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Abstract

This study uses the droughts of 2011 in Texas and 2012 over the central Great Plains as case studies to explore the potential of satellite-observed solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) for monitoring drought dynamics. We find that the spatial patterns of negative SIF anomalies from the Global Ozone Monitoring Instrument 2 (GOME-2) closely resembled drought intensity maps from the US Drought Monitor for both events. The drought-induced suppression of SIF occurred throughout 2011 but was exacerbated in summer in the Texas drought. This event was characterized by a persistent depletion of root-zone soil moisture caused by year-long below-normal precipitation. In contrast, for the central Great Plains drought, warmer temperatures and relatively normal precipitation boosted SIF in the spring of 2012; however, a sudden drop in precipitation coupled with unusually high temperatures rapidly depleted soil moisture through evapotranspiration, leading to a rapid onset of drought in early summer. Accordingly, SIF reversed from above to below normal. For both regions, the GOME-2 SIF anomalies were significantly correlated with those of root-zone soil moisture, indicating that the former can potentially be used as proxy of the latter for monitoring agricultural droughts with different onset mechanisms. Further analyses indicate that the contrasting dynamics of SIF during these two extreme events were caused by changes in both fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (fPAR) and fluorescence yield, suggesting that satellite SIF is sensitive to both structural and physiological/biochemical variations of
vegetation. We conclude that the emerging satellite SIF has excellent potential for
dynamic drought monitoring.

**Key words**: Solar-Induced Chlorophyll Fluorescence (SIF), fluorescence yield, drought
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**Key points**:

- The GOME-2 SIF reveals contrasting onset mechanisms of two major droughts in
US Great Plains
- Reduction of SIF during drought was caused by both decreased fPAR and
fluorescence yield
- Anomalies of SIF and root-zone soil moisture are significantly correlated in the
study area
1. Introduction

Drought is among the most damaging and least understood climate extremes in many regions of the world. In the US alone, drought has led to losses of hundreds of billions of dollars during the last three decades [Smith and Matthews, 2015]. The US Great Plains is particularly vulnerable to drought, as evident by the extreme events in the 1930s (“Dust Bowl”) and 1950s [Cook et al., 2007], as well as the 2011 Texas drought [Seager et al., 2014] and the 2012 drought in the central Great Plains [Hoerling et al., 2014]. Further, an increasing drought risk that accompanies the warming trend in the 21st century is projected in this region by state-of-the-art general circulation models [Cook et al., 2015], although the severity is uncertain [e.g., Hoerling et al., 2012]. As a major ‘bread basket’, the Great Plains’ high vulnerability to drought threatens both regional and global food security.

There is an urgent need for a system of early warning and real-time monitoring of emerging drought that can provide information on plant physiological stress for agricultural planning and mitigation in this region. Such a system can benefit from existing drought monitoring efforts, such as the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS) Drought Monitor [Sheffield et al., 2012; Xia et al., 2014a] and the US Drought Monitor [USDM, Svoboda et al., 2002]. In particular, the latter uses various indicators to track different components of the water cycle, e.g., precipitation, soil moisture, streamflow, and runoff, providing both quantitative (drought intensities) and
qualitative (assessment of social impacts) information on water status at varying time scales.

Satellite observations of vegetation status, which is strongly influenced by soil water stress, complement ground- and model-based operational systems such as those of the USDM and NLDAS. The routine availability of normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) datasets has led to the development of operational drought monitoring systems based on vegetation status information. For example, the VegDRI system uses the vegetation drought response index, which integrates NDVI-derived vegetation anomalies and climate-related variables as well as biophysical parameters of soils and land cover/use, for real-time drought monitoring across the contiguous US [Brown et al., 2008; Wardlow et al., 2012]. The DroughtView system, hosted by the University of Arizona (http://droughtview.arizona.edu/), also relies on high-resolution NDVI products to monitor drought in the southwestern US. Various extended indices built upon NDVI have been developed to improve the characterization of drought, for example, the vegetation condition index [Liu and Kogan, 1996], vegetation health index [Kogan, 1995], and drought severity index [Mu et al., 2013]. The enhanced vegetation index (EVI) [Huete et al., 2002], developed to overcome some shortcomings of the NDVI (e.g., atmospheric contamination and saturation with dense canopies), has also been widely applied to characterize drought, for example, the forest response to drought in the Amazon [Xu et al., 2011] and Congo [Zhou et al., 2014].
While hydrology- and vegetation index-based methods are indispensable for monitoring large-scale drought events, the information they provide is only indirectly related to vegetation functioning. From the perspective of agricultural planning and mitigation, stress-induced degradation in vegetation functioning is a more direct indicator of increased risk of reduction in plant productivity and crop failure. In this regard, detecting and monitoring drought dynamics based on the newly available satellite retrievals of solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) offers the potential to complement existing methods and provide critical information that meets planning and mitigation needs in agriculturally important regions such as the US Great Plains.

