1 Estimation of crop gross primary production (GPP):

2 fAPAR_{chl} versus MOD15A2 FPAR

3 Qingyuan Zhang^{1,2}, Yen-Ben Cheng^{3,2}, Alexei I. Lyapustin⁴, Yujie Wang^{5,2}, Feng Gao⁶, Andrew
4 Suyker⁷, Shashi Verma⁷, Elizabeth M. Middleton²

5
6 ¹Universities Space Research Association, Columbia, MD 21044, USA

7 ²Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, National Aeronautics and Space Administration/Goddard Space
8 Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

9 ³Sigma Space Corporation, Lanham, MD 20706, USA

10 ⁴Climate and Radiation Laboratory, Code 613, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
11 Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

12 ⁵Goddard Earth Sciences and Technology Center, University of Maryland Baltimore County,
13 Baltimore, MD 21228, USA

14 ⁶Hydrology and Remote Sensing Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, US Department of
15 Agriculture, Beltsville, MD 20705, USA

16 ⁷School of Natural Resources, University of Nebraska—Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588, USA
17
18

19 Corresponding author:

20 Qingyuan Zhang

21 Address:

22 Building 33, Room G321

23 Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, Code 618,

24 NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center,

25 Greenbelt, Maryland 20771, USA

26 Tel: 301-614-6672

27 Email: qyz72@yahoo.com

Abstract – Photosynthesis (PSN) is a pigment level process in which antenna pigments (predominately chlorophylls) in chloroplasts absorb photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) for the photochemical process. PAR absorbed by foliar non-photosynthetic components is not used for PSN. The fraction of PAR absorbed (fAPAR) by a canopy/vegetation (i.e., fAPAR_{canopy}) derived from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) images, referred to as MOD15A2 FPAR, has been used to compute absorbed PAR (APAR) for PSN (APAR_{PSN}) which is utilized to produce the standard MODIS gross primary production (GPP) product, referred to as MOD17A2 GPP. In this study, the fraction of PAR absorbed by chlorophyll throughout the canopy (fAPAR_{chl}) was retrieved from MODIS images for three AmeriFlux crop fields in Nebraska. There are few studies in the literature that compare the performance of MOD15A2 FPAR versus fAPAR_{chl} in GPP estimation. In our study MOD15A2 FPAR and the retrieved fAPAR_{chl} were compared with field fAPAR_{canopy} and the fraction of PAR absorbed by green leaves of the vegetation (fAPAR_{green}). MOD15A2 FPAR overestimated field fAPAR_{canopy} in spring and in fall, and underestimated field fAPAR_{canopy} in midsummer whereas fAPAR_{chl} correctly captured the seasonal phenology. The retrieved fAPAR_{chl} agreed well with field fAPAR_{green} at early crop growth stage in June, and was less than field fAPAR_{green} in late July, August and September. GPP estimates with fAPAR_{chl} and with MOD15A2 FPAR were compared to tower flux GPP. GPP simulated with fAPAR_{chl} was corroborated with tower flux GPP. Improvements in crop GPP estimation were achieved by replacing MOD15A2 FPAR with fAPAR_{chl} which also reduced uncertainties of crop GPP estimates by 1.12 – 2.37 g C m⁻² d⁻¹.

Key Words –GPP, MODIS, MOD15A2 FPAR, fAPAR_{chl}

I. INTRODUCTION

Terrestrial vegetation captures carbon as carbon dioxide (CO_2) and simultaneously releases O_2 and diffuses water (H_2O) through the process of photosynthesis (PSN). PSN is a basic physiological function of vegetation that relies on energy absorbed by chlorophyll (chl) for plant growth and biomass accumulation (Emmanuel et al. 1984). The Earth Observing System (EOS) has been designed to capture the patterns of the Earth's terrestrial ecosystems, including estimates of photosynthetic activity, through linking remote sensing observations to models (Ustin et al. 1991). The FOREST-BGC (BioGeoChemical cycles) model is a process model that depicts the cycles of carbon, water and nitrogen through forest ecosystems, including the vegetation photosynthesis process which uses leaf area index (LAI) as one of the variable inputs (Running 1984; Running and Coughlan 1988; Running and Gower 1991). The theoretical studies by Sellers (Sellers 1987; Sellers 1985) suggested that the normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) (Deering 1978; Tucker 1979) of the advanced very high resolution radiometer (AVHRR) is directly related to PSN and vegetation transpiration, especially for vegetation experiencing optimal temperature and water availability. Monteith (1972, 1977) suggested crop GPP could be estimated as $\text{GPP} = \epsilon * \text{fAPAR}_{\text{PSN}} * \text{PAR}$, where PAR is photosynthetically active radiation, $\text{fAPAR}_{\text{PSN}}$ is the fraction of PAR absorbed for PSN, and ϵ is photosynthetic light use efficiency (LUE). A pre-launch algorithm was developed in 1997 (Myneni et al. 1997) to estimate LAI and the fraction of PAR absorbed (fAPAR) by a canopy/vegetation ($\text{fAPAR}_{\text{canopy}}$, also called FPAR) using NDVI for the moderate resolution imaging spectroradiometer (MODIS), and is used as a backup for the standard MODIS LAI/FPAR (MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR) product when the retrieval based on the radiative transfer modeling fails (Knyazikhin et al. 1998; Myneni et al. 2002). The BIOME-BGC model developed from FOREST-BGC has been used to produce the MODIS GPP

standard product (MOD17A2 GPP) which integrated the understanding and knowledge at that time including the NDVI-LAI-FPAR linkage. The MOD15A2 FPAR product and a biome parameter look up table (BPLUT) of ϵ are two of the inputs used to produce MOD17A2 GPP (Justice et al. 1998; Running et al. 2000, 2004; Zhao and Running 2010).

