Soil moisture retrieval estimates at 1-km resolution making a synergistic use of Sentinel-1/2/3-Sentinel data
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Abstract.

High-resolution (HR) very high-resolution (≈ 10 – 100 m) surface soil moisture (SM) observations are important for applications in hydrology and agriculture, among other purposes. For instance, the This is the original goal of the the S² MP (Sentinel-1/Sentinel-2 derived Soil Moisture Product) algorithm, which was designed to retrieve surface SM at agricultural plot scale using simultaneously Sentinel-1 (S1) backscatter coefficients and Sentinel-2 (S2) NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) as inputs to a neural network trained with Water Cloud Model simulations. However, for many applications, including future hydrology and climate impact assessment at regional level, a resolution of large maps with a high-resolution (HR) of around 1 km is are already a significant improvement with respect to most of the publicly available SM data sets datasets, which have resolutions of about 25 km. Therefore, in

In this study, the S² MP algorithm was adapted to work at a resolution of 1 km 1-km resolution and extended from croplands (cereals and grasslands) to herbaceous vegetation types. A target resolution of 1 km also allows to explore the use of evaluate the interest of using NDVI derived from Sentinel-3 (S3) instead of S2. The algorithm improvements are evaluated both over Europe and other regions of the globe, for which S1 coverage is poorer.

Two sets of SM maps at 1-km resolution were produced with S² MP over six 6 regions of ≈ 10⁴ km² in the southwest and southeast of France, Spain, Tunisia, North America, as well as Australia from 2017 to and Australia for the whole year of 2019. The first set of maps was derived from the combination of S1 and S2 data (S1+S2 maps), while the second one was derived from the combination of S1 and S3 (S1+S3 maps). S1+S2 and S1+S3 SM maps were compared to each other and to those of the 1-km resolution Copernicus Global Land Service (CGLS) SM and Soil Water Index (SWI) data sets as well as to datasets, and to those of the SMAP+S1 product.

The S² MP S1+S2 and S1+S3 SM maps are in very good agreement in terms of correlation (R ≥ 0.9), bias (≤ 0.04 m³ m⁻³) and standard deviation of the difference (STDD ≤ 0.03 m³ m⁻³) over the 6 domains investigated in this study. The In a second step, the S1+S3, S² MP maps were compared to the other HR maps. S1+S3 SM maps are well correlated to those from the CGLS SM product maps (R ≈ 0.7-0.8), but the correlations with respect to the other HR maps (CGLS SWI and SMAP+S1) drop significantly over many areas of the 6 domains investigated in this study. In addition, higher The highest correlations
between the HR maps were found over croplands and when the 1-km pixels have a very homogeneous land cover. The bias in
between the different maps was found to be significant over some areas of the six domains, reaching values of \( \pm 0.1 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \).
The S1+\( \text{S2-S3} \) maps show a lower STDD with respect to CGLS maps (\( \leq 0.06 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \)) than with respect to the SMAP+S1
maps (\( \leq 0.1 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \)) for all the 6 domains.

Finally, all the HR datasets (S1+\( \text{S2}, \text{S1+S3}, \text{CGLS and SMAP+S1} \)) were also compared to in-situ measurements from 5 networks across 5 countries along with coarse resolution (CR) SM products from SMAP, SMOS and the ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI). While all the CR and HR products show different bias and STDD, the HR products show lower correlations than the CR ones with respect to in-situ measurements.

in-situ measurements. The discrepancies in between the different HR datasets except for the more simple land cover conditions (homogeneous pixels with croplands) and the lower performances with respect to in-situ measurement than coarse resolution datasets, show the remaining challenges for large scale HR SM mapping.

1 Introduction

Surface soil moisture (SM) plays a key role in the Earth water cycle as it affects many hydrological processes such as infiltration, runoff, evaporation and precipitation (Koster et al., 2004). SM measurements are used to constrain numerical weather prediction (NWP) models via data assimilation (De Rosnay et al., 2013; de Rosnay et al., 2014; Rodríguez-Fernández et al., 2019). It is also used as well as for crop yields forecasting, food security and agriculture management (Guerif and Duke, 2000). SM was identified as one of the 50 “essential climate variables” (ECVs) by the Global Climate Observing System in the context of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Plummer et al., 2017; GCOS, 2021). Building long time series of SM is crucial for climate applications, and this is the goal of projects such as the European Space Agency’s Climate Change Initiative (ESA CCI) for SM (Gruber et al., 2019).

