Soil and Atmospheric Controls on the Land Surface Energy Balance: A Generalized Framework for Distinguishing Moisture-Limited and Energy-Limited Evaporation Regimes

Erfan Haghighi1, Daniel J. Short Gianotti1, Ruzbeh Akbar1, Guido D. Salvucci2, and Dara Entekhabi1

1Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA,
2Department of Earth and Environment, University of Boston, Boston, MA, USA

Abstract The relationship between evaporative fraction (EF) and soil moisture (SM) has traditionally been used in atmospheric and land-surface modeling communities to determine the coupling strength between land surfaces and the atmosphere in the context of the dominant evaporation regime (energy or moisture limited). However, observation-based analyses suggest that EF-SM relationship in a given region can shift subject to other environmental factors, potentially influencing the determination of the dominant evaporation regime. This implies more complex dependencies embedded in the conventional EF-SM relationship and that in fact it is a multidimensional function. In this study, we develop a generalized EF framework that explicitly accounts for dependencies on other environmental conditions. We show that large scatter in observed EF-SM relationships is primarily due to the projection of variations in other dimensions and propose a normalization of the EF-SM relationship accounting for the dimensions and dependencies not included in the conventional relationship. In this first study, we focus on bare soil conditions in order to establish the basic theoretical framework. The new generalized EF framework provides new insights into the origin of transition between energy-limited and moisture-limited evaporation regimes (marked by a critical SM), linked to soil type and meteorological input data (primarily wind speed and air temperature, but not solar radiation) dominating the evolution of land surface temperature and thus the relative efficiency of surface energy balance components during surface drying. Our results offer new opportunities to advance predictive capabilities quantifying land-atmosphere coupling for a wide range of present and projected meteorological input data.

1. Introduction

Land surface energy balance is a key factor for the climate system, regulating hydrometeorological processes taking place near the Earth's critical zone where the subsurface is closely coupled with the atmosphere (Brooks et al., 2015). Of particular interest is the role of land surface water availability (hereafter referred to as soil moisture) in partitioning incoming radiative energy into sensible and latent heat fluxes at the land surface, which, in turn, affects temperature and humidity in the lower atmosphere (Entekhabi et al., 1996; Gu et al., 2006; Koster et al., 2009; Schwingshackl et al., 2017; Seneviratne et al., 2006, 2010, 2013; Whan et al., 2015). Soil moisture (SM) evolution itself is forced by available energy and precipitation resulting in (positive or negative) feedbacks with the atmosphere (Guillod et al., 2015; Tuttle & Salvucci, 2016). Such dynamic feedbacks between the land surface and the atmosphere can contribute to extended precipitation and temperature anomalies and can amplify climate extremes such as heat waves and drought (Fischer et al., 2007; Gu et al., 2006; Hauser et al., 2016; Hirschi et al., 2011; Miralles et al., 2014; Mueller & Seneviratne, 2012). Given the critical role of land-atmosphere water and energy exchange in modulating hydrologic and climatic conditions, it is imperative to quantitatively represent energy partitioning at the land surface and characterize its dependence on SM.

Land surface energy balance components include radiative exchanges with the atmosphere, ground heat flux, and turbulent exchanges of latent and sensible heat fluxes to the lower atmosphere. The abundance or lack of water at the surface determines the partitioning of available energy among latent and sensible heat fluxes. The partitioning is a critical factor in the efficacy of dissipating heat away from the surface (Bateni &
Entekhabi, 2012; Gentine et al., 2011b) and is represented as the latent heat flux normalized by the sum of latent and sensible heat fluxes, referred to as evaporative fraction (EF). It is also equivalent to latent heat flux fraction of the available energy in land surface energy balance. The EF diagnostic is a useful measure for energy partitioning at the land surface which has extensively been used in atmospheric and land-surface modeling communities to determine the strength of land-atmosphere coupling in the context of the dominant evaporation regime (energy or moisture limited; Dirmeyer et al., 2000; Koster et al., 2009; Santanello et al., 2011; Seneviratne et al., 2010).

Inspired from the seminal studies of Budyko (1974) and Eagleson (1978), the relationship between EF and SM reveals two distinct hydroclimatic regimes characterizing land-atmosphere water and energy interchange: (1) a wet regime in which SM content is high such that land evaporation (and the resulting latent heat flux) is governed by the incoming radiation and is thus referred to as energy limited and (2) a transitional regime with lower SM content in which land evaporation increases/decreases in response to increasing/decreasing SM content (i.e., moisture limited). Overall, the two distinct evaporation regimes determine how strongly SM constrains land evaporation and resulting feedbacks to the atmosphere (i.e., weak or strong land-atmosphere coupling). We note that SM in this study refers specifically to land surface water availability within a shallow surface layer (as opposed to the root-zone SM); nevertheless, the EF-SM relationship is also evident in the conditions of the surface SM layer which is correlated with the profile SM (at least for mean climatological conditions and except for very dry conditions; Crow et al., 2017; Hirschi et al., 2014; Qiu et al., 2016; Schwingshackl et al., 2017).

Implicit in the EF-SM metric is the assumption that the available SM is readily evaporated given sufficient available energy at the land surface and is neither restricted nor aided by near-surface boundary layer interactions (including subsurface hydraulic properties and above-surface diffusive mechanisms constraining vapor exchanges across the land-atmosphere interface). However, observational studies suggest that the EF-SM relationship is not unique such that the dominant evaporation regime in a given region may vary substantially with land surface and atmospheric variability (Bagley et al., 2017; Bertoldi et al., 2007; Williams & Torn, 2015; Zscheischler et al., 2015) and/or following precipitation or radiation anomalies (Ford et al., 2014; Koster et al., 2004, 2006, 2009; Schwingshackl et al., 2017). These imply that the conventional EF-SM relationship (exclusive of surface and meteorological conditions) is embedded in more complex dependencies (Gentine et al., 2007, 2011a; Gu et al., 2006) and that in fact it is a multidimensional function. An illustrative example is shown in Figure 1 demonstrating variations in half-hourly EF data (based on flux tower measurements of latent and sensible heat fluxes) with meteorological variables.
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**Figure 1.** The variability in the EF-SM space is due to the collapsing a multidimensional dependence in two dimensions. Data marked in red and yellow are conditioned on their respective meteorological conditions, implying that EF-SM relationship is in fact a multidimensional function. This has implications for the forced-averaging in the conventional EF-SM space that ignores the physical compatibility of data located in separate spaces, thereby hindering the opportunity to capture dynamic nature of EF-SM relationships (such as likely instantaneous transitions between dominant evaporation regimes) in response to environmental variabilities. Midday half-hourly data (10 A.M. to 4 P.M.) were obtained from Santa Rita Grassland site (Arizona, USA) during spring and summer season of 2010–2015.
Figure 1 shows the EF-SM relationship observed at a semiarid site during five spring and summer seasons. Also included are the histograms of key micrometeorological factors, including incoming solar radiation, screen-height air temperature, air relative humidity, and wind speed. The blue-colored data are inclusive of all environmental conditions, resulting in wide scatter in the EF-SM relationship. The red and yellow-colored data are for particular combinations of solar radiation, relative humidity, air temperature, and wind speed. The EF-SM relationships for these two subsets of data show the expected form of rising EF with SM that asymptotes for well-watered conditions. The two subsets (conditioned on environmental conditions) however have distinct forms. The conclusion is that the original (all-inclusive) blue-colored EF-SM scatter is composed of projections of many different dependencies not accounted for in a two-dimensional plane. Thus, the EF-SM relationship is not unique even for the same location and in fact it is a multidimensional function, with other dimensions including micrometeorological factors (i.e., solar radiation intensity, air temperature, relative humidity, and wind speed) and potentially many others (Gu et al., 2006). In this particular example, the incoming solar radiation factor in the two subsets is the most distinct. Even though EF is normalized by available energy, the solar radiation factor effect is prominently evident (Ford et al., 2014). The inset conceptual graphic depicted in the EF-SM plot of Figure 1 shows how the solar radiation dimension (for example) will contain different EF-SM relations. If all data are collapsed onto the two-dimensional EF-SM plane without consideration of other dependencies, large scatter and incoherent relationships emerge.