Zhang and colleagues have made efforts to retrieve the fraction of PAR absorbed by chlorophyll throughout the canopy ($fAPAR_{chl}$) using a coupled canopy-leaf radiative transfer model and surface reflectance of MODIS bands 1 – 7, obtained from actual MODIS satellite data and from MODIS-like data synthesized at 30 m or 60 m from EO-1 Hyperion images (Zhang 2003; Zhang et al. 2005, 2009, 2012, 2013). The inverse algorithm can also retrieve $fAPAR$ of foliage ($fAPAR_{foliage}$), $fAPAR$ of foliage non-chlorophyll components ($fAPAR_{non-chl}$), LAI, and the photosynthetic section (chlorophyll) of LAI (LAI_{chl}). Zhang et al. (2013) showed that (1) $fAPAR_{canopy} \neq fAPAR_{chl}$; and (2) both $fAPAR_{chl}$ and $fAPAR_{non-chl}$ of deciduous broadleaf forests and coniferous needleleaf forests varied seasonally.

Photosynthesis is a pigment level process in which antenna pigments (predominately chlorophylls) in chloroplasts absorb solar radiation for the photochemical process. Therefore estimating GPP with $fAPAR_{chl}$ is more consistent with the photosynthetic process than MOD15A2 FPAR. However, few studies have compared the performance of these two algorithms in GPP estimation. Objectives of this study succinctly are: (1) to evaluate the retrievals of $fAPAR_{chl}$ and MOD15A2 FPAR through comparison with crop field measurements, and (2) to evaluate the GPP estimation performance through comparison with tower flux GPP.

II. METHODS

Study Fields and Field Measured fAPARs

We selected three AmeriFlux crop fields for this study which are located at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln (UNL) Agricultural Research and Development Center near Mead, Nebraska (US-NE1, US-NE2 and US-NE3). The US-NE1 site (41°09′54.2″N, 96°28′35.9″W) and US-NE2 site (41°09′53.6″N, 96°28′07.5″W) are two circular fields (radius ~ 390 m) and the US-NE3 site (41°10′46.7″N, 96°26′22.4″W) is a square field (length~790 m). The US-NE1 field is a continuous maize (*Zea mays* L.) field while the US-NE2 and US-NE3 fields are maize-soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr.) rotation fields (maize is planted in odd years). The US-NE1 and US-NE2 fields are equipped with center-pivot irrigation systems while the US-NE3 field entirely relies on rainfall (Gitelson et al. 2008; Peng et al. 2013). Soybean is a C3 crop and maize is a C4 crop. These sites provide an opportunity to examine the GPP estimation performance using MOD15A2 FPAR versus fAPAR_{chl} for different vegetation types (C3 vs. C4 crops) in both irrigated and non-irrigated ecosystems.

Field activities were conducted to determine fAPAR_{canopy} and fAPAR by green leaves of the canopy (fAPAR_{green}) (Peng et al. 2011). The fAPAR_{green} is defined as:

$$fAPAR_{green} = fAPAR_{canopy} \times \frac{LAI_{green}}{LAI} \quad (1)$$

where LAI_{green} is green LAI (Peng et al. 2011). The point quantum sensors (LI-190, LI-COR Inc., Lincoln, NE) were used to measure incoming PAR from the atmosphere, PAR reflected out of the canopy by the canopy and soil/background, PAR transmitted through the canopy, PAR reflected into the canopy from soil. All of these PARs were used to compute absorbed PAR (APAR) by the canopy (APAR_{canopy}) and fAPAR_{canopy} [see (Peng et al. 2011) for details]. Each

sampled plant was separated into green leaves, dead leaves and litter components, and both green and dead leaves were run through the same area meter (Model LI-3100, Li-Cor, Inc., Lincoln NE). These leaf area measurements were used to determine (total) LAI and LAI_{green} (Gitelson et al. 2003), from which $fAPAR_{green}$ was computed with Eqn. (1). The field $fAPAR_{canopy}$, $fAPAR_{green}$, LAI and LAI_{green} were provided by Drs. Gitelson and Peng from UNL, and were used to evaluate both MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR and our $fAPAR_{chl}/LAI_{chl}$ retrievals (see definition of LAI_{chl} in Eqn. (4)).

Each crop field is equipped with an eddy covariance flux tower. Science quality algorithms have been applied to process tower measurements. The level 2 gap filled tower PAR and GPP data is publically available and can be downloaded from <ftp://cdiac.ornl.gov/pub/ameriflux/data/>. The nighttime ecosystem respiration/temperature Q_{10} relationship was used to estimate the daytime ecosystem respiration. Daily GPP was computed by subtracting respiration (R) from net ecosystem exchange (NEE), i.e., $GPP = NEE - R$ (Suyker et al. 2005). The GPP estimates obtained with MOD15A2 FPAR and $fAPAR_{chl}$ algorithms were compared to tower flux GPP, as described below.