The SIF is essentially a ‘glow’ of plants under sunlight. The absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR) by a leaf has several potential fates. In addition to being used to drive photochemical reactions to reduce atmospheric CO₂ (photosynthesis), it can be re-emitted as fluorescence at longer wavelengths. The absorbed energy can also undergo radiationless decay or be lost through regulated non-photochemical quenching (NPQ) processes [Baker, 2008]. As a consequence of energy conservation, variations in SIF contain information about plant biochemical, physiological, and metabolic functions as well as the amount of APAR. If drought induces changes in these functions, such changes will necessarily result in changes in SIF, usually reductions of both the photosynthesis and fluorescence yield [Flexas et al., 2002; Daumard et al., 2010]. Indeed, Damm et al. [2015] used airborne sensors to show that there is an ecosystem-specific relationship between gross photosynthesis and far-red
SIF. Therefore both on theoretical and empirical grounds, satellite SIF has been considered to be the most directly measurable signal of terrestrial photosynthesis from space \[ \text{Frankenberg et al., 2011b} \].

Although so far no satellite has been specifically designed and launched for SIF measurements, the potential of such information has motivated a number of researchers to derive SIF signals from spectral measurements obtained by existing satellite platforms \[ \text{Guanter et al., 2007, 2012; Frankenberg et al., 2011b; Joiner et al., 2011, 2012, & 2013} \]. These satellite SIF signals have been shown to be highly correlated with terrestrial gross primary production for natural vegetation \[ \text{Frankenberg et al., 2011b} \] and croplands \[ \text{Guanter et al., 2014} \] and with the seasonality of carbon uptake at flux tower sites \[ \text{Joiner et al., 2014} \]. These studies suggest that SIF is an important, perhaps also the most direct, remotely-sensed measure of vegetation canopy functioning.

Fluorescence has been used to study water stress at different spatial scales. \text{Flexas et al. [2002]} found a decrease of fluorescence yield under water stress for C3 leaves. \text{Daumard et al. [2010]} reported a reduction of canopy-scale fluorescence during a drought episode even though canopy greenness remained unchanged. This finding suggested that SIF may have a higher sensitivity to vegetation stress than vegetation indices that measure only plant greenness. \text{Lee et al. [2013]} quantified the degree of drought stress on productivity of the Amazon rainforest by using SIF measured by the Japanese Greenhouse-gases Observing SATellite (GOSAT).
To ascertain the potential of using satellite SIF to detect and monitor drought development in the context of agricultural planning and mitigation, it is essential to examine the role of soil moisture, particularly that of root-zone water content, in the SIF – drought relationship. Drought causes soil moisture deficit, which in turn leads to stomatal closure and reduction in photosynthesis and transpiration, important plant functions that affect fluorescence yield [Baker, 2008]. Severe droughts may result in acute shortage of soil moisture across the whole rooting depth of plants, causing leaf wilting and loss of chlorophyll [Hsiao, 1973]. The consequence of these effects may be reduction in the capacity of vegetation to absorb PAR and therefore a suppression in SIF. Consequently, the change of SIF is expected to be closely related to that of soil moisture integrated across the root zone but their phase relationship may depend on the intensity of soil moisture deficit.

We test this hypothesized linkage by investigating two contrasting extreme drought events in the US Great Plains: the 2011 Texas drought and the 2012 drought in the central Great Plains (Fig. 1 and Fig. S1). In 2011, Texas endured the most extreme single-year drought since 1895 with in summertime nearly the entire state area under the USDM ‘Exceptional Drought’ category (the highest intensity D4) (Fig. 1a). The annual rainfall fell to only 40% of its long-term mean, resulting in severe soil moisture deficits [Long et al., 2013]. This drought caused $7.6 billion in agricultural losses [Fanin, 2012]. The associated unprecedented high temperatures induced numerous wildfires that burned almost 4 million acres across Texas [Combs, 2012].
In the summer of 2012, over three quarters of the contiguous US experienced unusually dry conditions; in particular, states in the central Great Plains suffered extreme drought (Fig. 1b). With rainfall only at half of the long term mean, this event was the most severe seasonal drought in the central Great Plains in more than a century [Hoerling et al., 2014]. Economic losses were over $30 billion as estimated by the National Climatic Data Center (http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/billions/events), and substantial decreases in maize and soybean production were reported by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) [Gilbert, 2012].