Both active and passive microwave sensors can be used to estimate SM at coarse resolutions (\( \sim 25-40 \text{ km} \)) including the active Advanced Scatterometer (ASCAT, Vreugdenhil et al., 2016), the passive Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer 2 (AMSR2, Kim et al., 2015; Imaoka et al., 2000) and the two sensors that have specifically been designed to measure SM at L-band: the Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS, Kerr et al., 2012) and Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP, Entekhabi et al., 2010). However, despite the actual availability of these SM products, they do not match the requirements of a number of applications. Peng et al. (2020) have discussed a road-map and requirements for future SM products. An optimal spatial resolution for data assimilation into NWP models and reanalysis would be 5-10 km (global models are already running with resolutions better than 10 km, see for instance Muñoz-Sabater et al., 2021). The evaluation of climate models and the assessment of climate change impacts at regional level would also benefit from a higher resolution than that of the current generation of coarse resolution sensors. In addition, other applications in hydrology, agriculture and risk assessment require even higher resolutions of \( \sim 1 \text{ km} \) (Massari et al., 2021).

Downscaling the coarse scale resolution data by merging them with higher resolution data is a possibility to achieve high resolution SM data sets. For example, it can be done using high resolution SM estimates can be derived...
from visible/infrared data (Merlin et al., 2012) or using (Merlin et al., 2012) or Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR, Tomer et al., 2016; Das et al., 2019) measurements. SAR observations alone have also been tested to estimate SM using different frequencies and instruments such as RadarSAT, ALOS-L or TerraSAR-X. Radar signal is sensitive to the dielectric constant linked to SM but also to surface geometry (including roughness) and vegetation water content and structure (Ulaby et al., 1986). Different inversion algorithms have been proposed considering principally three techniques: change detection algorithms (Wagner et al., 1999; Balenzano et al., 2010; Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018), direct inversion of physical or empirical models (Moran et al., 2000; Srivastava et al., 2009; Pierdicca et al., 2010; Hajj et al., 2014; Bousbih et al., 2017; Sekertekin et al., 2018) and finally machine learning methods (El Hajj et al., 2017) (Paloscia et al., 2004; Notarnicola et al., 2008; El Hajj et al., 2017).

With the successive launches of the C-band SARs onboard Sentinel-1 A (S1-A, 2014) and Sentinel-1 B (S1-B, 2016), SM can be estimated at high spatial resolution and with a revisit time better than 6 days over Europe. Three operational high resolution (HR) SM datasets at 1-km resolution using S1 exist such as the S1 4-km SM and Soil Water Index (SWI) products from the Copernicus Global Land Service (CGLS, Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018, 2019) and the SMAP+S1 downscaled product (Das et al., 2020) with resolutions of 1 or 3 km. SM estimates at a very high resolution (plot 10-m scale) at some locations in Europe (as well as in Lebanon and Morocco) over croplands are also distributed by the French continental surfaces data center (THEIA, https://www.theia-land.fr). In contrast to the CGLS data sets, the THEIA SM data set is obtained making a synergistic use of dataset is obtained using synergistically S1 and Sentinel-2 (S2) using the measurements as inputs to the Sentinel-1/Sentinel-2 derived Soil Moisture Product (S2 MP) algorithm (El Hajj et al., 2017). This data set dataset has been evaluated against in situ data in in-situ measurements in comparison to SMAP, SMOS and ASCAT coarse resolution data sets (CR) datasets (El Hajj et al., 2018) and with respect to the CGLS S1 SM data set dataset (Bazzi et al., 2019), both in the south of France. The S2 MP SM estimates showed the lowest unbiased root mean squared errors with respect to in situ-in-situ measurements but also a moderate correlation, lower than that obtained for SMAP and ASCAT data sets datasets (El Hajj et al., 2018). In this region, the S2 MP SM showed better performances with respect to in situ-in-situ measurements than the CGLS SM for the classical metrics (Bazzi et al., 2019).

Taking into account the importance of having accurate HR SM data sets, a more comprehensive evaluation of existing products must be done over different types of surfaces and regions. It is worth noting that even if the current temporal coverage of the S1 data is relatively short, it is also essential to evaluate their potential future use for climatic applications. For this and other applications mentioned above a resolution of large scale SM datasets, in this study the S2 MP algorithm was extended to provide SM estimates over both croplands and herbaceous vegetation at 1-km is a breakthrough with respect to existing data sets. Moreover, this target resolution also makes possible resolution, which also allowed to use Sentinel-3 (S3) NDVI as input to the S2 MP algorithm in addition to S1 data instead of S2.