MODIS retrieved fAPARs: MOD15A2 FPAR and $fAPAR_{chl}$

The MOD15A2 FPAR product is a standard 1 km 8-day $fAPAR_{canopy}$ product for EOS-MODIS (Myneni et al. 2002). MOD15A2 FPAR of the three NE crop fields can be freely downloaded from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (<http://daac.ornl.gov/MODIS/>).

A procedure to produce an 8-day MODIS $fAPAR_{chl}$ product has recently been developed (Zhang et al., 2014 a, b). MODIS land bands (1 – 7) have variable nadir spatial resolutions between 250 and 500 m: B1 (red, 620 – 670 nm), B2 (near infrared, NIR_1 , 841 – 876 nm), B3

(blue, 459 – 479 nm), B4 (green, 545 – 565 nm), B5 (NIR₂, 1230 – 1250 nm), B6 (shortwave infrared, SWIR₁, 1628 – 1652 nm) and B7 (SWIR₂, 2105 – 2155 nm). MODIS L1B calibrated radiance data (MOD021KM and MOD02HKM) and geolocation data (MOD03) were downloaded from <https://ladsweb.nascom.nasa.gov:9400/data/>. The centers of the original 500 m grids defined in the standard MOD09 reflectance products (Wolfe et al. 1998) that encompass the three tower sites are not the centers of the fields [please check Figure 2 in (Guindin-Garcia et al. 2012) for details]. A modified gridding approach was used in this study (Zhang et al., 2014a). We defined the centers of the three fields as centers of three 500 m grids. The L1B radiance data from each swath were then gridded at 500m resolution for MODIS bands 1-7 with area weights of each MODIS observation. The gridded observations were then atmospherically corrected with the Multi-Angle Implementation of Atmospheric Correction (MAIAC) algorithm (Lyapustin et al. 2008, 2011a, 2011b, 2012). The bidirectional reflectance factors (BRF, also called surface reflectance) derived with MAIAC were used in the algorithm we developed to retrieve $fAPAR_{chl}$ (Zhang et al. 2005, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2014b). Only the MODIS observations with view zenith angles (VZA) less than 35° were used in the retrieval algorithm to reduce the observation footprint impact (Zhang et al. 2014a).

Here is a brief description of the retrieval algorithm. We use the PROSAIL2 model, a coupled canopy-leaf radiative transfer model (Zhang et al. 2005, 2009, 2012, 2013). The foliage component of a canopy is partitioned into chl and non-chlorophyll (non-chl) components, where non-chl is composed of non-photosynthetic pigments (referred to as brown pigment) and dry matter. The $fAPAR_{non-chl}$, $fAPAR_{foliage}$ and LAI_{chl} can be computed as:

$$fAPAR_{non-chl} = fAPAR_{brown_pigment} + fAPAR_{dry_matter} \quad (2)$$

$$fAPAR_{foliage} = fAPAR_{chl} + fAPAR_{non-chl} \quad (3)$$

$$LAI_{chl} = LAI * \frac{fAPAR_{chl}}{fAPAR_{foliage}} \quad (4)$$

We employ the Metropolis algorithm (Metropolis et al. 1953), a type of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) estimation procedure (Gelman et al. 2000), to invert the PROSAIL2 model to retrieve biophysical and biochemical variables of PROSAIL2. This method estimates posterior probability distributions per variable. The posterior statistical distributions provide the mode (i.e., best point solution) values per variable. The fAPARs ($fAPAR_{foliage}$, $fAPAR_{chl}$, $fAPAR_{non-chl}$) and LAI_{chl} are then computed with the estimated model variables through PROSAIL2 forward simulations.

To be comparable to MOD15A2 FPAR/LAI, $fAPAR_{chl}/LAI_{chl}$ retrievals for every 8-day period started from the first day of year (DOY) in each year, and were averaged to represent the 8-day values.

MODIS Retrieved fAPARs/LAIs versus Field Measured fAPARs/LAIs

Both MOD15A2 FPAR/LAI and $fAPAR_{chl}/LAI_{chl}$ were derived using MODIS surface reflectance. The $fAPAR_{green}$ was computed with the field values for $fAPAR_{canopy}$, LAI and LAI_{green} . Both the field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ and MOD15A2 FPAR product are defined as fAPAR at canopy level. In concept, for a given field at a given time, neither $fAPAR_{chl}$ nor $fAPAR_{green}$ should be greater than fAPAR at canopy level, and neither LAI_{chl} nor LAI_{green} should be greater than (total) LAI.

Time series of the retrieved MODIS fAPARs (MOD15A2 FPAR and $fAPAR_{chl}$) and field fAPARs (field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ and $fAPAR_{green}$) during 2001– 2004 were plotted to compare to each other. Time series of the retrieved MODIS LAIs (MOD15A2 LAI and LAI_{chl}) and field LAIs (field LAI and LAI_{green}) during 2001– 2004 were also plotted to compare to each other. Analysis and evaluation were carried out (see sections III and IV).