The main goal of this study is to analyze the underlying causes of large scatter in EF-SM observations and to demonstrate that the relationship is actually part of a multidimensional system with further dependencies on other environmental factors. We show that these factors can be taken into account explicitly through surface energy balance. Equations capturing the multidimensional system are developed and we normalize the EF-SM relationship such that the projection of the other dimensions onto the EF-SM plane does not result in scatter. Instead, a universal functional form is derived which distinguishes between the moisture-limited and energy-limited evaporation regimes. Thus, the objectives of this study are twofold: (1) to establish a physically based framework for energy partitioning at the land surface explicitly incorporating coupled SM-atmospheric controls and (2) to extend the results to develop a new generalized EF-based metric (with improved predictive capabilities) quantifying changes in the coupling strength between the land surface and the atmosphere a priori.

We introduce here a generalized EF framework (Figure 2) characterizing the coupling strength between land surfaces (specifically bare soils, in this study) and the atmosphere, with explicit account of the important role of varying surface and meteorological conditions in regulating land surface energy partitioning (Aminzadeh & Or, 2014; Bateni & Entekhabi, 2012; Shahraeeni & Or, 2010) and thus EF-SM relationships. In particular, we implement a linearized form of the surface energy balance equation that incorporates an analytical pore-scale soil evaporation model (Haghighi, 2015; Haghighi & Or, 2013) linking SM content and atmospheric properties jointly affecting heat and mass exchange rates at the surface. This enables us to predict a priori the evolution of land surface temperature during surface drying, thereby quantifying the surface energy partitioning between sensible and latent heat fluxes. Capitalizing on the advantages of this analytical setting, we derive a novel theoretical expression for EF in the form of relative efficiencies of surface energy balance components as well as climatological driving forces, providing new insights into the two key variables characterizing multidimensional EF-SM relationships: (1) a
potential EF (EF_{pot}) indicating the equilibrium value EF takes under nonlimiting SM (θl) for a given set of meteorological boundary conditions and (2) a critical SM (θc) that marks the onset of transition between energy-limited and moisture-limited evaporation regimes (see Figure 2).

We discuss potential benefits of these newly derived metrics for improving predictive capabilities of the conventional evaporation regime conceptualization, with results evaluated for field experiment data sets. In this study, we forward the theoretical framework with the bare soil case. The vegetated surface case has more parameters and it is more complicated. In this first introduction of the conceptual framework, we work with the simpler (but more critical) bare soil case, where ignoring near-surface atmospheric variability can lead to significant errors (>50%) in EF estimates (Bertoldi et al., 2007), and use observations from field sites with very sparse vegetation.

2. Theoretical Development

2.1. Analytical Description of EF Dependence on Land Surface Temperature

The land surface temperature is the state variable of surface energy balance and hence contains information on the partitioning of available energy at the surface among various surface energy balance components (i.e., sensible, latent, and ground heat fluxes as well as outgoing longwave radiation), reflecting their relative contribution (Aminzadeh & Or, 2014; Bateni & Entekhabi, 2012). We derive an estimate of equilibrium land surface temperature that forms the basis for a mechanistic description of energy partitioning at the land surface. The surface energy balance during equilibrium evaporation from the land surface is expressed as (Monteith, 1981; Penman, 1948)

\[ R_n - G = \lambda E + H \]  

where \( \lambda = 2.45 \times 10^6 \) (J kg\(^{-1}\)) is the latent heat of vaporization. A list of symbols used in this study is given in Table 1. Equation (1) serves as a boundary condition for energy exchange processes at the land surface, determining how available energy (i.e., net radiation flux minus ground heat flux, \( R_n - G \)) is partitioned between latent (λE) and sensible (H) heat fluxes when an equilibrium temperature achieved by the land surface (i.e., no storage in the surface layer; Monteith, 1981).

The net radiation flux \( R_n \) (W m\(^{-2}\)) is the primary source of energy intercepted at the land surface and is the sum of incoming and outgoing shortwave and longwave radiation fluxes according to

\[ R_n = (1 - \Lambda) \cdot R_d + \sigma e_s T_s^4 \]  

where \( \Lambda \) is the surface albedo, \( R_d \) (W m\(^{-2}\)) is the incoming solar radiation, and \( \sigma e_s T_s^4 \) and \( \sigma e_l T_l^4 \) are incoming and outgoing longwave radiation fluxes, respectively, with \( \sigma = 5.67 \times 10^{-8} \) (W m\(^{-2}\) K\(^{-4}\)) the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, \( e_s \) and \( e_l \) the air and surface thermal emissivity, respectively, and \( T_s \) and \( T_l \) (K) air temperature at a reference height and equilibrium surface temperature, respectively. We note that the effective atmospheric emissivity \( e_a \) could be obtained as a function of near-surface air temperature and vapor pressure under clear-sky condition (Brutsaert, 1975) and corrected for cloudiness using the method proposed by Crawford and Duchon (1999).

Using the resistance analogy based on Ohm’s law, ground heat flux \( G \) (W m\(^{-2}\)) and sensible heat flux \( H \) (W m\(^{-2}\)) can be expressed in terms of the near-surface gradient of temperature from the land surface (\( T_s \)) to the deep ground (\( T_d \), approximated by monthly averaged air temperature) and to the atmosphere (\( T_a \)), respectively, as

\[ G = \frac{\rho c_p}{K} (T_s - T_d) \]  

\[ H = \frac{\rho c_p}{e_a \delta} (T_l - T_a) \]  

where \( \rho \) (kg m\(^{-3}\)) is the air density, \( c_p \) (J kg\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)) is the air specific heat at constant pressure, and \( e_a = \rho c_p Z_T / K_0 \) and \( e_a = \rho c_p \delta / K_0 \) (s m\(^{-1}\)) are the ground heat flux resistance and the aerodynamic resistance to sensible heat flux from the surface to the overlaying air layer, respectively. \( Z_T \) (m) is an effective thermal depth that senses surface temperature fluctuations and ranges from 10 to 30 mm for practical conditions (Gao...
et al., 2017; Li et al., 2016; Shahraeeni & Or, 2011), and $\delta \approx 21v/u$, (m) is the thickness of an aerodynamic layer close to the surface (termed viscous sublayer) that underlies turbulent air boundary layer and sets the boundary conditions for heat and water vapor transfer by thermal conduction and molecular diffusion, respectively (Haghighi et al., 2013; Haghighi & Or, 2013, 2015b). $v$ (m s$^{-1}$) is the air kinematic viscosity and $u$ (m s$^{-1}$) is the friction velocity approximated by $0.1\times U_a$ for bare soils (Haghighi & Or, 2013, 2015a), with $U_a$ (m s$^{-1}$) the wind speed at the reference height. $K_s$ and $K_a$ (W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$) are the soil and air thermal conductivity, respectively.