These two drought events represent an opportunity for a comparative study of the drought–soil moisture–SIF relationships because they differed in the development of the drought dynamics and occurred in regions with contrasting water management practices. The Texas drought was characterized by persistent deficits in precipitation that started from late 2010 [Seager et al., 2014] and the induced soil moisture depletion intensified throughout spring and summer in 2011 [Long et al., 2013]. In contrast, the 2012 drought in the central Great Plains was preceded by relatively normal precipitation and warmer surface temperature in spring followed by an abrupt rainfall reduction and abnormally high temperatures in summer, typifying a “flash” drought [Hoerling et al., 2014; Mo and Lettermannier 2015]. The two drought extremes happened within the era of the satellite SIF observations, making them ideal examples to study the response of SIF to drought.

In this study, we aim to address the following questions: 1) Can SIF detect the differences in the temporal progression and spatial extension of the two contrasting...
droughts? 2) How are the temporal and spatial dynamics of SIF related to those of soil moisture, precipitation, temperature, and evapotranspiration (ET) under these two different drought regimes? 3) How do different processes contribute to drought-induced changes in SIF (i.e., changes in APAR vs. fluorescence yield)? 4) What improvements are needed in the still relatively new satellite SIF measurements in order to better serve the needs of the large-scale agricultural community in terms of drought planning and mitigation?

2. Data and Methods

2.1 Framework for interpreting dynamics of SIF

Analogous to fluorescence emission from a leaf, SIF from a canopy ($F$) can be expressed as:

$$ F = \phi \times f_{PAR} \times PAR = \phi \times APAR $$

(1)

where $f_{PAR}$ is the fraction of absorbed $PAR$, i.e., $APAR = f_{PAR} \times PAR$ and $\phi$ is defined as the effective fluorescence yield of the canopy; here $\phi$ can be considered as the product of the actual fluorescence yield of the canopy and the fraction of the canopy emission that escapes to the atmosphere. These two factors cannot be separated in satellite-based measurements; only their product $\phi$ can be determined, i.e.,

$$ \phi = F / (f_{PAR} \times PAR) = F / APAR $$

where $F$, $f_{PAR}$ and $PAR$ can be estimated from remotely sensed variables. For examination of the relative changes under clear-sky
conditions, as is done in this study, the absolute value of PAR is not needed. Instead, one could simply examine spatial and temporal variations in:

\[
\frac{F}{\cos(Z)} \propto \phi \times f\text{PAR},
\]

(2)

\[
\frac{F}{\cos(Z) \times f\text{PAR}} \propto \phi,
\]

(3)

where \(\cos(Z)\) is used as a proxy of \(\text{PAR}\) and \(Z\) is the solar zenith angle. Equation (2) describes the combined net effect on \(F\) resulting from changes in vegetation physiological and biochemical states, which primarily affect \(\phi\), and in vegetation structural variables (e.g., chlorophyll content, LAI), which affect \(f\text{PAR}\). Equation (3) isolates the effect on \(\phi\).

Yoshida et al. [2015] used a similar approach for separating \(\phi\). Similar to light use efficiency (LUE) models of photosynthesis widely used by the remote sensing community, Equations (1) to (3) greatly simplify fluorescence emission, transfer and absorption in a plant canopy by treating it as a big leaf. While such simplification ignores the complexities caused by the 3D structure of a canopy, Damm et al. [2015] suggested with simulations of the Soil-Canopy Observations of Photosynthesis and Energy Balance model (SCOPE) [van der Tol et al., 2009] that the generally linear feature of these equations is adequate for separating changes in \(F\) caused by variations in fluorescence yield from that of APAR. Note also that Equations (1)-(3) do not explicitly capture effects such as the impact of diffuse versus direct beam radiation on canopy fluorescence [Yang et al. 2015]. Since the present study focuses on clear-sky or nearly clear-sky
conditions, the impact of variations in $F$ caused by changing diffuse to direct beam ratios is minimized.

### 2.2 Satellite-based SIF data

Our study uses two satellite-based SIF datasets retrieved from different instruments. The first SIF product is inferred from the Global Ozone Monitoring Instrument 2 (GOME-2) onboard Eumetsat’s MetOp-A satellite. It provides retrieval of the far-red chlorophyll fluorescence peaking at 740 nm, which is estimated from measurement over a broad spectral range (734-758 nm) [Joiner et al., 2013, 2014]. The retrieval employs a simplified radiative transfer model together with a principal component analysis to disentangle the spectral signatures of atmospheric absorption, surface reflectance, and fluorescence emission. The version 26 level 3 dataset used here provides monthly global coverage of SIF observations at 0.5° × 0.5° spatial resolution and covers the period from 2007 to present.