GPP estimation performance: MOD15A2 FPAR versus $fAPAR_{chl}$

Tower measured PAR was averaged every 8-day to match the temporal interval of the MOD15A2 FPAR product. In order to evaluate the GPP estimation performance using the MODIS retrieved fAPARs, the products of the retrieved fAPARs and 8-day mean daily PAR ($MOD15A2\ FPAR * PAR$ and $fAPAR_{chl} * PAR$) were compared against the tower flux 8-day mean daily GPP, respectively. We tested the simple linear model: $y=ax$, where $y=GPP$; x is APAR of canopy or of chlorophyll ($APAR_{canopy}$ or $APAR_{chl}$), i.e., $x=fAPAR_x * PAR$ ($fAPAR_x=MOD15A2\ FPAR$ or $fAPAR_{chl}$); and the coefficient “a” was computed with the least squares best fit algorithm. Statistics for the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the root mean square error (RMSE) are reported to evaluate model performance.

III. RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the intensive field measurements at the US-NE1 field from June to September during 2001 – 2004. Seasonal dynamics of field $fAPAR_{canopy}$, $fAPAR_{green}$, LAI and LAI_{green} , and seasonal dynamics of MOD15A2 FPAR/LAI and the $fAPAR_{chl}/LAI_{chl}$ retrievals are presented. The $fAPAR_{chl}$ and LAI_{chl} retrievals were much lower than the counterpart MOD15A2 FPAR and LAI values during the spring seasons before new leaves emerged. The $fAPAR_{chl}$

retrievals were also much lower than the counterpart MOD15A2 FPAR values during the senescent stage and after harvesting. The difference between MOD15A2 FPAR and field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ was > 0.17 during June to September. The difference between MOD15A2 LAI and field LAI was > 2.4 during peak of the growing season. Field $fAPAR_{green}$ matched well with the $fAPAR_{chl}$ retrievals during the early vegetative stage in June and early July but was higher than $fAPAR_{chl}$ during the mature/reproductive and senescent stages in late July, August and September. In addition, similar patterns were observed between LAI_{green} and LAI_{chl} . In order to save pages, we do not exhibit the similar figures for US-NE2 and US-NE3 here.

FIGURE 1 HERE

The product of $fAPAR_x$ (MOD15A2 FPAR or $fAPAR_{chl}$) and PAR for each crop type per field was compared against tower flux GPP to determine the function for the simple linear regression model. The function $y=ax$, R^2 and RMSE were listed in Table 1, where the dependent variable (y) is tower flux GPP, and the independent variable (x) is the product of PAR and $fAPAR_x$. The physiological meaning of slope “a” is average light use efficiency (LUE): it means LUE at canopy level ($LUE_{canopy} = \frac{GPP}{[MOD15A2\ FPAR]*PAR}$) for MOD15A2 FPAR and means LUE at chlorophyll level ($LUE_{chl} = \frac{GPP}{fAPAR_{chl}*PAR}$) for $fAPAR_{chl}$. Table 1 shows average LUE_{chl} (maize, 0.70; soybean, 0.45 g C mol⁻¹ Photosynthetic Photon Flux Density (PPFD)) is greater than LUE_{canopy} (maize, 0.58; soybean, 0.35 g C mol⁻¹ PPFD) for both crop types in each field. Neither the average LUE_{canopy} nor the average LUE_{chl} changed much from field to field per crop type. The functions were employed to estimate GPP. The improvement achieved by replacing MOD15A2 FPAR with $fAPAR_{chl}$ to estimate crop GPP is obvious in terms of R^2 and RMSE for each crop type in each field. The performance of $fAPAR_{chl}$ in the irrigated field (US-NE2) is

better than in the rainfed field (US-NE3) for both maize and soybean, as expressed in terms of R^2 and RMSE.

TABLE 1 HERE

We combined data for maize from all three fields and combined data for soybean from US-NE2 and US-NE3 to determine more general relationships for both crop types using MOD15A2 FPAR and $fAPAR_{chl}$ to simulate GPP. Tower-based mean daily GPP values during the growing season were 12.44 and $8.07 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ for maize and soybean, respectively. Figure 2 shows the comparison of simulated GPP using MOD15A2 FPAR and $fAPAR_{chl}$ against tower flux GPP for maize and soybean, respectively. The GPP estimation performance using $fAPAR_{chl}$ is noticeably better than using MOD15A2 FPAR for both crop types: for maize, R^2 increases from 0.68 to 0.87 and RMSE decreases from 4.59 to $2.88 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$; for soybean, R^2 increases from 0.46 to 0.83 and RMSE decreases from 3.72 to $2.10 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$.