The S1 spatial coverage and revisit time are optimized over Europe and the CGLS products only provided over Europe and Mediterranean region. However, it is interesting to evaluate the potential of Sentinel based products over other regions of the globe. Hence, Two sets of SM maps at 1-km resolution were produced with the S2 MP algorithm over six domains of ∼ 10^4 km^2 were studied in the southwest and southeast of France, Tunisia, North America, Spain and Australia (see panel A from Figure 1). A set is based on the combination of S1 and S2 measurements (S1+S2 maps), while the other is based on
the combination of S1 and S3 measurements \( (S1+S3 \text{ maps}) \). The \( S^2MP \) S1+S2 and S1+S3 maps were compared to those provided by the SMAP+S1 product as well as those from the CGLS SM and SWI data sets. The comparison was carried out over the 6 study regions on a per pixel basis and the results were analysed according to pixel homogeneity for areas covered by croplands and herbaceous vegetation. In addition, the HR time series were evaluated against in-situ data—*in-situ measurements*—along with those of coarser resolution SM data sets from SMAP, SMOS, and ESA CCI.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the different remotely sensed and ground based data that are used in this study. Section 3 describes the methodology used to estimate SM over croplands and herbaceous regions using S1+S3. Section 4 shows the results of the comparisons of the HR S1+S3 \( S^2MP \) maps and time series. They are also compared to the S1+S2 maps as well as to other HR datasets, coarse resolution datasets and in-situ measurements. Section 5 discusses the interest of the \( S^2MP \) algorithm modifications and the remaining challenges for large scale HR SM mapping. Section 6 draws the conclusions of the study.

2 Data

2.1 High-resolution soil moisture \( S^2MP \) maps computation

2.1.1 \( S^2MP \)

The \( S^2MP \) algorithm

2.1.1 Sentinel-1

The Sentinel-1 (Sentinel-2 derived Soil Moisture Product) algorithm (El Hajj et al., 2017) estimates surface SM at the scale to agricultural plots using synergistically radar signal and optical images from S1. The mission is the first satellites constellation mission of the Copernicus program and was conducted by ESA. The mission is composed of a constellation of two satellites sharing the same orbital plane. S1A was launched on 3 April 2014, and S1B on 25 April 2016. They were placed in a near-polar, sun-synchronous orbit. The revisit frequency is 12 days over Europe (6 days using both satellites) with crossing time at equator at 6:00 pm for the descending overpass. S1A and S2 satellites as inputs to a neural network. The neural network is trained using a synthetic database gathering (i) SAR–S1B carry onboard a C-band backscatter coefficients in the VV-polarization (ii) incidence angles (from 20 to 45 degrees), and (iii) NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) as input and SM examples as target. This synthetic database is built using a Water Cloud Model (Baghdadi et al., 2017) combined with an Integral Equation Model (Baghdadi et al., 2006, 2011) that are specially modified and optimized for this application.

In the framework of this study, the trained neural networks were applied to a real database gathering SAR. For the production of the \( S^2MP \) SM maps, S1A and NDVI measurements computed from S1 and S2 over croplands and herbaceous vegetation areas at 100 m resolution using the CGLS land cover map. It does not consider retrievals for other types of land cover.
Afterwards, the data were averaged at 1-km resolution to provide HR SM maps (hereafter $S^2MP_{1,2}$) over the six ~10\(^4\) km\(^2\) regions of the study. The $S^2MP$ algorithm was also adapted to work directly at 1-km resolution using NDVI from S3 instead of S2 to produce maps for the same six regions (hereafter $S^2MP_{S3S}$, see Sect. 3.1). S1B SAR images were collected over each region of study. S1 images are accessible from the Copernicus Open Access Hub. The S1 images (10 m x 10 m) were acquired in the Interferometric Wide-swath (IW) imagining mode with VV and VH polarizations and the S1 Toolbox (S1Tbx) developed by ESA was used to calibrate the images. This calibration aims to convert digital number values from S1 images into backscattering coefficients ($\sigma^o$) in a linear unit and ortho-rectifying the images using the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) Digital Elevation Model (DEM) at 30-m spatial resolution. A database of S1 images available from January to December 2019 was created for each region of study. The databases contain S1 images acquired both in ascending (afternoon) and descending (morning) modes.

2.1.2 SMAP/Sentinel-1 L2 Sentinel-2

Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) was launched on 31 January. The Sentinel-2 A and B (S2A and S2B) satellites were launched on 23 June 2015 by NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration). It carries on-board a passive radiometer operating at 1.4 GHz (L-band), and a synthetic aperture radar (active instrument) operating at 1.2 GHz. The respective spatial resolutions of the two instruments are 40 km and 1 to 2 km, however the radar stopped working a few months after launch. SMAP provides passive measurements of the land surface SM in vertical and horizontal polarizations at a fixed incidence angle of 40 degrees (Entekhabi et al., 2014). SMAP ascending and descending orbits cross the equator at 6 and 7 March 2017, and were placed in a near-polar, sun-synchronous orbit. The revisit frequency is 10 days (5 days with 2 satellites) and the descending orbit crossing time at equator is at 10:00 pm and 30 am. The spatial coverage ranges from 56° S to 84° N. The satellites carry onboard a multi-spectral instrument with 13 bands: 4 bands at 10-m, 6:00 am respectively, and the maximum revisit period is at bands at 20-m and 3 days bands at 60-m spatial resolution. The orbital swath width is 290 km (Spoto et al., 2012).