In addition, we use SIF retrievals from the GOSAT [Frankenberg et al., 2011a, 2011b]. These retrievals are solely based on the in-filling of the Fraunhofer lines between 755 and 775 nm from spectra recorded by the Thermal And Near infrared Sensor for carbon Observation (TANSO) Fourier Transform Spectrometer (FTS). The TANSO-FTS high spectral resolution ensures a more robust and accurate SIF retrieval as atmospheric absorption, scattering, and albedo effects can be minimized using narrow spectral fitting windows [Frankenberg et al., 2011b]. However, the GOSAT SIF retrievals have a lower spatial resolution (4° × 4°) and shorter duration (2009-2012) as compared with GOME-2.
We therefore primarily use the GOME-2 dataset in our analyses. We further apply a local 3×3 window (1.5° × 1.5°) smoothing to minimize the noise inherent in the original retrieval.

2.3 Satellite-based fraction of absorbed Photosynthesis Activate Radiation (fPAR)

We use the MODerate resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS, Collection 5) MOD15A2 fPAR dataset [Myneni et al., 2002] in our analyses. The fPAR dataset is an 8-day composite at 1km × 1km. Its information to derive fPAR comes from the same reflectance used to compute vegetation indices such as NDVI. The primary purpose of using fPAR here is to identify its relative contribution to drought-induced decrease of SIF.

2.4 Soil water content simulated by land surface models

Ground measurements of root-zone soil moisture are spatially sparse in the study regions and remotely-sensed soil moisture through microwave is generally restricted to the top few centimeters of soil. We therefore use the soil water content (SWC) simulated by the NLDAS Phase 2 (NLDAS-2) land surface models [Xia et al., 2012]. A major mission of NLDAS-2 is to provide support for the National Integrated Drought Information System (NIDIS). These NLDAS-2 models are driven by reanalysis of atmospheric forcing and run at 1/8th degree over the contiguous US from 1979 to present. Here three model products are used: the Mosaic [e.g., Koster and Suarez, 1992], Noah [e.g., Ek et al., 2003], and the Variable Infiltration Capacity (VIC) [e.g., Liang et al., 1994]. Mosaic has three soil layers: 0-10, 10-40, and 40 – 200 cm, and the centers of each
layer are 5, 25, and 120 cm, respectively. Noah provides soil moisture at four soil depths with spatially fixed thicknesses, 0-10, 10-40, 40-100, and 100-200 cm centered at 5, 25, 70 and 150 cm respectively. VIC has three soil layers; its first soil layer has a fixed thickness of 10 cm and the other two soil layers have depths spatially varying from grid to grid. These simulated soil moisture products have been evaluated with in situ measurements across the contiguous US. They generally capture the wet/dry events and have high correlation with measurements in terms of temporal variability although large biases exist in terms of absolute magnitude [Xia et al., 2014b]. Previous studies demonstrated the capability of NLDAS-2 Mosaic and Noah models to depict the depletion of soil water in the 2011 Texas drought [Long et al., 2013].

Here we use the SWC within the top 100 cm soil layer to represent the root-zone soil moisture, as typically used for monitoring agricultural drought. For the VIC model, which has spatially varying soil layers, a vertical interpolation is performed to convert SWC into four uniform soil layers corresponding to those of the Noah model, following the protocol of Xia et al. [2014b]. We then compute the ensemble mean of root-zone SWC from the three NLDAS-2 models and only use this ensemble mean in our analyses. This practice takes advantage of the fact that model simulation skills vary among regions and models but their ensemble means generally show better performance than any individual model [Xia et al., 2014b]. The Noah model itself uses 100 cm root depth for grasslands and crops and 200 cm for woodland and forest, whereas the Mosaic model sets root depth to 40 cm for all vegetation types. The root depths of the VIC model vary from
135 cm to 300 cm, depending on vegetation type. Consequently, the use of the top 100 cm to calculate the mean SWC of the three models represents a compromise among the three models and appears to be characteristic of the root zone depth in the Great Plains.

2.5 Other climate variables

Multiple climate-related variables are employed to help interpret the temporal and spatial dynamics of SIF during the two drought events. They include precipitation, temperature at 2-m height from ground, and ET. The 2-m temperatures and precipitation are from the NLDAS-2 climate forcing, derived from the NCEP North American Regional Reanalysis [NARR, Mesinger et al., 2006] and NOAA Climate Prediction Center (CPC) gauge-based analyses, respectively. The three NLDAS-2 models share identical meteorological forcings. ET data are obtained from the NLDAS-2 model output, which have been shown to exhibit close correlation with MODIS and GRACE-based ET products in the southern Great Plains [Long et al., 2014] and have been comprehensively evaluated against flux tower observations [Xia et al., 2015]. We derive a three-model ensemble mean of ET as we do for the soil moisture.