FIGURE 2 HERE

IV. DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows average LUE_{chl} of maize ($0.70 \text{ g C mol}^{-1} \text{ PPFD}$) is much higher than average LUE_{chl} of soybean ($0.45 \text{ g C mol}^{-1} \text{ PPFD}$). The MOD17A2 GPP algorithm and product assume the maximum LUE for crop is 0.68 g C/MJ ($\cong 0.15 \text{ g C mol}^{-1} \text{ PPFD}$) in the Biome Properties Look-Up Table (BPLUT)(Running et al. 2004; Zhao and Running 2010; Zhao et al. 2006) which is significantly lower than the mean LUE_{chl} values for both maize (C4 type) and soybean (C3 type) in the study fields. This result demonstrates that, in order to achieve better GPP estimates, the MOD17A2 GPP algorithm should expand the BPLUT by splitting the single

“crop” type into multiple crop types with updated maximum LUEs. Potential approaches for estimating daily LUE_{chl} include the photochemical reflectance index (PRI) retrieved from MODIS ocean bands or from other sensors (Hilker et al. 2008; Hilker et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2014c).

Phenology indicated by MOD15A2 FPAR incorrectly describes an earlier start of growing season than was indicated by tower flux GPP, field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ or $fAPAR_{green}$ (Fig. 1(a)). MOD15A2 FPAR reached ~ 0.3 in late April and early May even though the new crop leaves had not yet appeared. The midsummer MOD15A2 FPAR was lower than field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ (Fig. 1(a)). The difference between field $fAPAR_{green}$ and retrieved $fAPAR_{chl}$ during mid July to early August was ~ 0.21 . Earlier studies have reported the proportion of PAR absorbed by non-photosynthetic components of a mature green leaf ranged from 15% to 20% of the PAR absorbed by the whole leaf (Evans 1987; von Caemmerer 2000). Leaf dry matter in the leaf tissue is increasing after early crop growth (Demarez et al. 1999; Gond et al. 1999; Smart and Bingham 1974) which partly accounts for the difference between $fAPAR_{chl}$ retrievals and field $fAPAR_{green}$ values in late July, August and September. The computing of field $fAPAR_{green}$ does not consider the impact of litter components and non-photosynthetic pigments within “green leaves” which also contributes the difference between $fAPAR_{chl}$ and field $fAPAR_{green}$. The field measured $fAPAR_{canopy}$ is comprised of $fAPAR_{foliage}$ and $fAPAR_{stem}$ (by corn stalks and other non-foliar components). Therefore, $fAPAR_{green}$ calculated with Eqn. (1) might be greater than actual fAPAR by green leaves. All these factors might also account for the difference between field LAI_{green} and retrieved LAI_{chl} in late July, August and September.

The $fAPAR_{chl}$ and LAI_{chl} retrieval algorithm (Zhang et al. 2013) includes search ranges for soil/background reflectance and stem reflectance for MODIS bands 1 – 7 as input, and does

not need biome type as input for inversion, and can successfully invert leaf chlorophyll content, leaf dry matter, leaf water content and leaf non-photosynthetic pigment (also referred to as brown pigment) using PROSAIL2 and surface reflectance of MODIS bands 1 – 7. When there are no leaves standing in the field, whether live leaves or dead leaves, the retrieved $fAPAR_{chl}$ and LAI_{chl} will be ~zero. In contrast, the MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR algorithm needs biome type of each pixel as input for inversion and does not intend to achieve $fAPAR_{foliage}$, $fAPAR_{chl}$ or $fAPAR_{non-chl}$. Upstream activities of the MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR and MODIS $fAPAR_{chl}$ retrieval processes include L1B data calibration, gridding and atmospheric correction. Both the differences among the upstream activities and the differences among the MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR and the $LAI_{chl}/fAPAR_{chl}$ retrieval algorithms might contribute to the performance difference of the MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR product and the $LAI_{chl}/fAPAR_{chl}$ product.

V. CONCLUSION

For these study fields, MOD15A2 FPAR overestimated field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ in spring and fall, and underestimated the peak field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ values in summer. MOD15A2 LAI also overestimated field LAI in spring, and underestimated field total LAI in summer. This suggests that the slope “a” in Table 1 for MOD15A2 FPAR would diff from field LUE_{canopy} ($field\ LUE_{canopy} = \frac{GPP}{[field\ fAPAR_{canopy}] * PAR}$) because the product [MOD15A2 FPAR]*PAR overestimated field $fAPAR_{canopy}$ in spring and fall, and underestimated it in summer. The eye ball inspection approach of “green leaves” (Gitelson et al. 2012; Peng et al. 2011, 2013; Viña and Gitelson 2005; Viña et al. 2011) does not tell how much non-photosynthetic pigment and dry

matter exists, especially during the middle and late growing season. This can limit the use of $fAPAR_{green}$ and LAI_{green} in GPP estimation.

GPP simulated with $fAPAR_{chl}$ was corroborated with tower flux GPP in crops. Replacing MOD15A2 FPAR with $fAPAR_{chl}$ resulted in improvement and reduction of uncertainties of crop GPP estimates. Overall, for maize, R^2 increased by ~ 0.19 and RMSE decreased by $1.71 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$; for soybean, R^2 increased by ~ 0.37 and RMSE decreased by $1.62 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. Investigations on GPP estimation performance with $fAPAR_{chl}$ versus MOD15A2 FPAR for other plant functional types are needed. GPP estimated with MODIS $fAPAR_{chl}$ over the Bartlett Experimental Forest in New Hampshire also was validated with its tower GPP (Cheng et al., 2014). The MODIS $fAPAR_{chl}$ and LAI_{chl} products, compared to MOD15A2 LAI/FPAR, have the potential to improve the parameterization of absorbed energy for vegetation photosynthesis in satellite-based GPP monitoring algorithms (e.g., the MOD17A2 GPP algorithm)(Cheng et al. 2014), land surface models and terrestrial carbon cycle models.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by a NASA ROSES project (Grant No., NNX12AJ51G; PI, Q. Zhang), through the Terrestrial Ecology Program (Dr. Diane Wickland, manager). We would like to thank the support and the use of facilities and equipment provided by the Center for Advanced Land Management Information Technologies and the Carbon Sequestration program, University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Site-specific climate and CO_2 flux data are distributed by AmeriFlux network (<http://public.ornl.gov/ameriflux>), supported by Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory of the Department of Energy. We are grateful to