The SMAP for the production of the $S^2MP$ SM maps based on S1 and S2, optical images from S2A on dates close to S1 L2 V001 product (hereafter SMAPS1) provides SM at 1-km and 3-km resolution that are estimated using the SMAP Enhanced L3 V004 Half Orbit at 9-km resolution. SAR images (less than 2 weeks) were downloaded from the French land data service center (Theia) website (https://www.theia-land.fr/). The S2A optical images (10 m x 10 m) are corrected for atmospheric effects and ortho-rectified.

2.1.3 Sentinel-3

The Sentinel-3 A and B (S3A and S3B) and Copernicus S1A and S1B C-band SAR data (Das et al., 2020). Brightness temperatures from SMAP are disaggregated on the 1-km and 3-km EASE Grid by using the S1 radar backscatter data and HR SM retrievals are obtained using the SMAP Active Passive algorithm. Data are split in two different sets. The first set only uses the closest data in time from SMAP descending orbits to spatially match up with the S1 scene. While the second set uses the closest data in time between descending (6 S3B) satellites were launched on 16 February 2016 and on 25 April 2018, respectively. The S3 satellites orbit is a near-polar, sun-synchronous orbit with crossing time at equator at 10:00 am) and ascending (6:00 pm).
orbits. The second data set at am for the descending overpass. They carry onboard an optical instrument payload, the Ocean and Land Colour Instrument (OLCI), that samples 21 spectral bands (0.4-1.02 μm) with a swath width of 1,270 km and a spatial resolution of 300 m. They also carry a dual-view scanning temperature radiometer at 500-m spatial resolution: the Sea and Land Surface Temperature Radiometer (SLSTR). The revisit frequency of these instruments is 2 days when both satellites are used together (Donlon et al., 2012).

In this study, the S3 10-days synthesis NDVI at 1-km resolution was considered in this study, spatial resolution were used for the production of the $S^2MP$ SM maps based on S1 and S3. These data are accessible in the $SY_2V10$ product (Henocq et al., 2018) and were downloaded from the Copernicus Open Access Hub. The data from this product rely upon the synergistic use of the OLCI and SLSTR instruments. The product provides a 1-km VEGETATION-like product including 10-day synthesis surface reflectances and NDVI. The NDVI values correspond to a maximum NDVI value composite of all segments received for 10 days.

2.1.4 Copernicus Global Land Service products

2.2 Data used for evaluation

The Copernicus Global Land Service-

2.2.1 Copernicus Global Land service

Two CGLS datasets were used to compare with the $S^2MP$ maps:

(i) The CGLS V111 S1 Surface Soil Moisture product (hereafter CoperSSM) is retrieved from the S1 radar backscatter images estimations over the European continent at 1-km resolution (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2019). The images are acquired at C-band SAR in VV polarization, and the retrieval approach is based on a change detection algorithm (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018). Changes observed in the C-band SAR backscatter coefficient are interpreted as changes in the SM values, whereas other surface properties such as the geometry, surface roughness and vegetation cover are interpreted as assumed to be static in time for each pixel. The algorithm provides local relative SM values in percentages ranging between 0% and 100% except in the case of extremely dry conditions, frozen soil, snow-covered soil and flooding. The data are sampled at 1-km resolution from 11°W to 50°E and from 35°N to 72°N.

The Copernicus Global Land Service (ii) The CGLS V101 S1 Soil Water Index product (hereafter CoperSWI) is derived from a fusion of surface SM observations from S1 C-band SAR and Metop ASCAT sensors (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2018). It uses a two-layer water balance model that is adapted to use a recursive formulation and does not account for soil texture. A Surface State Flag (SSF) that indicates frozen/unfrozen/melting state of the surface, depending on the temperature, is used to identify SM values under non-frozen conditions to be used for the SWI calculation. SWI and quality flag values are calculated based on a phenomenological formulation that depends on a parameter the characteristic time length parameter (hereafter $T_c$). An increased $T_c$ value is either due to represents an increase in reservoir depth or a decreased pseudo-diffusivity coefficient. This means that, for a fixed pseudo-diffusivity constant, an increased $T_c$ value represents a deeper soil layer (Paulik
et al., 2014). SWI estimations for eight different $T$ values are provided within the product. Previous evaluations of SWI data by Paulik et al. (2014) and Albergel et al. (2008) showed that the best agreement with in-situ measured surface SM is usually obtained with $T$ values in the range of 5-10, therefore SWI data with $T = 5$ were used in this study.

