to the following:

(1) Under light saturation conditions (high light illuminations), plants photosynthesis is limited by Rubsico maximum carboxylation rate (Vcmax) in the Faquahar et al. model, and hence for fluorescence in the model. In the Figure 2a of their study, the authors show the sensitivity of SIF to Vcmax at an incoming radiation level of 500 W/m2 (Rin). In the study of Zhang et al. (2014),

they focused the analysis during the growing season at crop sites. The Rin in these crop sites (e.g., Mead sites) can be more than 900 W/m2 (generally larger than 700) around noon during July and August. Hence, the radiation level in the current study may be too low as they stated in their manuscript in P726, Line 3-4. This level of radiation may be still in light-limited conditions for plants. In the study of Zhang et al. (2014), they also pointed out that the sensitivity of SIF to Vcmax is not high during the early or late growing season.

This is the most important factor why the simulated Fs is not sensitive to Vcmax. As stated in the study of van der Tol, et al., (2015), ' When light is in excess or stress develops there is a reduction in the fluorescence yield and the slope of the dependence of SIF on light intensity declines. This is the basis for inversions to obtain Vcmo [Zhang et al., 2014]. With increasing stress or reductions in Vcmax at constant light (as would occur with repeated sun synchronous satellite observations), SIF would be observed to decrease. The extent of this decrease may depend on the severity and type of stress.'.

(2) The study of Zhang et al. (2014) focused on the cropland, especially for C4 crop (corn). The authors need to mention this when making the comparisons.
(3) The current study used monthly observed climate data including incident radiation to drive SCOPE which gave smaller radiation values as they mentioned. While Zhang et al. (2014) used field instantaneous meteorological and other measurements (e.g., LAI etc) which represent more actual conditions. As they stated in P731 Line 1-3, if they optimally chose temperature and LAI, they could reproduced a sensitivity about 2/3 that shown in Zhang et al. (2014). This means that the data set they used to drive SCOPE has given some uncertainties for the sensitivity analysis. This raised the concern whether they can used mean monthly observed data for SCOPE since it need instantaneous driver especially for radiation. This should be discussed carefully.
Our responses are given in items 1) and 4) in our general comments

In summary, the authors need specify and mention the different conditions when they compare with other studies.
The different settings when comparing our results to those of Zhang et al. (2014) are now given in a new Table (Table 2). Otherwise, the settings are specified in the legends of the figures.

The Abstract is not clear at the current stage. They should clearly state their main findings.
The abstract has been revised

Their Fig.3a is similar to the Figure 12 (lower left) in the study of van der Tol, et al.,(2015), but with lower sensitivity of Fs to Vcmax. This needs to be discussed and explained.
The analysis presented in van der Tol et al. (2014) (Figure 12) deals with fluorescence flux at leaf level, while SIF in Figure 3 is computed at the canopy level, as described in the Section 2.1.1 of the paper. In fact, van der Tol et al. (2014) argued that "*in the canopy, leaf illumination is variable among leaves, and the relationship after aggregating over all leaves may differ from what we presented here* (i.e. in their Figure 12)". That is exactly what we obtained in this study (e.g., Figure 3). See page 19, from line 18.
Moreover, we do not use the same K_n model when computing the fluorescence yield (see item 2) in our general comments for more details)

For the diurnal simulations, they could use other FluxNet sites to make the comparison with the SIF and GPP measurements. This would make the diurnal simulations more meaningful.
We have made SCOPE simulations by using meteorological data (here temperature and incoming short wave radiation) observed at two FLUXNET stations: Hyytiala (acronym FI-Hyy, longitude/latitude of 24.295^o/61.847^o) and Roccarespampani1 (acronym IT-Ro1 11.93^o/42.408^o). The diurnal variations of both the simulated and observed GPP together with the input variables and also the simulated SIF at the station Hyytiala during summertime are shown in Figure 4, which replaces the one in the submitted version of the paper (i.e., diurnal variations at Cabauw). For details, see item 3) in our general comments. See page 20 in Section 4.1.3.

LAI is a more important parameter for both SIF and GPP simulations. In the sensitivity analysis in 3.1, why don't they provide the sensitivity analysis for LAI?
The sensitivity analysis for LAI was already discussed in either the idealized tests (Figure 2) or the CCDAS simulations where the LAIs are provided at each grid cell of the model at global scale. Thus, in Figure 2 of the paper, the graphs are generated for several values of LAIs. As expected, both SIF and GPP are sensitive to LAI and this sensitivity slightly decreases for large LAI values (>4). Comments about these results were already mentioned in the submitted version of the paper in Section 4.1.1. See page 17, from line 5 in the revised text

Specific & minor points (reference is made to page P and line L numbers):

P708 L7-8: Need specify the result is for low-light conditions within the CCDAS.
The short wave radiation values used in the CCDAS span large range representing low and high light conditions. Therefore, we do not mention this. See item 4) in our general comments for further details. Also, see Section 3.2, from page 16, from line 1 (revised text)