Drs. Anatoly Gitelson and Yi Peng for helpful discussion and comments and for providing field fAPAR_{canopy}, fAPAR_{green}, LAI and LAI_{green}. USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

References:

- Cheng, Y., Zhang, Q., Lyapustin, A.I., Wang, Y., & Middleton, E.M. (2014). Impacts of Light Use Efficiency and fPAR Parameterization on Gross Primary Production Modeling. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 189-190, 187 - 197
- Deering, D.W. (1978). Rangeland reflectance characteristics measured by aircraft and spacecraft sensors. In, *College Station* (p. 338). TX: Texas A&M University
- Demarez, V., Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.P., Mouglin, E., Marty, G., Proisy, C., Dufrene, E., & Le Dantec, V. (1999). Seasonal variation of leaf chlorophyll content of a temperate forest. Inversion of the PROSPECT model. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 20, 879-894
- Emmanuel, W.R., Killough, G.G., Post, W.M., & Shugart, H.H. (1984). Modelling terrestrial ecosystems in the global carbon cycle with shifts in carbon storage capacity by land-use change. *Ecology*, 65, 970-983
- Evans, J.R. (1987). The dependence of quantum yield on wavelength and growth irradiance. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, 14, 69-79
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J.B., Stern, H.S., & Rubin, D.B. (2000). Markov chain simulation. In A. Gelman, J.B. Carlin, H.S. Stern & D.B. Rubin (Eds.), *Bayesian Data Analysis*. New York: Chapman & Hall /CRC
- Gitelson, A.A., Peng, Y., Masek, J.G., Rundquist, D.C., Verma, S., Suyker, A., Baker, J.M., Hatfield, J.L., & Meyers, T. (2012). Remote estimation of crop gross primary production with Landsat data. *Rem. Sens. Environ.*, 121, 404-414
- Gitelson, A.A., Verma, S.B., Vina, A., Rundquist, D.C., Keydan, G., Leavitt, B., Arkebauer, T.J., Burba, G.G., & Suyker, A.E. (2003). Novel technique for remote estimation of CO2 flux in maize. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 1486
- Gitelson, A.A., Viña, A., J.G., M., Verma, S.B., & Suyker, A.E. (2008). Synoptic Monitoring of Gross Primary Productivity of Maize Using Landsat Data. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 5, 133-137
- Gond, V., de Pury, D.G.G., Veroustraete, F., & Ceulemans, R. (1999). Seasonal variations in leaf area index, leaf chlorophyll, and water content; scaling-up to estimate fAPAR and carbon balance in a multilayer, multispecies temperate forest. *Tree Physiology*, 19, 673-679

- Guindin-Garcia, N., Gitelson, A.A., Arkebauer, T.J., Shanahan, J., & Weiss, A. (2012). An evaluation of MODIS 8- and 16-day composite products for monitoring maize green leaf area index. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 161, 15–25
- Hilker, T., Coops, N.C., Schwalm, C.R., Jassal, R.S., Black, T.A., & Krishnan, P. (2008). Effects of mutual shading of tree crowns on prediction of photosynthetic light-use efficiency in a coastal Douglas-fir forest. *Tree Physiology*, 28, 825–834
- Hilker, T., Hall, F.G., Coops, N.C., Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Nesic, Z., Grant, N., Black, T.A., Wulder, M.A., Kljun, N., Hopkinson, C., & Chasmer, L. (2010). Remote sensing of photosynthetic light-use efficiency across two forested biomes: Spatial scaling. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114, 2863–2874
- Justice, C.O., Vermote, E., Townshend, J.R.G., Defries, R., Roy, D.P., Hall, D.K., Salomonson, V.V., Privette, J.L., Riggs, G., Strahler, A., Lucht, W., Myneni, R.B., Knyazikhin, Y., Running, S.W., Nemani, R.R., Wan, Z.M., Huete, A.R., van Leeuwen, W., Wolfe, R.E., Giglio, L., Muller, J.P., Lewis, P., & Barnsley, M.J. (1998). The Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS): Land Remote Sensing for Global Change Research. *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING*, 36, 1228–1249
- Knyazikhin, Y., Martonchik, J.V., Myneni, R.B., Diner, D.J., & Running, S.W. (1998). Synergistic algorithm for estimating vegetation canopy leaf area index and fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation from MODIS and MISR data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 103, 32257–32275
- Lyapustin, A., Martonchik, J., Wang, Y., Laszlo, I., & Korkin, S. (2011a). Multi-Angle Implementation of Atmospheric Correction (MAIAC): Part 1. Radiative Transfer Basis and Look-Up Tables. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D03210
- Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., & Frey, R. (2008). An Automatic Cloud Mask Algorithm Based on Time Series of MODIS Measurements. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113
- Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Laszlo, I., Hilker, T., Hall, F., Sellers, P., Tucker, J., & Korkin, S. (2012). Multi-Angle Implementation of Atmospheric Correction for MODIS (MAIAC). 3: Atmospheric Correction. *Rem. Sens. Environ.*, 127, 385–393
- Lyapustin, A., Wang, Y., Laszlo, I., Kahn, R., Korkin, S., Remer, L., Levy, R., & Reid, J.S. (2011b). Multi-Angle Implementation of Atmospheric Correction (MAIAC): Part 2. Aerosol Algorithm. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D03211
- Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A.W., Rosenbluth, M.N., Teller, A.H., & Teller, E. (1953). Equations of state calculations by fast computing machines. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21, 1087–1092
- Monteith, J.L. (1972). Solar-Radiation and productivity in tropical ecosystems. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 9, 747–766
- Monteith, J.L. (1977). Climate and efficiency of crop production in Britain. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 281, 277–294
- Myneni, R.B., Hoffman, S., Knyazikhin, Y., Privette, J.L., Glassy, J., Tian, Y., Wang, Y., Song, X., Zhang, Y., Smith, G.R., Lotsch, A., Friedl, M., Morisette, J.T., Votava, P., Nemani, R.R., & Running, S.W. (2002). Global products of vegetation leaf area and fraction absorbed PAR from year one of MODIS data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 83, 214–231