Implicit in (3) is the assumption of a linearized soil temperature profile, originally varying exponentially with soil depth (Bateni & Entekhabi, 2012; Shahraeeni & Or, 2011), across the relatively shallow surface soil layer.

| Symbol | Unit | Description |
|--------|------|-------------|
| $c$    | J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ | Model coefficient in (15) |
| $c_p$  | J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ | Specific heat |
| $D$    | m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ | Water vapor diffusion coefficient in free air |
| $E$    | kg m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ | Evaporation flux |
| $E_F$  | | Evaporative fraction |
| $E_{Fpot}$ | | Potential evaporative fraction |
| $G$    | W m$^{-2}$ | Soil vertical conductive heat flux |
| $g$    | m s$^{-1}$ | Conductance |
| $H$    | W m$^{-2}$ | Sensible heat flux |
| $K$    | W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ | Air/soil thermal conductivity |
| $k$    | m s$^{-1}$ | Unsaturated soil hydraulic conductivity |
| $p$    | m | Soil mean pore size |
| $q_0$  | kg kg$^{-1}$ | Air specific humidity |
| $q_s$  | kg kg$^{-1}$ | Saturated specific humidity |
| $R$    | W m$^{-2}$ | Isothermal net radiation |
| $R_a$  | W m$^{-2}$ | Net radiation |
| $R_i$  | W m$^{-2}$ | Incoming shortwave radiation |
| $R_H$  | | Relative humidity of ambient air |
| $r_a$  | s m$^{-1}$ | Aerodynamic resistance to latent heat flux |
| $r_{adi}$ | s m$^{-1}$ | Aerodynamic resistance to sensible heat flux |
| $r_g$  | s m$^{-1}$ | Resistance to ground heat flux |
| $r_{rad}$ | s m$^{-1}$ | Resistance to (longwave) radiative heat flux |
| $r_s$  | s m$^{-1}$ | Soil resistance to latent heat flux |
| $r_{cl}$ | s m$^{-1}$ | Climatological resistance |
| $T$    | K | Temperature |
| $T_d$  | K | Deep ground temperature |
| $U_a$  | m s$^{-1}$ | Wind speed |
| $u$    | m s$^{-1}$ | Friction velocity |
| $v$    | m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ | Air kinematic viscosity |
| $Z_T$  | m | Effective soil thermal thickness |
| $\alpha_{PT}$ | | Priestly-Taylor coefficient |
| $\beta$ | | Bowen ratio |
| $\delta$ | m | Viscous sublayer thickness |
| $e_a$  | | Air thermal emissivity |
| $e_s$  | | Soil thermal emissivity |
| $\gamma$ | Pa K$^{-1}$ | Psychrometric constant |
| $\lambda$ | J kg$^{-1}$ | Latent heat of vaporization |
| $\theta_e$ | m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ | Critical soil moisture content |
| $\theta_{ws}$ | m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ | Residual soil moisture content |
| $\theta_{sat}$ | m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ | Saturated soil moisture content |
| $\theta_{surf}$ | m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ | Surface soil moisture content |
| $\rho$ | kg m$^{-3}$ | Air density |
| $\sigma$ | W m$^{-2}$ K$^{-4}$ | Stefan-Boltzmann constant |
| $\xi$  | | Model coefficient in (16) |
| $\Delta$ | Pa K$^{-1}$ | Saturation vapor pressure gradient with temperature |
| $\Gamma$ | | Model coefficient in (6), O(10$^{-5}$) |
| $\Lambda$ | | Surface reflectivity/albedo |

of thickness $Z_T$ where more dramatic temperature changes (from $T_s$ to $T$) occur. We also note that (4) assumes a fully mixed turbulent regime above the viscous sublayer such that air temperature at the border of the viscous sublayer is similar to that at the reference height. According to the surface renewal theory (Danckwerts, 1951; Higbie, 1935), intermittent sweep and ejection of turbulent eddies above the viscous sublayer (termed renewal events) would result in scalar transfer coefficients much higher than the corresponding ones across the viscous sublayer. This, in turn, enables the assumption that vertical gradients in scale quantities (from their values at the surface to those in the ambient air at the reference height) are steepest across the viscous sublayer, and that heat and mass transfer across the viscous sublayer is the rate-limiting process controlling surface fluxes (Haghighi & Or, 2013, 2015b; Katul et al., 1996; Paw U et al., 1995).

We note that the assumption of a well-mixed turbulent atmosphere (i.e., limiting process controlling surface fluxes (Haghighi & Or, 2013, 2015b; Katul et al., 1996; Paw U et al., 1995). stability conditions could result in significant errors (Haghighi & Or, 2015b) and is basically applicable to unstable atmospheric conditions. This is the case for most practical conditions of interest here with $H > 0$ (i.e., $EF < 1$) that facilitates rapid vertical movement of turbulent eddies (i.e., unstable atmospheric boundary layer). The numerical procedure proposed by Haghighi and Or (2015b) can be used to correct this top boundary condition as a function of atmospheric stability parameter.

Latent heat flux $\dot{E}$ (W m$^{-2}$) is the key component of the surface energy balance equation providing direct links to the coupled SM-atmospheric controls on land surface energy partitioning and the resulting surface temperature field as the land surface gradually dries. Here we use a pore-scale description of diffusive water vapor fluxes from discrete pores (Haghighi et al., 2013; Shahraeeni et al., 2012) quantifying latent heat fluxes from the surface as

$$ \dot{E} = \dot{q}_a \left( \frac{T_s - T_a}{r_{BL}} \right) $$

where $q_a(T_s)$ is the saturated specific humidity at the surface temperature, $q_a = RH \times q_a(T_s)$ (kg kg$^{-1}$) is the overlying air specific humidity, with $RH$ the air relative humidity, and $q_a(T_s)$ is the saturated specific humidity at the air temperature. $r_{BL} = r_{f} + r_{t}$ where $r_{f} = \frac{\delta}{D}$ (s m$^{-1}$) is the aerodynamic resistance to diffusive water vapor transfer across the viscous sublayer, with $D$ (m$^2$ s$^{-1}$) the water vapor diffusion coefficient in free air, and $r_{t}$ (s m$^{-1}$) is the soil resistance accounting for soil viscous losses and the effects of soil pore size and spacing between evaporating (water-filled) pores on the evolution of vapor diffusion path as the surface dries (Haghighi et al., 2013; Schlünder, 1988):