2.3 Coarse-resolution soil moisture products

2.2.1 SMAP products

In addition to the SMAP S1 product (see Sect. 2.2), several coarse resolution data sets SMAP provides passive measurements of 1.4 GHz brightness temperatures in vertical and horizontal polarizations at a fixed incidence angle of 40 degrees with a resolution of ~ 45 km (Entekhabi et al., 2014) SMAP ascending and descending orbits cross the equator at 6:00 pm and 6:00 am respectively, and the maximum revisit period is 3 days. Several HR and CR SM datasets from SMAP were used for comparison purposes the evaluation of the $S^2 MP$ maps:

(i) the SMAP L3 V6 SM product (hereafter $SMAPL3$). It is a daily gridded composite of the SMAP L2 V5 SM files (O’Neill et al., 2018, 2019b). Only SM retrievals estimates derived from L1C brightness temperatures (Chan et al., 2018) using the Single Channel Algorithms V-polarization (Entekhabi et al., 2010) were considered. SMAP L3 data are sampled at 36-km resolution.

(ii) the SMAP Enhanced L3 V1 SM product (hereafter $SMAPL3E$), which is obtained by oversampling the L1C brightness temperatures from 36-km to 9-km resolution using the Backus-Gilbert interpolation algorithm an interpolation algorithm (O’Neill et al., 2019a). Only SM retrievals estimates derived using the Single Channel Algorithms V-polarization were considered.

2.2.2 SMOS products

(iii) The SMAP+S1 L2 V1 SM product (hereafter $SMAPS1$) provides SM at 1-km resolution that are estimated using the SMAP Enhanced L3 V004 Half-Orbit at 9-km resolution and Copernicus S1A and S1B C-band SAR data (Das et al., 2020). Brightness temperatures from SMAP are disaggregated on the 1-km EASE-Grid by using the S1 radar backscatter data and HR SM estimates are obtained using the SMAP Active-Passive algorithm. The closest data in time between descending and ascending orbits from SMAP are used to spatially match up with the S1 scene.

The Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission is part of the Earth Explorer program from ESA (European Space Agency), with contributions from CNES (Centre National d’Etudes Spatiales, France) and CDTI (Centro Para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Industrial, Spain). The satellite was launched on 2 November 2009 to measure globally and frequently the surface SM over land and sea surface salinity over the oceans (Kerr et al., 2001), with a maximum revisit time of 3 days and Equator crossings at 6:00 am and 6:00 pm for ascending and descending overpasses, respectively.
2.2.2 SMOS

The SMOS mission relies on a two-dimensional interferometric instrument (Kerr et al., 2010) carries a passive interferometric radiometer operating at L-band (21 cm, 1.4 GHz) able to measure brightness temperatures in both vertical and horizontal polarizations, at incidence angles from 0 to 60 degrees and with a spatial resolution of 25-50 depending on the position on the field of view (43 km on average). The following SMOS SM data sets CR SM datasets from SMOS were used in this study:

(i) The CATDS SMOS L3 V3-V7 SM product (hereafter SMOSL3), which is a multi-orbit SM product provided by the Centre Aval de Traitement des Données (CATDS) with a grid resolution of 25 km (Al Bitar et al., 2017). The SM retrieval process is based on the algorithm used for the SMOS L2 product (Kerr et al., 2012), and focuses on the iterative minimization of the difference between a forward model and the brightness temperatures. The model uses the $\tau - \omega$ (optical depth-single scattering albedo) approach to take into account the effect of vegetation. In contrast to the L2 algorithm, the L3 one uses but using simultaneously three orbits within a one week period to better constrain the SM and VOD (vegetation optical depth) estimations. The data are sampled at 25-km resolution, optical depth estimations.

(ii) The ESA SMOS Near Near Time (NRT) Neural Network (NN) V2 SM product (hereafter SMOSNRT), provided on the icosahedral equal area grid (ISEA4H9) with 15-km resolution (Rodríguez-Fernández et al., 2017). It is designed to provide SM in less than 3.5 h after sensing. The algorithm uses a neural network (NN) trained using SMOS L2 SM data (Kerr et al., 2012). The input data for the NN are SMOS brightness temperatures with incidence angles from 30 to 45 degrees for horizontal and vertical polarizations and soil temperature in the 0–7 cm layer from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) models.

2.2.3 ESA CCI COMBINED product

In the COMBINED product of ESA SM CCI version 5.2 (hereafter CCISM V5.2) (Dorigo et al., 2017; Gruber et al., 2019) (hereafter CCISM, Dorigo et al., 2017; Gruber et al., 2019) L2 data sets datasets from different active and passive sensors are directly scaled by matching their Cumulative Density Functions (CDF) to that of the GLDAS (Global Land Data Assimilation System, Rodell et al., 2004) Noah land surface model in order to remove relative biases and harmonize their dynamical ranges. In the period of this study, ESA CCI Combined uses the H SAF active sensor products from ASCAT A and B (Advanced Scatterometer, Wagner et al., 2013) the Advanced Scatterometer A and B (ASCAT, Wagner et al., 2013) and the passive sensors AMSR2 (Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer 2, Kim et al., 2015; Imaoka et al., 2000) and SMAP, sensor products from the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer 2 (AMSR2, Kim et al., 2015; Imaoka et al., 2000), as well as those from SMAP and SMOS. SM data from the passive sensors are estimated using the Land Parameter Retrieval Model (LPRM) version 6 V6 (Van der Schalie et al., 2016, 2017). The data are sampled at 25-km resolution.