2.6 Calculation of anomalies

We calculate monthly anomalies of all the aforementioned variables to obtain drought stress-related signals. The anomalies are computed as a departure from their corresponding multi-year mean for each month. The multi-year mean and anomalies are established from 2007 to 2013 for all datasets. The GOSAT SIF data are only available
from 2009 to 2012; thus its anomaly is calculated as departure from the average of this 4-year period.

2.7 Matching spatial resolution for different datasets

The spatial resolution of different datasets used in this study varies substantially. For example, the GOME-2 SIF has a spatial resolution of 0.5° while fPAR is at 1km and the modeled SWC at 0.125°. Therefore it is necessary to reprocess the data in order to minimize potential discrepancies resulting from the mismatch in spatial resolution for quantifying the relationships among SIF, root-zone SWC, ET, and temperature. We spatially aggregate the finer resolution products, i.e., fPAR and SWC, to match the SIF grid size. In addition, the 8-day fPAR dataset is temporally aggregated into monthly means, consistent with the SIF dataset.

3. Results

Our analyses show that strong negative anomalies of GOME-2 SIF existed during the 2011 Texas drought and the 2012 central Great Plains drought and that their spatial patterns were consistent with the USDM mapping of these two events (Fig. 1a-b). At the peak of the 2011 Texas drought (August), there were substantial SIF negative anomalies throughout Texas, with departures generally exceeding one standard deviation from the multi-year mean (Fig. 1c). Large negative SIF anomalies were also observed in Oklahoma, southern Kansas, and western New Mexico. The areas with the largest negative SIF anomalies generally corresponded to those designated as exceptional
drought (D4) by the USDM (Fig. 1a). The GOSAT SIF anomalies exhibited a spatial pattern consistent with that of GOME-2 but with somewhat different amplitudes (Fig. S2a). The latter difference is likely a combined consequence of the coarse resolution of the GOSAT dataset, obscuring small-scale details, its inference of SIF at a different reference wavelength compared to GOME-2, and the different satellite overpass times.

The 2012 central Great Plains drought, which also peaked in August (Fig. 1b), had a widespread reduction of SIF across Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Oklahoma (Fig. 1d). Northwestern Texas, in contrast to the eastern Texas, also displayed a considerable negative SIF anomaly. The GOSAT SIF likewise captured this large-scale drought pattern across the central Great Plains and the spatial drought gradient in Texas (Fig. S2b), but showed a much larger area with negative anomalies including the western Great Plains and eastern US, where the USDM indicated that drought was not as severe as in the central Great Plains (Fig. 1b). Thus our analyses demonstrate that satellite SIF available from current instruments has the potential to delineate the spatial extent of regions under the impact of drought, even though these instruments were not specifically designed for measuring SIF.

Can SIF also capture the dynamic process of drought development? For most months during the Texas drought in 2011, the spatially averaged GOME-2 SIF (averaged over 27-34°N, 94-103°W as highlighted in Fig. 1c) was significantly smaller than the corresponding multi-year mean (Fig. 2a). Here significance is considered as a departure >1 standard deviation. The difference between 2011 and the multi-year mean values was
relatively small in spring but grew larger until near the end of 2011 when the drought was interrupted by precipitation (Fig. 2e). The simulated ET showed a broadly similar temporal pattern although subtle differences existed (Fig. 2c). Presumably, the broad similarity between SIF and ET reflects the tight coupling between photosynthesis and transpiration [e.g., Ball et al., 1987]. These persistent negative vegetation responses were a consequence of the long-lasting soil water depletion in the root-zone (Fig. 2d) caused by the large precipitation deficit throughout 2011 (Fig. 2e), probably also exacerbated by anomalously high temperatures (Fig. 2b). The soil water deficit maximized during summertime, corresponding to the maximum monthly depression in SIF. As the soil moisture started to recover near the end of 2011 following rainfall episodes, the SIF signal moved towards its multi-year mean (Fig. 2a). However, although precipitation and soil moisture increased from a late summer minimum, SIF did not, probably because by that time vegetation had entered into a less-active stage and seasonal PAR had peaked, as indicated by a general decline in the multi-year mean SIF (Fig. 2a). The temporal dynamics of SIF and associated variables were also reflected in the spatial distributions of their anomalies for the spring and summer of 2011 in Texas (Fig. 3a-h).