$$ r_{t} = \frac{\Gamma}{4k(\theta_{surf})} + \frac{D}{D_{s}} \cdot f(\theta_{surf}) \quad (6) $$

where $\Gamma$ is a proportionality constant reconciling units for capillary liquid to vapor fluxes (see Haghighi et al., 2013 for more detail), $k(\theta_{surf})$ is the unsaturated soil hydraulic conductivity (m s$^{-1}$) at the surface SM content $\theta_{surf}$ (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) (Haghighi et al., 2013; Mualem, 1976), $\rho(m)$ is the soil mean pore size (estimated as 1/3 of the mean particle size; Glover & Walker, 2009), and $f(\theta_{surf})$ is a surface-wetness-dependent coefficient accounting for nonlinear interactions influencing vapor diffusion path as the surface dries and spacing between remaining evaporating pore increases (i.e., the evolution of the vapor concentration field from an initially stratified 1-D domain to individual 3-D vapor shells forming over isolated active pores; Schlünder, 1988; Shahraeeni et al., 2012):

$$ f(\theta_{surf}) = \frac{1}{2(\theta_{surf} - \theta_{res})} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}(\theta_{surf} - \theta_{res})} \quad (7) $$

with $\theta_{res}$ (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) the residual SM content. At residual state condition, the water phase is discontinuous and isolated with thin films of water held tightly to the soil grains (Fairbridge & Finkl, 1979). Thus, $\theta_{res}$ specifies the maximum amount of water in a soil that does not contribute to liquid flow and surface soil evaporation and can be estimated from a soil water characteristic curve model (Luckner et al., 1989).

To facilitate an analytical solution for the equilibrium surface (soil) temperature $T_s$, we linearize the outgoing longwave radiation $\sigma_v T^4_s$ and saturated specific humidity $q^*_s(T_s)$ terms around air temperature through truncated Taylor’s series as

$$ \sigma_v T^4_s \approx \sigma_v T^4_{a} + (4\sigma_v T^3_{a} \cdot (T_s - T_{a})) $$

$$ (8) $$
\[ q_*^i(T_s) \approx q_*^i(T_o) + \left( \frac{c_p \Delta}{\gamma} \cdot (T_s - T_o) \right) \]  

(9)

where \( \Delta (\text{Pa} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}) \) is the saturation vapor pressure gradient with temperature and \( \gamma (\text{Pa} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}) \) is the Psychrometric constant. Substituting (2) to (9) into (1) and solving for the state variable \( T_s \) yields

\[ T_s = T_o + \frac{\frac{r_{rad}}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{r_{BL}}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{D}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{r_{BL}}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{T_o}{T_o}}{\gamma} \]  

(10)

where \( r_{rad} = \rho c_p / 4 \sigma s r^2 \) (m \(^{-1}\)) is the resistance to (longwave) radiative heat flux and \( r_{BL} \) (m \(^{-1}\)) is the so-called climatological resistance combining climate variables of saturation deficit and available energy, as a measure of the dominating overhead climatological condition (Lafleur & Rouse, 1988; Raupach, 2001):

\[ r_{BL} = \frac{\lambda_p \cdot (1 - RH) \cdot q_*^i(T_o)}{\gamma - \frac{\Delta}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{\gamma} \cdot (T_o - T)} \]  

(11)

with \( \gamma = (1 - \Lambda) \cdot R_i - \sigma_s r^2 \cdot (1 - r_{rad}) \). A basic test of the derived surface temperature parametrization in (10) using controlled laboratory-scale data is given in supporting information Figure S1.

The analytical expression for the equilibrium surface temperature in (10) allows estimation of surface energy balance components, provided surface and routine meteorological variables are available (see supporting information Figures S2–S4). This analytical solution, which is expressed in terms of resistances representative of surface and climatic mechanisms regulating surface fluxes, allows us to parametrize partitioning of available energy at the soil surface between sensible and latent heat fluxes and thus determine \( EF \) as

\[ EF = \frac{\lambda_p}{\lambda_p + \gamma} = \frac{1}{1 + \beta} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\Delta}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{\gamma} \cdot \frac{T_o}{T_o} - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{T_o} - 1}} \]  

(12)

where \( \beta = H / \lambda_p \) is the Bowen ratio, and \( r_{BL}/r_{BL} \) and \( r_{rad}/r_{BL} \) are dimensionless groups composed of ratios of resistances accounting for the relative efficiencies of surface energy balance components and (surface-temperature-independent) climatological processes in regulating surface temperature evolution:

\[ \frac{r_{rad}}{r_{BL}} = 1 + \frac{\Delta}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{r_{BL}}{r_{rad}} \]  

(13)

where \( g = 1 / r \) (m \(^{-1}\)) is referred to as conductance. Note that the dimensionless efficiency terms in (13) are relative to sensible heat flux, and the ratios \( \Delta / \Delta \cdot r_{BL}/r_{rad} \) denote the effectiveness of the surface-independent climate variables relative to sensible and latent heat fluxes, respectively. For given surface and aerodynamic conditions, climate dominates (i.e., \( r_{rad} \to 0 \)) sensible and latent heat fluxes under clear-sky (i.e., high incoming radiation) and saturated air (resulting in minimal latent heat flux) conditions. As a result, surface temperature evolution is constrained by climatological processes rather than near-surface interactions controlling surface energy fluxes; see section 3.1 for further discussions.

The EF parametrization in (12) complements the conventional formulations based on the Penman-Monteith equation for latent heat flux (e.g., Nichols & Cuenca, 1993) by explicitly addressing the relative efficiency of climatological and surface processes in restoring the state variable of the surface energy balance (i.e., \( T_s \)). In addition to EF estimates, the parametrization in (12) facilitates physically based estimates of the Bowen ratio \( \beta \) and the Priestly-Taylor coefficient \( x_{PT} \) (Davies & Allen, 1973; see supporting information Figure S5), with explicit account of the important role of soil and aerodynamic resistances. This is particularly of importance for the attribution of surface temperature anomalies at the regional scale, which is accounted for by the accurate description of dependencies between the Bowen ratio (or the Priestly-Taylor coefficient) and near-surface boundary layer interactions (Rigden & Li, 2017).