2.3 Land cover map

The-
2.2.1 Land cover

The Copernicus Global Land Service (CGLS) V3 Dynamic Land Cover Map product version 3 provided by CGLS was used to evaluate the different HR and CR data sets. As described above, it is the same land cover map used by the \( S^2 MP \) algorithm for this study. This product delivers a global land cover map at 100-m resolution covering the period between 2015 to 2019 (Buchhorn et al., 2020). For each year, a land cover map is provided with three different levels of classes: 11 classes at level 1 (all types of forests are considered as an unique land cover class), 13 classes at level 2 (forests are splitted in two land cover classes: open and closed forests) and up to 22 classes at level 3 (all types of open and closed forests are considered). In this study, only the 2019 land cover map at level 1 was considered. The panel B of Figure 1 shows the 7 land cover classes that are represented in the 6 regions of study. In this figure, the land cover map was aggregated from 100-m to 1-km resolution for evaluation purposes meaning that only the dominant land cover for each 1-km\(^2\) pixel is shown.

2.3 in-situ data

2.2.1 In-situ measurements

The evaluation against in-situ measurements in-situ measurements of soil moisture was performed using data from the REMED-HUS (Gonzalez-Zamora et al., 2018), SMOSMANIA (Calvet et al., 2007), OZNET (Smith et al., 2012; Young et al., 2008), USCRN (Bell et al., 2013), ARM (Cook, 2016, 2018) and the Merguellil networks (Gorrab et al., 2015) (Gorrab et al., 2015) that are located within the six regions of this study (Table 1). All the data, except those from the Merguellil network, were retrieved from the International Soil Moisture Network (ISMN, Dorigo et al., 2011, 2021). Only sensors between 0 and 5 cm depth were considered. In total, 43 ISMN and 6 Merguellil sites were used for the evaluation (Table 1). scaling of the CoperSSM and CoperSWI data (Sect. 3.2). Less sites (40 from ISMN and 2 from Merguellil) were used to assess the remotely sensed data following the criteria explained in Section 3.3. The different in-situ stations can be located using the panels A and B from Figure 1.

3 Methods

3.1 Building \( S^2 MP \) maps using NDVI derived from Sentinel-2 and Sentinel-3

The \( S^2 MP \) algorithm for soil moisture estimation requires as input values the \( S^2 MP \) algorithm (El Hajj et al., 2017) was originally designed to estimate surface SM at the scale of agricultural plots (10-m resolution) using synergistically data derived from S1 radar signal and S2 optical images as inputs to a neural network. The neural network was first trained using a synthetic database gathering (i) SAR C-band backscatter coefficients in the VV polarization (ii) incidence angles (from 20 to 45 degrees), and (iii) NDVI as inputs and SM examples as target. This synthetic database was built using a Water Cloud Model (Baghdadi et al., 2017) combined with an Integral Equation Model (Baghdadi et al., 2006, 2011) that was specially modified and optimized for this application. Then, the \( S^2 MP \) algorithm was applied to a real database gathering the SAR backscatter
The NDVI could be either derived from taken by S2 or S3 images. In this study, the use of the S2 and S3 NDVI was tested for soil moisture estimation using the $S^2MP$ algorithm. In the first version of the $S^2MP$ algorithm, NDVI values required as input for the neural network are derived from S2 optical images. The NDVI was first calculated as follows. Firstly, the NDVI was computed at 10-m spatial resolution (native resolution of the S2) using the atmospherically and ortho-rectified S2 images. To overcome the cloud cover issue present in optical images, a gap filling was performed using the linear interpolation to obtain two cloud-free NDVI images per month (1st and 15th of each month). Over each study site and at each date, a linear interpolation was performed for each S2 pixel using the NDVI values corresponding to the closest S2 images acquired before and after the S1 date. Secondly, the 10-m resolution S1 backscattering signal, incidence angle and S2 NDVI (nearest NDVI date to the S1 date) were averaged for each 100-m masked land cover pixels (cropland and herbaceous vegetation). The pixels from the CGLS land cover map were referred to as the over pixels covered by croplands using the CGLS land cover map described above (see Sect. 2.2.1). There is no retrieval for other types of land cover, in contrast to the (El Hajj et al., 2017) approach described above, in the current study S1+S2 maps were also computed for 100-m pixels covered by herbaceous vegetation. In addition, the 100-m SM estimations were then aggregated aggregated to 1-km. On the other hand, HR SM maps were also produced using NDVI from the $SY_2-V10$ product at 1-km grid scale, by averaging the 100-m SM estimation within each 1-km grid cell, to obtain the 1-km SM product using the same 1-km grid extent of the Coper$S^2SM$ product. In the second version of the $S^2MP$ algorithm, the resolution from S3 (see Sect. 2.1.3). Due to the spatial resolution of the S3 NDVI was used instead of the S2 NDVI. In this case, the S1 VV backscattering and the incidence angle at each S1 acquisition were averaged directly at backscattering signal and incidence angle were first aggregated from 10-m to 100-m resolution and then re-aggregated from 100-m to 1-km scale only for only over croplands and herbaceous vegetation areas inside each 1-km grid cell and the NDVI values were derived directly from the S3 images at 1-km scale. The SM estimation using the neural network inversion was thus directly applied at only applied over 1-km grid scale to obtain 1-km SM estimations pixels that are partly or entirely covered by croplands and/or herbaceous vegetation. The objective was to assess the impact of using lower spatial resolution NDVI as inputs to the $S^2MP$ algorithm.