The 2012 central Great Plains drought (35-42°N, 93-103°W as highlighted in Fig. 1d) showed a different temporal pattern of drought development (Fig. 2f-j). In spring 2012, the monthly GOME-2 SIF rose more rapidly than the multi-year mean (Fig. 2f), as also did ET (Fig. 2h). This rise was apparently caused by favorable conditions for vegetation growth in early 2012. The temperature was warmer (Fig. 2g) and the
precipitation was similar to multi-year mean (Fig. 2j) while the soil moisture was only slightly below normal (Fig. 2i). However, by May, the vegetation growth conditions in the Great Plains started to deteriorate as the precipitation turned from above to below normal and the soil moisture deficit widened sharply. The persistently high spring temperatures, among other factors, probably exacerbated the sharp decline of soil moisture in summer. This deteriorating growth condition led to the change of the monthly GOME-2 SIF around May from being higher than normal to less than normal. Its departure from normal widened until some precipitation events occurred and re-supplied moisture to the soil late in the summer. Similar to the 2011 Texas drought, the simulated ET showed temporal dynamics broadly resembling that of the GOME-2 SIF with some difference occurring around the time when the drought started to break (Fig. 2h). As in the 2011 Texas event, the spatial distributions of the SIF anomalies and environmental variables revealed the dynamic progression of drought from spring to summer of 2012 in the central Great Plains (Fig. 3i-p).

The PAR-normalized SIF (i.e., Equations 2 and 3) provides further insights into the component processes that were responsible for the drought-induced changes in SIF during the two droughts (Fig. 4). Once the effects of seasonal variations in PAR were removed (Equation 2), the drought impacts on SIF became more pronounced for both drought events and the contrast between them became clearer (compare Figs. 2a and 2f with Figs. 4a and 4d, respectively). Sustained decrease in fPAR (Fig. 4b) and in the effective fluorescence yield (Equation 3 and Fig. 4c) was observed in 2011 for the Texas
drought. For the 2012 event in the central Great Plains, both fPAR (Fig. 4e) and the effective fluorescence yield (Fig. 4f) were higher than the corresponding multi-year mean for early spring but this pattern was reversed in the rest of the year. Thus our results indicate that both fPAR and the effective fluorescence yield were affected by the droughts and contributed to the observed dynamics of SIF.

The seasonal pattern of the PAR-normalized multi-year mean SIF is dominated by that of fPAR in the central Great Plains (compare Fig. 4d and 4e). However, during 2012, the pattern was more similar to that of the effective fluorescence yield than to that of fPAR (compare Fig. 4d and 4f). In particular, both the PAR-normalized SIF and the effective fluorescence yield peaked in April 2012 and then declined steadily afterwards. In contrast, fPAR was relatively stable from April to July 2012. This indicates that the steady decrease in the effective fluorescence yield was responsible for the decreasing trend in the PAR-normalized SIF from its early spring peak in 2012. Only after July 2012, fPAR started to decline and its significant deviation from the multi-year mean contributed to the SIF reduction. For Texas, the seasonal pattern of the PAR-normalized SIF (Fig. 4a) was more similar to that of the effective fluorescence yield (Fig. 4c) than to that of fPAR for both the 2011 drought and the multi-year mean.

Therefore our analyses indicate that the GOME-2 SIF not only depicts the spatial extension of both drought events but also captures the temporal dynamics of their impacts on fPAR and effective fluorescence yield. These qualitative analyses are corroborated by the quantification of the relationships of SIF with key drought sensitive variables in a
broader context in Fig. 5. Both in Texas (Fig. 5a) and in the central Great Plains (Fig. 5b), the anomalies of GOME-2 SIF are significantly positively correlated with the anomalies of root-zone SWC across June, July, and August. The SIF-SWC correlations tend to be stronger in summer than in spring and fall especially in the central Great Plains (Fig 5c-d). In addition to SWC, the SIF anomalies also show significant positive correlation with ET (Fig 5c-d). In contrast, the correlation of SIF and temperature anomalies is more complicated. In Texas where climate is relatively warm, the SIF-T correlation is negative throughout growing season. In the central Great Plains, the correlation was only negative in the summer but positive in spring, because of temperature control on spring phenology rather than soil moisture in this region. The strong correlations of GOME-2 SIF with SWC, temperature, and ET are also reflected in the striking resemblance between the spatial distributions of the anomalies of these variables for the spring and summer of 2011 and 2012 (Fig. 3).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study indicates that satellite-based SIF reasonably characterizes the spatial and temporal dynamics of drought development and identifies regions with varying drought severity. Severe summer drought onset can either follow a strong soil moisture deficit in spring due to lack of rainfall, such as during the 2011 Texas drought [Fernando et al., 2015] or a relatively normal rainfall and warm spring but a sudden rainfall deficit in summer, such as during the 2012 central Great Plains drought [Hoerling et al., 2014].
Such differences in drought onset mechanisms lead to different soil moisture regimes, which in turn have contrasting impacts on the development of plant activity. For the first type of drought, soil moisture constrained vegetation growth in both spring and summer. For the second, “flash” type of drought, vigorous photosynthetic activity in spring was stimulated by favorable temperatures, exhausting soil water supply and amplifying the sharp drop of soil water storage caused by sudden precipitation depletion later in the summer. The SIF signal can well capture such contrasting dynamics of vegetation functioning and thus provide insights for interpreting the development of drought.