### 2.2. A Generalized EF Framework

Given the multidimensional nature of the EF-SM relationship in (12), resulting from the complex (nonlinear) interactions among micrometeorological variables constraining their contribution to energy partitioning at the surface (Gu et al., 2006), the conventional (two-dimensional) EF-SM plane in fact contains multiple curves conditioned on their respective surface and meteorological conditions (Figures 1 and 2a). There is no
characterizing EF-SM relationships under various surface and meteorological conditions (Ford et al., 2014; Schwingshackl et al., 2017). To account for such dependencies, we focus on the two key parameters characterizing EF-SM relationships: (1) the potential (independent of SM) value that EF takes under energy-limited regime (EFpot) and (2) the critical SM \( \theta^* \) that determines when EF deviates from EFpot and thus transitions from energy-limited to moisture-limited regime (Figure 2a). The asymptotic value of EF under energy-limited regime (EFpot) is not necessarily unity and its value depends on environmental conditions. Provided theoretical estimates of these parameters as functions of surface and meteorological conditions are available, conventional EF-SM framework can be transformed into a “normalized” form with a unique universal curve properly accounting for the multidimensional nature of EF-SM relationships as (Figure 2b)

\[
EF = \begin{cases} 
1 & \theta_{surf} \geq \theta^* \\
\frac{\theta_{surf} - \theta_{res}}{\theta^* - \theta_{res}} & \theta_{surf} < \theta^*
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \theta_{res} \) (m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\)) is the residual SM, EFpot is obtained from (12) at \( \theta_{surf} = \theta_{sat} \) with \( \theta_{sat} \) (m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\)) the saturated SM content, and \( \theta^* \) is approximated as the SM content at which EF takes 90–95\% of its maximal (potential) value, given the convexity of the EF-SM relationship prescribed by (5) to (7) and (12):

\[
\theta^* = \frac{\pi c + 1 - \sqrt{2 \pi c + 1}}{2 \pi c^2} + \theta_{res}
\]

where

\[
\zeta = \left(1 - \frac{r_{BL}}{r_{sat}}\right) \frac{r_{BL}}{d} \cdot \left(\frac{d}{h_m} - 1\right) + 1 \frac{\rho_0}{\delta}
\]

with \( \zeta = 0.9-0.95 \) and \( r_{BL} = \delta/D \). Note that the dimensionless ratios in (16) account for the combined and coupled impacts of soil type and meteorological conditions on \( \theta^* \) and thus on the dominant evaporation regime. Provided surface and routine meteorological measurements are available, the expression for \( \theta^* \) in (15) and (16) facilitates quantification of the coupling strength between land surface and the atmosphere in the moisture-limited (transitional) regime (Schwingshackl et al., 2017).

We note that the analytical solution in (15) and (16) assumes negligible subsurface viscous losses (i.e., \( \Gamma/4k \approx 0 \)) imposed on capillary liquid flow toward the vaporization plane at the soil surface. However, such internal losses become important when the land surface water availability is supplied by a shallow groundwater table, with stronger impacts in fine-textured soils subjected to high atmospheric evaporative demand (Haghighi et al., 2013; Lehmann et al., 2008; Shokri & Salvucci, 2011). Hence, a more complete solution for \( \theta^* \) is obtained from the implicit solution of \( EF(\theta) = \zeta EF_{pot} \) for \( \theta \) with \( EF_{pot} = EF(\theta_{sat}) \).

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1. EF Dynamics Controlled by SM and Meteorological Conditions

In the theoretical expression (12), EF is characterized by two dimensionless groups, \( r_{sat}/r_{tol} \) and \( r_{BL}/r_{\phi} \), jointly accounting for the relative contribution of climatological and near-surface processes to the evolution of land surface temperature and thus partitioning of available energy at the land surface. Figures 3 and 4, respectively, show how the ratios \( r_{sat}/r_{tol} \) and \( r_{BL}/r_{\phi} \) vary as functions of surface and meteorological variables. The ratio \( r_{sat}/r_{tol} \) that indicates the relative strength of aerodynamic processes controlling sensible heat flux versus the sum of aerodynamic, radiative, storage, and climatological terms is typically larger than unity under a wide range of practical environmental conditions. It approaches unity as wind speed increases especially when saturation deficit is the dominant overhead climatological forcing (i.e., low relative humidity and cloudy sky conditions), implying the dominant role of aerodynamic processes (compared to the other three mechanisms) in dissipating heat and thus the evolution of land surface temperature. The results reveal that the ratio \( r_{sat}/r_{tol} \) is independent of weather conditions (warm versus cold climate), attributed to the opposite sensitivities of its individual components to air temperature (see the insets). The insets in Figure 3 exhibit corresponding variations in the individual components of the ratio \( r_{sat}/r_{tol} \), with outgoing...
longwave radiation the least efficient (i.e., $r_{\text{rad}} < 1$) and the efficiency slightly increases in warmer climates. The ground heat flux, which is more influential than the outgoing longwave radiation (i.e., $r_{\text{rad}} > r_{\text{H}}$), is also relatively inefficient compared to turbulent sensible heat fluxes (Bateni & Entekhabi, 2012; Gentine et al., 2011b) and its efficiency does not change with air temperature (Bateni & Entekhabi, 2012). On the other hand, the relative efficiency of overhead climatological conditions (compared to sensible heat flux) decreases in warmer climates. Note the increasing efficiency of radiation, storage and climatological processes by decreasing wind speed such that sensible heat flux becomes less efficient compared to the other three mechanisms under relatively low wind speed conditions ($U_a < 3$).

In contrast to $r_{\text{H}} = r_{\text{H}}$, the ratio $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}}$, that indicates the relative efficiency of climatological processes versus latent heat flux is strongly influenced by weather conditions and surface water availability as well as by sky and wind speed conditions (Figure 4). Figure 4 demonstrates theoretical variations in the ratio $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}}$ under various surface and meteorological conditions, revealing its highly dynamic nature (i.e., $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}} > 1$ or $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}} < 1$). Note that $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}} = 1$ implies equal contribution of the dominant climatological forcing (saturation deficit or available energy) and the latent heat flux to surface energy partitioning such that $EF = 1$, referred to as isothermal evaporative fraction independent of aerodynamic processes (Raupach, 2001). Boundary layer processes governing turbulent latent heat fluxes are of higher efficiency than the overhead climatological forcing (i.e., $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}} < 1$ and thus $EF > 1$) under relatively high SM and wind speed conditions, especially when saturation deficit (rather than incoming radiation) is the dominant overhead climatological forcing (see the red line under cloudy sky-warm weather condition in Figure 4). Climate’s dominance over turbulent latent heat fluxes enhances (i.e., $r_{\text{BL}}/r_{\text{O}} > 1$ and thus $EF < 1$) as wind speed and SM decrease especially under clear-sky conditions (see the blue line under clear-sky cold weather condition in Figure 4).
Note the sensitivity of the ratio $r_{BL}/r_0$ to SM (i.e., the strength of their relationship) varying substantially with wind speed such that the inflection point of the $r_{BL}/r_0$–SM relationship shifts to larger SM values by increasing wind speed. Such nonlinear response of $r_{BL}/r_0$ to SM variations is attributed to $r_{BL}$ and associated pore-scale mechanisms governing vapor diffusion from soil pores into the atmosphere (see (5)–(7); Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Haghighi & Or, 2015b; Shahraeeni et al., 2012). In particular, it results from 3-D vapor shells forming over individual active evaporating pores as their spacing gradually increases by surface drying, compensating for the loss of evaporation area by enhancing per-pore fluxes (the so-called compensatory mechanism; Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Shahraeeni et al., 2012). Strong wind speed and/or airflow turbulence conditions, however, result in the formation of a thin viscous sublayer adjacent to the soil surface that restricts full development of the 3-D vapor shells and thus $r_{BL}$ continually increases with decreasing SM.