### 3.2 Data sets comparisons and evaluations

Comparisons between data sets and evaluations against in situ measurements were done from January 2017. Hereafter $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ will refer to the $S^2MP$ SM datasets derived based of the synergistic use of S1 + S2, and S1 + S3 measurements, respectively. $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ were produced from January to December 2019. Only ascending orbits from SMOS and descending orbits from SMAP within this time period were considered.

Relative error for $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$, it is important to highlight again that there is no SM estimate available over 1-km$^2$ pixels not covered at all by croplands and herbaceous vegetation. However, as long as there is a fraction of croplands and/or herbaceous vegetation (whatever the amount) within the pixel, SM values are provided. The proportion of croplands and herbaceous vegetation within each 1-km$^2$ pixel for the 6 regions of study is shown on the panel C from Figure 1.
3.2 CoperSSM and CoperSWI rescaling

Relative SM indices from CoperSSM and CoperSWI were scaled against in-situ data, in-situ measurements for each region independently. This process is needed to transform the indices into SM values estimates with volumetric units (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$). The following scaling formula was applied:

\[
SM^*_n = SM_n \times \left[ \max(SM^I_n) - \min(SM^I_n) \right] + \min(SM^I_n)
\]

(1)

where \(SM_n\) and \(SM^*_n\) are respectively the original and scaled SM values indices from CoperSSM. \(SM^I_n\) includes all the SM observations measurements from all the in-situ time series available for the current region \(n\). The 2019 (Table 1). This concretely means 19 in-situ time series for the Spanish region, 4 in the southwest of France, 5 in the southeast of France, 11 for the Australian region, 26 in North America, and 5 in Tunisia.

The 2.5% lowest and 2.5% highest values are discarded before applying the minimum and maximum functions to remove the effect of possible outliers that can be caused by instrumental noise (Brocca et al., 2011). The same process was also undertaken to scale the SWI values from CoperSWI. The Copernicus indices were also scaled using SMOSL3 or SMAPL3 to obtain the maximum and minimum references instead of in-situ in-situ measurements. The final results were quite comparable regardless the reference used and thus only the scaling against in-situ in-situ measurements was used for the rest of the study.

Since all the HR data sets are sampled on the same 1-km regular grid, the different time series.

3.3 Datasets comparisons

Comparisons between datasets and evaluations against in-situ measurements were done from January to December 2019. In a first step, the $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ maps were compared on a per pixel basis for each region in terms of Pearson correlation ($R$), bias and standard deviation of the difference ($STDD$, also referred to as unbiased Root Mean Square of the Difference by some authors) creating maps of each metric. The results were analyzed as a function of the land cover class. More precisely, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$. The metrics for which the P-value exceeded the threshold of 5% (interval of confidence of 95%) were discarded.

In a second step, $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ were compared to the 3 HR datasets described in Section 2: CoperSSM, CoperSWI and SMAPS1. Of course, the $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ maps were also compared to those of $S^2MP_{S1S2}$. This analysis was also performed by computing $R$, bias and $STDD$ on a per pixel basis for each region (all the HR datasets are sampled on the same 1-km regular grid). In addition, the metrics were analyzed as a function of croplands and herbaceous vegetation coverage over 1-km$^2$ pixels. The metrics for which the P-value exceeded the threshold of 5% were discarded.