In summertime, large decreases in the GOME-2 SIF occurred for both the Texas and central Great Plains droughts. The latter happened because water supply is the limiting factor that determines plant photosynthesis in summer, allowing the soil moisture deficit to be well tracked by abnormally low SIF values. The strong SIF-SWC relationship revealed in this study indicates a potential of using SIF as a proxy for root-zone soil moisture for characterizing agricultural drought.

The SIF-soil moisture-drought relationship depends on variations of both APAR (or fPAR) and fluorescence yield in response to water stress. Under extreme drought, for example the two events examined in our study, photosynthetic pigments can degrade and LAI decrease. Severe drought stress can also cause leaf wilting, a sign of plant turgor loss, or can trigger leaf movement and rolling, all of which can reduce effective LAI. All these potential foliar changes reduce fPAR and therefore the energy for both photosynthesis and fluorescence emission [Porcar-Castell et al., 2014]. Presumably, some combination
of these changes occurred for both of our events as we observed the simultaneous drought responses of fPAR and SIF. In particular, when drought starts before and persists throughout the growing season, plant phenology of the whole growing season may be adapted to a new drought regime with sustained reduction in LAI, leading to a season-wide suppression of photosynthesis and SIF.

Variations in SIF caused by changes in fluorescence yield are more complex. Our results indicate that both drought events depressed the effective fluorescence yield of the vegetation in the study regions. Changes in fluorescence yield may occur without concurrent changes in chlorophyll content and phenology, as for example, in cases of relatively mild stress conditions compared to that an extreme drought. Water deficit usually induces stomatal closure and hence reduction of CO₂ uptake, which in turn slows down photosynthesis. This reduces the proportion of APAR that is used to drive electron transport for carbon assimilation, or ‘photochemical yield’, but this does not necessarily mean more APAR is available for fluorescing as the heat dissipation via NPQ may increase to a level that compensates for the effect of reduced photochemical yield, leading to a decrease of fluorescence yield and hence SIF (if there are no concurrent changes of chlorophyll content or LAI) [Flexas et al., 2002; Daumard et al., 2010]. Although both SIF and fPAR are responsive to chlorophyll content and LAI, SIF but not fPAR is sensitive to variations in fluorescence yield.

In a broad context, the sensitivity of satellite-observed SIF to the environmental variables that influence vegetation growth is complicated, because fluorescence yield is
affected by biotic (species types, photosynthetic capacities, etc.) and abiotic factors (e.g., nutrient availability, temperature, CO₂ concentration and radiation) in complex nonlinear ways [Porcar-Castell et al., 2014]. Our inference of the drought effects on fluorescence yield is indirect as it relies on the remote sensing of fPAR as an input, which may also contain errors. The fPAR product used here is affected by not just green leaves but also by non-green elements such as branches, stems and soils, which could confound the inference of the effective fluorescence yield. Also it is possible that the relatively simple linear correlative analyses in this study (e.g. Fig. 5) may have primarily captured stress-induced changes in chlorophyll content and LAI but not sufficiently in fluorescence yield. Additional analyses could be performed with models that explicitly represent SIF processes [e.g., van der Tol et al., 2014 and Lee et al., 2015], so that one can further attribute the stress-induced variations of SIF to different sources. For example, Yoshida et al. [2015] have used model simulated SIF to examine the 2010 Russian drought and found that it is broadly consistent with satellite observed SIF pattern. This work further partitioned the SIF variations (for both satellite and modeled datasets) into fluorescence yield and fPAR, similar to our analysis. Nevertheless, more process-based studies of responses of leaf-, canopy- and landscape-scale fluorescence to environmental stresses with better temporally resolved experiments are needed. With guidance and data from such studies, more sophisticated analyses of responses of SIF from satellite remote sensing to environmental stresses can be developed.
Future satellite SIF products would be improved by tracking SIF variation on a sub-daily scale. Field studies have shown that the sensitivity of fluorescence yield to water stress is higher in the afternoon when plants water stress tends to peak [Daumard et al., 2014]. The current GOME-2 SIF is measured at a local overpass time of 09:30 am, when physiological water stress tends to be diminished by the resupply of plant water overnight and by the relatively low atmospheric vapor pressure deficit in the early morning. Future satellite fluorescence missions would be improved by measurement of SIF both in the morning and afternoon. At present, such morning – afternoon observation coupling may be obtained by combining datasets from GOME-2 with those of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2, Frankenberg et al., 2014) or could be explored after the future launch of TROPOspheric Monitoring Instrument (TROPOMI, Guanter et al., 2015). Thus with improved spatial resolution, timing of observation, sampling density, and retrieval methods coupled with better mechanistic understanding of solar energy partitioning at the leaf scale, future satellite SIF products should better serve drought monitoring needs.