Figure 5 demonstrates the rich dynamics of land surface EF which is constrained by nonlinear (and/or counteractive) interactions among SM and meteorological variables accounted for by the internally linked dimensionless groups $r_{BL}/r_0$ and $r_{BL}/r_0$ (with shared meteorological variables). When the saturation deficit is the dominant overhead climatological forcing (rather than available energy) and surface evaporation capacity is not limiting to meet the prescribed atmospheric evaporative demand (i.e., $r_{BL}/r_0 < 1$), the surface receives energy from the convective overlaying air layer (i.e., $H < 0$) to support the latent heat exchange rates at the surface, and as a result $EF$ exceeds unity. $EF$ decreases as the rate-limiting factors constraining latent heat and/or downward sensible heat (supporting latent heat) fluxes become important (i.e., increasing $r_{BL}/r_0$ and $r_{BL}/r_0$ ratios, respectively).

Figure 4. Typical variations in the ratio $r_{BL}/r_0$, accounting for the relative efficiency of climatological processes versus boundary layer processes influencing latent heat fluxes, with climate variables of relative humidity $RH$ and wind speed $U_a$ as well as SM ($θ_{surf}$) under different radiation ($R_s=1,000$ and $400 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for clear and cloudy sky, respectively) and weather ($T_a=313, 298, \text{ and } 283 \text{ K}$ for warm, mild and cold weather, respectively) conditions. Dotted line indicates the isothermal condition (i.e., $T_s=T_a$ and $H=0$) where latent heat flux and available energy equally contribute to land surface energy partitioning (i.e., $r_{BL}=r_0$) and thus $EF=1$. 

Note the sensitivity of the ratio $r_{BL}/r_0$ to SM (i.e., the strength of their relationship) varying substantially with wind speed such that the inflection point of the $r_{BL}/r_0$–SM relationship shifts to larger SM values by increasing wind speed. Such nonlinear response of $r_{BL}/r_0$ to SM variations is attributed to $r_{BL}$ and associated pore-scale mechanisms governing vapor diffusion from soil pores into the atmosphere (see (5)–(7); Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Haghighi & Or, 2015b; Shahraeeni et al., 2012). In particular, it results from 3-D vapor shells forming over individual active evaporating pores as their spacing gradually increases by surface drying, compensating for the loss of evaporation area by enhancing per-pore fluxes (the so-called compensatory mechanism; Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Shahraeeni et al., 2012). Strong wind speed and/or airflow turbulence conditions, however, result in the formation of a thin viscous sublayer adjacent to the soil surface that restricts full development of the 3-D vapor shells and thus $r_{BL}$ continually increases with decreasing SM.

Figure 5 demonstrates the rich dynamics of land surface EF which is constrained by nonlinear (and/or counteractive) interactions among SM and meteorological variables accounted for by the internally linked dimensionless groups $r_{BL}/r_0$ and $r_{BL}/r_0$ (with shared meteorological variables). When the saturation deficit is the dominant overhead climatological forcing (rather than available energy) and surface evaporation capacity is not limiting to meet the prescribed atmospheric evaporative demand (i.e., $r_{BL}/r_0 < 1$), the surface receives energy from the convective overlaying air layer (i.e., $H < 0$) to support the latent heat exchange rates at the surface, and as a result $EF$ exceeds unity. $EF$ decreases as the rate-limiting factors constraining latent heat and/or downward sensible heat (supporting latent heat) fluxes become important (i.e., increasing $r_{BL}/r_0$ and $r_{BL}/r_0$ ratios, respectively).
When surface evaporation capacity and atmospheric evaporative demand exceed available energy at the surface (i.e., \( r_{BL} < r_0 \)), the surface receives energy from the convective overlaying air layer (i.e., \( H < 0 \)) to support latent heat exchange rates at the surface and thus \( EF > 1 \). Note that \( EF \) becomes independent of aerodynamic processes and takes its isothermal value of \( T_s \) (i.e., \( r_t = r_0 - r_{ae} \)).

By increasing the ratio \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) to values larger than unity, which implies the dominant role of the climate variable of available energy over saturation deficit and boundary layer processes governing turbulent latent heat fluxes, \( EF \) becomes less than unity and is partitioned between latent and upward (competing rather than supporting) sensible heat fluxes. The competition is evident from the counteractive influence of the ratios \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) and \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \) on \( EF \) variations (note the order of colored lines for \( r_{BL}/r_0 < 1 \) and \( r_{BL}/r_0 > 1 \) reversed) such that, e.g., a decrease in \( EF \) by increasing the ratio \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) for given SM and weather conditions could be partially/fullly compensated for (or even be reversed) by the corresponding increase in the ratio \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \). Given the different dependencies of the ratios \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \) and \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) on the shared micrometeorological variables (as seen in Figures 3 and 4), their rate of variations (and thus their relative contribution to \( EF \) variations) differs under various SM and climatic conditions. The theoretical results in Figure 5 reveal qualitatively that \( EF \) variations would be dominated by the variations in the ratio \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \) provided \( r_{BL}/r_0 \gg 1 \) (normally under very low SM conditions) where the theoretical lines are of similar slope but relatively large spacing. As the ratio \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) approaches unity (typically under non-limiting SM conditions), however, lines spacing decreases while variations in their slope increases, implying the increasing contribution of the ratio \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) to \( EF \). Note that \( EF \) becomes independent of aerodynamic processes parametrized by the ratio \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \) and takes its isothermal value of \( EF=1 \) when surface evaporation capacity is balanced with the overhead dominating climatological forcing (i.e., \( r_{BL}=r_0 \)), resulting in \( T_s = T_g \) (see (10)) and thus \( H=0 \).

### 3.2. Critical SM as a Measure of Land-Atmosphere Coupling

After analyzing how \( EF \) magnitude is constrained by complex (nonlinear) interactions among SM and micrometeorological factors reflected in the two dimensionless groups, we explore in this section whether (and how) such interactions affect the local dynamics of land-atmosphere coupling inferred conventionally from \( EF-SM \) relationship. This relationship, as a measure for land-atmosphere coupling, is characterized by the two key parameters, \( EF_{pot} \) and \( \theta^* \) (see section 2.2 and Figure 2). The latter not only marks \( EF \) deviations from \( EF_{pot} \) (i.e., the transition point) but also facilitates quantification of the coupling strength between land surface and the atmosphere (i.e., \( \partial EF/\partial \theta \)) in moisture-limited regime (Schwingshackl et al., 2017). Theoretical results presented in Figures 6 and 7 demonstrate the dominant role of the ratio \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) in prescribing both \( EF_{pot} \) and \( \theta^* \) for a given region with prescribed soil properties. The ratio \( r_{atm}/r_{HI} \) contributes primarily to the \( EF \) magnitude and dominates over \( r_{BL}/r_0 \) under relatively low SM conditions where sensible heat flux is of higher efficiency than latent heat flux. Overall, mechanisms controlling climatic conditions and latent heat fluxes are the key ones dominating \( EF-SM \) dynamics under a wide range of practical conditions.