P708 L14: The natural terrestrial carbon flux
OK. Done. See page 3, line 1

P708 L14: This sentence is not clear.
The sentence has been clarified. Page 3, from line 1

P709 L17: 'their estimates' means what?
Their GPP estimates. This has been clarified. See page 4, from line 6

P709 L18: '. . . larger GPP in the tropics .." compare to what?
Koffi et al. (2012) found larger GPP in the tropics compared to those inferred from satellite based up-scaling methods. This has been clarified. See page 4, from line 6

P709 L21: '. . . plant fluorescence (hereafter Fs) . . .' . Please consider ' sun-induced fluorescence (SIF)' and revise through the manuscript.
SIF has been used to replace Fs through the manuscript as suggested.

P709 L24-25: ' They showed . . . GPP at the global scale'.
OK. Corrected as suggested. See page 4, line 17

P710 L3-4: Not really well understood, especially with the stead state fluorescence. Need reference here.
The references are already given afterwards in the submitted version of the paper by quoting different studies about that. See page 4, from line 24

P715 L14-15: Not summation of fluorescence yield Φft, but florescence flux.
OK. Corrected. See page 11, line 2

P716 L2: should be ' canopy radiative transfer'?
Yes. Corrected. See page 11, from line 18

P717 L21-24: SCOPE need instantaneous driver, especially for radiation input, are the mean monthly observed climate data OK for the simulations?
Yes. See our general comments for the range of their values in item 4). See also Section 3.2, from page 16, from line 1
P719: Are the sensitivity running of SCOPE at hourly step?
Yes. As described in the Section 3.2 of the paper, the CCDAS simulates hourly SIF and GPP for one representative day in a month. We do that because the computation of fluorescence SIF is time demanding. Thus, we compute both SIF and GPP only at 12 h local time, i.e., around the time of their peaks during a sunny day. Moreover, for the idealized tests, both SIF and GPP are computed at 12 h (see Section 3.1). This is now clarified. See page 16, from line 18

P720 L19-21: I would say, C4 vegetation is more sensitive.
Yes, but not at this place. We say this after the sensitivity tests in the Section 4.1.2. See page 19, from line 23

P720-721: Need point out the sensitivity analysis is under light-limited conditions.
No. We made the tests first by using short wave radiation R_{in} of 500 W/m^2, then we examined the sensitivities of both SIF and GPP to R_{in} (Figure 2 of the paper). Furthermore, we investigated the sensitivities of SIF and GPP to V_{cmax} for various values of R_{in} (Figure 3). We clarify the text. See page Section 4.1.1, page 17 and from line 6

P721 L25-28: This contradicts with well-known and many published studies. Need specify why.
Yes. This was already acknowledged in the discussions. Now, we mention this also in this part. See page 18, from line 15

P723 L10-11: In my opinion, Vcmax impacts the values of SIF and GPP, but not their relationship.
The simulated SIF and GPP are strongly sensitive to aPAR. GPP is strongly dependent on V_{cmax} and this study shows that SIF is dependent to C_{ab}. Having a subtle relationship between these variables (i.e., SIF and GPP) via V_{cmax} or C_{ab} can help to transfer SIF information to GPP and vice versa. This is the basic element of the CCDAS since aPAR (or short wave radiation) are input variables to this system.

P724 L4-6: Should include negative retrievals of SIF.

We agree with reviewer that measured negative values of SIF are signal. However, the SCOPE model does not simulate such SIF negative values. Hence, considering the observed negative values of SIF will systematic bias the result. To avoid this, we only consider only positive measured SIF in the comparison. This has been clarified. See page 22, lines 4-5

P726 L3-4: How smaller is the Rin in the CCDAS than actual values? The radiation level determined the relationship between SIF and GPP, and their sensitivity to Vcmax.
See our general comments in item 4). The range the radiation used in the CCDAS is now given in the Section 3.2 and R_{in} are cover moderate light conditions and also in some cases high light conditions. See page 16, from line 1

P729 L16-18: should be ' . . . is unlikely to work within the CCDAS'.
The sentence has been clarified. See page 28, from line 15.

P730 L18-19: You need mention that the work of Zhang et al. (2014) was at light saturation state for cropland.
OK. Done. See page 30, line 3

P730 L19-20: How the 4 times differences come from? In their work of Zhang et al. (2014), they showed different sensitivity of SIF to Vcmax for different period of the growing season for the cropland. If you compared the sensitivity of SIF to Vcmax for the early growing season (e.g., early June) with that in the middle of growing season (e.g., July), there are also differences especially for C3 crop. Please also check the general comments.
See our general comments in item 1)

P731 L1-3: This is good point. Need discuss more.
See our general comments in item 1)

P732 L8-9: Need mention the illumination condition (light limited or light saturated).
No. See item 4 in our general comments