The Texas region appears to have a tighter coupling in summer months between SIF and the modeled soil moisture than the central Great Plains (compare Fig. 5a with 5b). This regional difference may be caused by a lack of representing irrigation in NLDAS-2 models [Xia et al., 2014b], a process that is critical for plant and crop growth in the central Great Plains. In addition, the simulated soil moisture can also be biased by factors such as uncertainties in atmospheric forcing, model parameters of soil properties, model
structural deficiencies, etc. But overall, NLDAS-2 land surface models are able to simulate soil moisture that can reasonably track the wet/dry variations compared to measurements [Xia et al., 2014b] and so capture the considerable drawdown of soil moisture in extreme drought events as shown in this study. The close relationship between simulated soil moisture and satellite SIF confirms the usefulness of these model products in large-scale drought monitoring.

In summary, we find that satellite-based SIF has potential for characterizing and monitoring the spatial and temporal dynamics of drought in vegetated regions. Using the droughts of 2011 in Texas and 2012 in the central Great Plains as two case studies, we found that the satellite SIF anomalies can be used as a measure of drought intensity in general and root zone soil moisture deficit in particular. The significant correlations of SIF with drought-induced anomalies in key environmental variables and their spatial and temporal variations are consistent with the expectation that SIF measures the physiological and biochemical state of vegetation and is a direct signal of vegetation photosynthetic functioning. Future applications of satellite SIF could be improved by better timing of observations, higher spatial resolution, and modeling of processes controlling energy partitioning within the photosynthetic machinery.
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Figure Legends

**Figure 1.** Drought intensity and its impact on vegetation of the two extreme drought events: the 2011 Texas drought (left) and the 2012 drought in the central Great Plains (right). (a) and (b) show the spatial extent of the drought category in the last week of August, i.e., August 30th 2011 (for the Texas drought) and August 28th 2012 (for the central Great Plains drought). Data are from the US Drought Monitor. (c)-(d) show the SIF anomalies in August. Here the anomalies are normalized by the standard deviation in order to make the SIF signals spatially comparable. The green boxes (27-34°N, 94-103°W for Texas, and 35-42°N, 93-103°W for the central Great Plains, respectively) highlight the regions that are used for deriving the regional-wide averages.

**Figure 2.** The regional-wide mean seasonal cycle of GOME-2 SIF (a and f), 2m temperature (T2m, b and g), evapotranspiration (ET, c and h), soil water content (SWC, d and i) integrated through the plant root zone (0-1m) and precipitation (P, e and j) for Texas (left column) and for the central Great Plains (right column). The black curves represent the monthly multi-year mean of each variable between 2007 and 2013; the red curves show the seasonal evolution during the drought year (2011 for Texas and 2012 for the central Great Plains, respectively). The grey shaded area is the ± 1 standard deviation of the multi-year mean.
**Figure 3.** The spatial distributions of the anomalies of SIF, T2m, ET, and root-zone SWC for the US during the 2011 Texas drought (left two columns) and the 2012 central Great Plains drought (right two columns). Spring (April and May) and summer (June, July and August) anomalies are separated, demonstrating the dynamic development of two drought events.

**Figure 4.** The regional-wide mean seasonal cycle of SIF normalized by PAR (i.e., divided by cosine of solar zenith angle cos(Z), a and d), fPAR (b and e), and SIF normalized by APAR (i.e., PAR normalized SIF further divided by fPAR, c and f), which is related to fluorescence yield.

**Figure 5.** Relationships between the summertime root-zone SWC anomaly and SIF anomaly (left: Texas; right: central Great Plains). Each dot represents a grid cell within the defined areas in Figure 1 in a month from June to August between 2007 and 2013. Color demonstrates the density of dot distribution. The correlation coefficients (R) and associated p values are also shown. The bottom panels show monthly temporal evolution of the correlation of all grid cells in each month among anomalies of SIF with SWC, ET, and temperature.