- Myneni, R.B., Nemani, R.R., & Running, S.W. (1997). Estimation of global leaf area index and absorbed PAR using radiative transfer models. *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING*, 35, 1380-1393
- Peng, Y., Gitelson, A.A., Keydan, G.P., Rundquist, D.C., & Moses, W.J. (2011). Remote estimation of gross primary production in maize and support for a new paradigm based on total crop chlorophyll content. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115, 978-989
- Peng, Y., Gitelson, A.A., & Sakamoto, T. (2013). Remote estimation of gross primary productivity in crops using MODIS 250 m data. *Rem. Sens. Environ.*, 128, 186-196
- Running, S., Nemani, R., Heinsch, F., Zhao, M., Reeves, M., & Hashimoto, H. (2004). A continuous satellite-derived measure of global terrestrial primary production. *Bioscience*, 54, 547-560
- Running, S.W. (1984). Microclimate control of forest productivity: Analysis by computer simulation of annual photosynthesis/transpiration balance in different environment. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 32, 267-288
- Running, S.W., & Coughlan, J.C. (1988). A General-Model of Forest Ecosystem Processes for Regional Applications .I. Hydrologic Balance, Canopy Gas-Exchange and Primary Production Processes. *Ecological Modelling*, 42, 125-154
- Running, S.W., & Gower, S.T. (1991). Forest-BGC, a General-Model of Forest Ecosystem Processes for Regional Applications .II. Dynamic Carbon Allocation and Nitrogen Budgets. *Tree Physiology*, 9, 147-160
- Running, S.W., Thornton, P.E., Nemani, R., & Glassy, J.M. (2000). Global terrestrial gross and net primary productivity from the Earth Observing System. In O.E. Sala, R.B. Jackson, H.A. Mooney & R.W. Howarth (Eds.), *Methods in Ecosystem Science* (pp. 44-57). New York: Springer Verlag
- Sellers, P. (1987). Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis and transpiration. II. The role of biophysics in the linearity of their interdependence. *Rem. Sens. Environ.*, 21, 143-183
- Sellers, P.J. (1985). Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis and transpiration. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 6, 1335-1372
- Smart, R.E., & Bingham, G.E. (1974). Rapid Estimates of Relative Water Content. *Plant Physiol.*, 53, 258-260
- Suyker, A.E., Verma, S.B., Burba, G.G., & Arkebauer, T.J. (2005). gross primary production and ecosystem respiration of irrigated maize and irrigated soybean during a growing season. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 131, 180-190
- Tucker, C.J. (1979). Red and Photographic Infrared Linear Combinations for Monitoring Vegetation. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 8, 127-150
- Ustin, S.L., Wessman, C.A., Curtiss, B., Kasischke, E., Way, J., & Vanderbilt, V.C. (1991). Opportunities for using the EOS Imaging Spectrometers and synthetic aperture radar in ecological models. *Ecology*, 72, 1934-1945
- Viña, A., & Gitelson, A.A. (2005). New developments in the remote estimation of the fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation in crops. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32
- Viña, A., Gitelson, A.A., Nguy-Robertson, A.L., & Peng, Y. (2011). Comparison of different vegetation indices for the remote assessment of green leaf area index of crops. *Rem. Sens. Environ.*, 115, 3468-3478
- von Caemmerer, S. (2000). *Biochemical models of leaf photosynthesis*. Collingwood, Vic., Australia.: CSIRO