While \( EF \) and its potential value \( EF_{pot} \) are notably influenced by climate conditions (Figures 6 and 7), \( \theta^* \) indicating \( EF \) deviations from \( EF_{pot} \) (i.e., \( EF=\xi EF_{pot} \) marked by red arrows in Figure 6) is of more complex (and rather counteractive) dependencies constraining its variations. This is of profound implications for understanding and determining surface and climatic mechanisms controlling transitions between dominant evaporation regimes under prescribed surface and meteorological conditions (Bagley et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2014; Gentine et al., 2007, 2011a; Schwingshackl et al., 2017). Given the generalized form of the \( EF-SM \) relationship depicted in Figure 2, systems with larger or smaller values of the critical SM (\( \theta^* \)) are, respectively, of higher tendency toward moisture-limited or energy-limited regimes, with stronger or weaker coupling between the land surface and the atmosphere. Of particular interest are regions straddling the two regimes (i.e., \( \theta_{atm}=\theta^* \)) where changes in local micrometeorological conditions influencing \( \theta^* \) would be of substantial impacts on local land-atmosphere feedback processes (Koster et al., 2009; Schwingshackl et al., 2017). Thus, there is an obvious need to determine a priori variations in \( \theta^* \) under atmospheric variability and its likely impacts on local climatic conditions (e.g., persistence of the existing meteorological anomalies and/or occurrence of climate extremes).
To explore complex dependencies embedded in $\theta^+$, Figure 8 shows theoretical variations in $\theta^+$ as a function of three dimensionless groups, $p/\delta$, $r_{gh}/r_{gh}$, and $r_{lst}/r_{lst}$ in (15) and (16). Generally, $\theta^+$ tends to increase when climate condition is favorable to sensible heat flux compared to latent heat flux such that $r_{gh}/r_{gh} \rightarrow 1$ and $r_{lst}/r_{lst} \rightarrow 0$ (e.g., cold and humid environment under clear-sky condition). In the absence of subsurface viscous losses under hydrostatic conditions, soil limitation to latent heat flux increases by increasing soil pore size (see (5) and (6); Lehmann et al., 2008; Or et al., 2013) and thus $\theta^+$ further increases in coarse-textured...
media (i.e., $p/\delta \to 1$). Note the important role of wind speed in supporting both $r_{\text{sh}}/r_{\text{sh}} \to 1$ and $p/\delta \to 1$ conditions, implying higher sensitivity of $\theta^*$ to wind speed than other environmental factors. This is in agreement with the regional-scale results revealing turbulent heat fluxes (and resulting EF estimates) over bare soil locations primarily dominated by wind speed variability (Bertoldi et al., 2007).

Figure 9 explicitly shows the relative strength of different micrometeorological variables in regulating $h$ for a given region. Wind speed and air temperature are the most influential factors affecting $\theta^*$ and thus EF estimates over bare soils surfaces (similar to the findings by Bertoldi et al. (2007)) while climate variables of incoming radiation and relative humidity seem to be of minor contribution to the dominant evaporation regime. Nevertheless, $\theta^*$ could be influenced by the climate condition (clear versus cloudy), provided land surface is subjected to a relatively dry air layer of high velocity. Variations in air relative humidity would also
be important under cloudy sky conditions. Given the complex (nonlinear) interactions among micrometeorological variables constraining their contribution to energy partitioning at the surface (Gu et al., 2006) and eventually to \( \frac{h}{C_3} \) (Figure 9), further considerations are required prior to “generalizing” individual studies performed under prescribed land and atmospheric conditions (e.g., Bagley et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2014; Gentine et al., 2007, 2011a).

### 3.3. Evaluation With Field Observations

Finally, we evaluate the proposed generalized EF framework (Figure 2) and its potential benefits for determining the dominant evaporation regime using field measurements of SM and sensible and latent heat fluxes, as well as routine meteorological variables (i.e., solar radiation, air temperature and relative humidity, and wind speed). Given the low vegetation cover in semiarid regions that results in the soil surface having a substantial influence on the partitioning of energy fluxes at the land surface (with most precipitation input lost as soil evaporation; Bertoldi et al., 2007; Cavanaugh et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2009; Morillas et al., 2013; Scott & Biederman, 2017; Yepez et al., 2005), we analyzed data from four semiarid sites (see Figure 10) in the early growth stage (MJJ) with minimal vegetation greening.

Results in Figure 10 show how individual realizations (obtained under instantaneously different atmospheric conditions) in the conventional EF-SM plane could systematically be combined in the context of the generalized EF framework. This helps determine the dominant evaporation regime with explicit account of the complex interactions constraining EF-SM relationships. We note that in an ideal setting, the transformed realizations are expected to be collapsed completely along the unique universal curve in the generalized EF framework (see, e.g., model-based transformed EF-SM relationships in supporting information Figure S6 with EF values predicted by the model); however, the developed model is of limited predictive capabilities in reproducing observation-based EF values due to uncertainties regarding the neglected role of plant transpiration and/or measurements’ quality reflected in the energy balance closure (see supporting information Figures S3 and S4). Thus, model “estimates” of \( \frac{EF_{pot}}{\rho} \) and/or \( \theta_h \) for a prescribed set of micrometeorological conditions may not fully account for the corresponding “observed” EF, and as a result the transformed EF scatters over the universal curve.

The transformed EF-SM relationships (right column in Figure 10) explicitly reveal that the selected semiarid regions in Arizona, USA are characterized by a moisture-limited regime during the study period, as widely recognized in the literature (Cavanaugh et al., 2011; Koster et al., 2009; Kurc & Small, 2004, 2007; Schwing-shackl et al., 2017; Yepez et al., 2005). Note the radiation-driven distinction deduced from EF-SM relationships in the conventional plane (left column in Figure 10) that suggests likely changes in the dominant evaporation regime from moisture-limited to energy-limited regime as the incoming radiation decreases.

Figure 8. Typical variations in the critical SM governed by nonlinear interactions among three dimensionless groups, namely \( r_w \), \( r_{H} \), and \( p/c \). Note that these theoretical results were obtained for a constant residual SM \( \rho_{surf} = 0 \) which is known to vary with soil texture (reflected in pore size \( p \)) and thus affect critical SM estimates.
Although this seems to be in agreement with our theoretical results in Figure 9 indicating a reduction in $\theta_*$ (i.e., moving toward an energy-limited regime) under cloudy sky conditions, such two-dimensional representation of EF-SM relationship does not ensure if the rest of (coupled) meteorological conditions are sufficient (i.e., an overlaying air layer of relatively high velocity and low saturation, see Figure 9). Explicitly accounting for these complex interdependencies, the generalized EF framework (the right column in Figure 10) reveals the independence of the dominant evaporation regime from incoming radiation, corroborating theoretical and observational findings of Gentine et al. (2007, 2011a) and Bagley et al. (2017).

