

Interactive comment on “Distinguishing between early and late covering crops in the land surface model Noah-MP: Impact on simulated surface energy fluxes and temperature” by Kristina Bohm et al.

Kristina Bohm et al.

imukovaks@gmail.com

Received and published: 8 March 2020

We thank the reviewer for his very positive feedback and helpful comments. We have addressed all the questions and comments as described below.

1. How long were the Noah-MP simulations run: for a single year or from 2012-2013? Are the results plotted in the figures results from Noah-MP 2012 and 2013 output or results from Noah-MP driven with the multi growing season mean?

The Noah-MP was run over two years 2011-2012. The first year (2011) is intended

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



to be a 'warm-up' period; thus, the following year, 2012, was considered for the assessment of the impact of different crop groups on simulated surface energy fluxes and temperature. The results plotted in the figures results from Noah-MP 2012 output. Unfortunately, there was a typo on line 177, 2013 was written instead of 2012. We corrected it now.

2. In the second set of simulations, there are two runs, the "generic crop" and run 2. Is the second run "crop specific", the weighted average of the Noah-MP driven separately with just LCC and just ECC LAI and GVF dynamics?

In the second run, we performed two simulations: one for early covering crops using their specific LAI and GVF dynamics and another one for late covering crops using corresponding LAI and GVF dynamics. Afterward, we calculated the weighted average of the simulated fluxes and temperatures considering the spatial distribution of early covering (72%) and late covering crops (28%) in the study region. For greater clarity, we rewrote lines 238-241 in the manuscript. It reads now as follows: "Run 2: We first simulated the energy and water fluxes separately for ECC and LCC with their crop-specific vegetation dynamics. Afterward, we calculated the weighted averages of the simulated fluxes and temperatures based on the share of early covering (72%) and late covering crops (28%) in Kraichgau".

3. In the runs used as results in section 3.3 is the LCC share increasing over time or was this additional run driven with a "generic crop" equivalent that used a different share weight?

To study the effect of increasing the LCC share from 28% to 38% in the study region on the Noah-MP simulations, we performed one additional generic crop simulation, but this time the generic crop dynamics were computed with an LCC share of 38% (Please, see lines 246-248 of the manuscript). Similar simulations were presented also in the discussion part of the manuscript. In lines 446-460, we show the results for five additional simulations using generic crop but with different ECC-LCC shares: ECC

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

90%-LCC 10%, ECC 70%-LCC 30%, ECC 50%-LCC 50%, ECC 30%-LCC 70%, ECC 10%-LCC 90%).

Speciifn Comments 1. Line 36: The acronym LE is used without being deifn

We corrected it (Line: 37)

2. Line 57: What do you mean by simulation domain? Is that the Kraichgau region?

In this case, the simulation domain can be also read as a simulation area. On line 57, we mean that in many parts of the world, cropland as a land-use class in the land surface models can cover a considerable part of the simulation area. We used now the word 'area' on line 58 as it fits better.

3. Line 202: What was the weighted average weighted by? The crop type area?

We corrected it. Please see above and the lines 238-241 of the manuscript.

4. Line 425: The idea in this sentence seems incomplete, the GVF and LAI yields pronounced differences between what, the crop types or atmospheric flux from the crop types?

We corrected it. Now it reads as "GVF and LAI significantly affect the simulation of energy partitioning, yielding pronounced differences between simulated surface energy and water fluxes and temperatures of ECC and LCC." (Please, see lines: 525-526)

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-453>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