- Wolfe, R., Roy, D., & Vermote, E. (1998). The MODIS land data storage, gridding and compositing methodology: Level 2 Grid. *IEEE Transactions on Geosciences and Remote Sensing*, 36, 1324-1338
- Zhang, Q. (2003). Improving estimation of terrestrial gross primary productivity (GPP): retrieval of fraction of photosynthetically active radiation absorbed by chlorophyll (fAPAR_{chl}) versus FAPAR. *NASA Earth System Science (ESS) Fellowship Program*
- Zhang, Q., Middleton, E.M., Cheng, Y.-B., & Landis, D.R. (2013). Variations of Foliage Chlorophyll fAPAR and Foliage Non-Chlorophyll fAPAR (fAPAR_{chl}, fAPAR_{non-chl}) at the Harvard Forest. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 6, 2254-2264
- Zhang, Q., Cheng, Y.-B., Lyapustin, A.I., Wang, Y., Xiao, X., Suyker, A., Verma, S., Tan, B., & Middleton, E.M. (2014a). Estimation of crop gross primary production (GPP): I. Impact of MODIS observation footprint area and Impact of vegetation BRDF characteristics. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 191, 51 – 63
- Zhang, Q., Cheng, Y.-B., Lyapustin, A.I., Wang, Y., Zhang, X., Suyker, A., Verma, S., Shuai, Y., & Middleton, E.M. (2014b). Estimation of crop gross primary production (GPP): II. Do the scaled vegetation indices improve performance? *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, in revision
- Zhang, Q., Middleton, E.M., Cheng, Y.-B., Huemmrich, K.F., Cook, B.D., Corp, L.A., Kustas, W.P., Russ, A.L., & Prueger, J.H. (2014c). Remote estimation of corn daily gross primary production (GPP): integration of fAPAR_{chl} and PRI. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, in review
- Zhang, Q., Middleton, E.M., Gao, B.-C., & Cheng, Y.-B. (2012). Using EO-1 Hyperion to Simulate HypsIRI Products for a Coniferous Forest: the Fraction of PAR Absorbed by Chlorophyll (fAPAR_{chl}) and Leaf Water Content (LWC). *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 50, 1844-1852
- Zhang, Q., Middleton, E.M., Margolis, H.A., Drolet, G.G., Barr, A.A., & Black, T.A. (2009). Can a satellite-derived estimate of the fraction of PAR absorbed by chlorophyll (FAPAR_{chl}) improve predictions of light-use efficiency and ecosystem photosynthesis for a boreal aspen forest? *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113, 880-888
- Zhang, Q., Xiao, X.M., Braswell, B., Linder, E., Baret, F., & Moore, B. (2005). Estimating light absorption by chlorophyll, leaf and canopy in a deciduous broadleaf forest using MODIS data and a radiative transfer model. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 99, 357-371
- Zhao, M., & Running, S. (2010). Drought-Induced Reduction in Global Terrestrial Net Primary Production from 2000 Through 2009. *Science*, 329, 940-943
- Zhao, M., Running, S., & Nemani, R.R. (2006). Sensitivity of Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) terrestrial primary production to the accuracy of meteorological reanalyses. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, G01002

Captions

Fig. 1 The seasonal dynamics at US-NE1 during 2001 – 2004 for: (a) MOD15A2 FPAR, $fAPAR_{chl}$, field $fAPAR_{canopy}$, field $fAPAR_{green}$, and the tower flux 8-day mean daily GPP; and (b) MOD15A2 LAI, retrieved LAI_{chl} , field LAI_{total} and field LAI_{green} .

Fig. 2 Comparison of simulated GPP with tower flux GPP: (a) GPP was simulated using MOD15A2 FPAR for all three maize fields; (b) GPP was simulated using $fAPAR_{chl}$ for all three maize fields; (c) GPP was simulated using MOD15A2 FPAR for soybean in US-NE2 and US-NE3; and (d) GPP was simulated using $fAPAR_{chl}$ for soybean in US-NE2 and US-NE3.

Tab. 1 List of regression linear functions between tower flux GPP and APAR: $y=ax$ (y is tower GPP, $APAR=[MOD15A2\ FPAR]*PAR$ or $APAR=fAPAR_{chl}*PAR$). Slope (“ a ”) means average light use efficiency (LUE, $g\ C\ mol^{-1}\ PPFD$) at canopy level or at chlorophyll level, respectively. R^2 and RMSE ($g\ C\ m^{-2}\ d^{-1}$) also are reported.

			$y=ax$ $x=[MOD15A2\ FPAR]*PAR$	$y=ax$ $x=fAPAR_{chl}*PAR$
US-NE1 (maize)			$y=0.58x$	$y=0.71x$
	R^2		0.66	0.86
	RMSE		4.87	2.88
US-NE2 (maize)			$y=0.61x$	$y=0.69x$
	R^2		0.72	0.94
	RMSE		4.43	2.06
US-NE2 (soybean)			$y=0.37x$	$y=0.45x$
	R^2		0.46	0.88
	RMSE		3.80	1.81
US-NE3 (maize)			$y=0.54x$	$y=0.70x$
	R^2		0.67	0.85
	RMSE		4.31	2.93
US-NE3 (soybean)			$y=0.33x$	$y=0.44x$
	R^2		0.48	0.74
	RMSE		3.61	2.49

Figure 1

Figure 2