Moreover, the generalized EF framework reveals that the Santa Rita Grassland site was of higher tendency toward (or was about experiencing) energy-limited regime than Walnut Gulch site during the study period, despite the similar range of variations in SM. The results also reveal that the Freeman Ranch site in Texas, USA, was occasionally experiencing energy-limited regime as well, with $\theta_*/\theta_* > 1$ under a given set of meteorological conditions. These indicate the important role of environmental variabilities in regulating local land-atmosphere coupling by influencing $\theta_*$ and thus system tendency toward either of the evaporation regimes independent of SM, not explicitly accounted for by the conventional EF-SM space. To explore more systematically the dependence on other environmental factors, theoretical estimates of $\theta_*$ for the selected sites as a function of measured meteorological variables are presented in Figure 11. The results show the instantaneous nature of the critical SM resulting from varying meteorological conditions in given regions (with prescribed soil properties). The air temperature and wind speed are clearly the dominant factors (the right two columns of Figure 11) in semiarid regions where soil evaporation and its associated

Figure 9. Theoretical estimates of the critical SM as a function of climate variables of relative humidity RH and wind speed $U_a$ under different radiation ($R_s = 1,000$ and $400$ W m$^{-2}$ for clear and cloudy sky, respectively) and weather ($T_a = 313, 298, \text{ and } 283$ K for warm, mild and cold weather, respectively) conditions. Note the dominant role of wind speed and air temperature in regulating EF-SM inflection point ($\theta_*$) marking the onset of transition between energy-limited and soil-moisture-limited evaporation regimes.

(Ford et al., 2014).
Figure 10. (left) Original and (right) transformed representation of midday-averaged (10 A.M. to 4 P.M.) EF-SM relationships in four semiarid sites in the early growth stage (MJJ): Santa Rita Grassland (Arizona, USA, 2010–2015), Walnut Gulch (Arizona, USA, 2010–2015), Flagstaff-Wildfire (Arizona, USA, 2007–2010), and Freeman Ranch-Mesquite Juniper (Texas, USA, 2005–2008). Color shading indicates variations in solar radiation and symbol size refers to wind speed with larger symbols indicating higher wind speed.
mechanisms are of substantial contribution to total exchange rates at the surface (Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Hu et al., 2009; Morillas et al., 2013; Scott & Biederman, 2017). Note the opposing effects of air temperature and wind speed on EF estimates (with stronger sensitivity to wind speed, evident from less scattered \(h/C^3\) plots) previously recognized over bare soil locations in semiarid regions (Bertoldi et al., 2007). As discussed in section 3.1, the relatively strong influence of wind speed and/or atmospheric turbulence on \(\theta^*\) results from its contribution to nonlinear interactions governing vapor diffusion processes from soil pores across viscous sublayer (see Figure 4).

Figure 11. Instantaneous variations in the critical SM estimated theoretically using meteorological variables in the selected semiarid regions. Note the dominant (and opposing) control of air temperature \(T_a\) and wind speed \(U_a\) on \(\theta^*\).
Such relatively wide range of variations in θ+ quantified by readily measurable micrometeorological variables (i.e., $R_s$, $T_a$, $RH$, and $U_a$) provides basis for determining the frequency of the occurrence of moisture-limited and energy-limited regimes and thus the local dynamics of the land-atmosphere coupling in a given region. Moreover, (predictable) changes in θ+ is of particular importance for quantifying the sensitivity of EF to SM in the moisture-limited regime (quantified by $\partial E/F/\partial h$) (Haghighi & Kirchner, 2017; Schwingshackl et al., 2017), with implications for land-surface feedbacks to the lower atmosphere (Gevaert et al., 2018; Schwingshackl et al., 2017; Vogel et al., 2017).

4. Summary and Conclusions

We introduce a generalized framework for evaporative fraction (EF), with explicit incorporation of varying surface and meteorological conditions not accounted for by the conventional evaporation regime conceptualization. The theoretical basis underlying the conventional EF framework is generally limited to cases where soil moisture (SM) is readily evaporated given sufficient available energy at the land surface, such that EF is neither restricted nor aided by near-surface boundary layer interactions (including subsurface hydraulic properties and above-surface diffusive mechanisms constraining vapor exchanges across the land-atmosphere interface). This is of practical implications for determining land-atmosphere coupling strength in the context of the dominant evaporation regime (energy versus moisture limited; Koster et al., 2009; Seneviratne et al., 2010) and associated impacts on climate extremes and ecosystems (Lorenz et al., 2010; Reichstein et al., 2013; Whan et al., 2015), given observational studies revealing complex environmental dependencies that substantially influence energy partitioning at the surface (Gu et al., 2006) and resulting EF-SM relationships (Bagley et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2014; Koster et al., 2004, 2006; Schwingshackl et al., 2017; Williams & Torn, 2015; Zscheischler et al., 2015).

Recent progress in mechanistic modeling of coupled soil moisture-atmospheric controls on surface heat and vapor fluxes (Aminzadeh et al., 2016; Haghighi, 2015; Haghighi & Or, 2015c) provides impetus for developing equations capturing the multidimensional nature of EF-SM relationship. Using a mechanistic pore-scale model for bare soil evaporation constrained by surface energy balance, we parametrized the evolution of land surface temperature and the relative efficiency of surface energy balance components in partitioning available energy between sensible and latent heat fluxes, with explicit account of surface and micrometeorological conditions. This parametric framework facilitates a normalized representation of EF-SM relationship characterized by two normalization factors: (1) an asymptotic value ($EF_{pot}$) that EF takes under nonlimiting SM condition for a given set of micrometeorological boundary conditions and (2) a critical SM ($\theta_+$) that marks the onset of EF deviation from $EF_{pot}$ (i.e., system transitions from an energy-limited regime to a moisture-limited one). Thus, the projection of the other dimensions (i.e., environmental conditions other than SM) onto the EF-SM plane does not result in scatter, an instead a universal functional form is obtained distinguishing between moisture-limited and energy-limited evaporation regimes (Figure 2).

This study offers physically based estimates of the asymptotic EF ($EF_{pot}$) and the critical SM ($\theta_+$) as functions of micrometeorological and soil conditions, and provides a robust framework for determining the dominant evaporation regime over bare soil locations. Our results reveal the dominant contribution of wind speed and air temperature, among other environmental factors, to transitions between moisture-limited and energy-limited regimes (parametrized by $\theta_+$) in regions where soil evaporation and its associated mechanisms are known to play a critical role. The systematic incorporation of complex dependencies in EF-SM relationships into a framework with predictive capabilities potentially reduces much of the empiricism of present approaches quantifying the coupling strength between land surfaces and the atmosphere in the context of the dominant evaporation regime. This is particularly of importance for local regime changes before and during extreme events mostly indirectly detected due to lacking estimates of surface energy fluxes (e.g., Hirschi et al., 2011; Mueller & Seneviratne, 2012; Quesada et al., 2012). Provided measurements (and/or projections) of SM and routine meteorological variables (i.e., solar radiation, air temperature, relative humidity, and wind speed) are available, we envision $\theta_+$ as a useful tool to detect (and/or predict) frequency of the occurrence of moisture-limited and energy-limited regimes in a given region (i.e., $\theta/\theta_+ < 1$ or $>1$).

Additional tests and further considerations regarding the important role of plant transpiration and associated physiological adjustments in densely vegetated areas, which are not addressed in this study to retain a simple and practical framework, would be required to assess the general usefulness of the proposed metric.
at operational scales of hydrologic and climatic interest. Nevertheless, this study provides a physical basis for reconciling independent studies (with seemingly contradictory findings) exploring the effects of incoming radiation and other meteorological conditions on the dominant evaporation regime (e.g., Bagley et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2014; Gentile et al., 2007, 2011a); otherwise remains inaccessible with empirical representation of EF-SM relationships.
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