Finally in a third step, all the different CR and HR data sets datasets were evaluated against the in-situ data in-situ measurements available in the 6 regions of study. To perform the analysis in the optimal conditions, only morning orbits from SMOS (ascending overpasses) and SMAP (descending overpasses) within this time period were considered. During the night and early in the morning, the soil is in thermal balance, meaning that the vegetation temperature is equal to the soil temperature. During the afternoon, the balance is lost and the vegetation temperature is closer to the air temperature leading to satellite
estimates of lower quality. This is often reflected by lower performances against in-situ measurements for the afternoon SM estimates than those of the morning (Leroux et al., 2014). For each ground station, the closest time series of each remotely sensed data set was compared to the in-situ measurements by computing the correlation $R$, bias and $STDD$. Only samples for which the difference in acquisition times with the in-situ measurements does not exceed 1 hour were taken into account to compute those statistical metrics. Then, only in-situ Metrics for which the corresponding P-value exceeded the threshold value of 5% were discarded. This implies that only in-situ locations where all the data sets provide a time series were used (Tab. 1). Time series of This concretely means 13 in-situ time series for the Spanish region, 3 in the southwest of France, 0 in the southeast of France, 10 for the Australian region, 15 in North America, and 2 in Tunisia.

Then, remotely sensed time series of anomalies in a 35-days time window were also compared to those of the in-situ measurements in terms of $R$. They were derived as follows.

$$SM_t^a = (SM_t - \mu_t)/\sigma_t$$

$$\mu_t = 1/N \times \sum_{n=t_1}^{t_2} SM_n$$

$$\sigma_t = \sqrt{1/(N - 1) \times \sum_{n=t_1}^{t_2} (SM_n - \mu)^2}$$

where $SM_t^a$ and $SM_t$ are the SM and anomalies values at time $t$, respectively. N is the number of observations from $t$ minus 17 days ($t_1$) to $t$ plus 17 days ($t_2$).

Finally, the HR data were also evaluated against in-situ measurements datasets ($S^2MP_{S1S2}$, $S^3MP_{S1S3}$, CoperSSM, CoperSWI and SMAPS1) were evaluated against in-situ measurements ($R$, bias and $STDD$ with P-values below 5%) after aggregation at a 25-km resolution (same grid as that of CCISM) in order to compare their performances to the CR data at a comparable resolution.

4 Results

4.1 Sentinel-3 versus Sentinel-2 NDVI

The S2 and S3 NDVI were compared in each site at 1-km grid scale to help better understand the reliability of using the S3 NDVI instead of the S2 NDVI when estimating the SM at 1-km grid scale using the $S^2MP$ algorithm. The S2 NDVI at 1-km grid scale was calculated by averaging the S2 NDVI pixels at 10 m scale corresponding to the cropland and herbaceous vegetation within each 1-km grid cell (same grid of the S3 NDVI) and compared to the S3 NDVI obtained at 1 km. Figure 2 shows scatter plots between the S2 NDVI and the S3 NDVI over the year 2019 for all the study sites. Figure 2 shows that the correlation between the S2 NDVI and the S3 NDVI varies across the studied sites with high correlations region of study at 1-km grid scale in terms of $R^2$ as scatter plots in Figure 2. High $R^2$ are observed in Australia (0.86) and Tunisia (0.79), moderate correlations for both USA and moderate values are found in North America (0.68) and Spain (0.64) and no correlation
in the west and east of Occitania. No significant correlation is observed in the southwest and southeast of France. The results indicate that in dry regions such as that in Australia, Tunisia and USA-North America, high correlation exists between S2 and S3 NDVI whereas low correlation between S2 and S3 NDVI is present in humid areas such as the Occitania region. The results also show that the S3-NDVI for all sites saturates at approximately temperate areas with patchy land covers such as in the south of France. For all the study regions, S3 NDVI saturates between 0.6 and 0.7 whereas the S2-NDVI-S2 NDVI reaches higher values between 0.8 and 0.9. The lower NDVI values provided by S3 NDVI compared to the S2 NDVI difference could be mainly due to the mixture of the surface reflectance for surface reflectances from different land cover classes in the 1-km S3-NDVI within the 1-km S3 NDVI.

Figure 3 shows the distribution of the correlation coefficient (R²) values for each site $R^2$ between S2 and S3 NDVI as a function of the months. The results show that in the dry periods of the year (summer season of each site), the correlation between the S2 and S3 NDVI is higher than that in the for each region. In general, higher correlations are obtained in the summer season (dry periods) than in winter and spring season (humid periods). For example, the Australian site shows that the correlation between the S2-NDVI and the S3-NDVI $R^2$ between S2 and S3 NDVI is only high (0.72) in the from January to June (summer and autumn season between January and June). In USA, months seasons in Australia. In North America, from March to July, had a correlation, $R^2$ is between 0.25 and 0.53 whereas other months had no correlation between the no significant correlation between S2 and S3 NDVI values. In Occitania east and west is found for the others months. In the southwest and southeast of France, no correlation are found for most of the months show no correlation between the S2 and S3-NDVI values except for some summer months such as except in summer such as in June, July and August. In fact, winter and spring seasons encounters. On the one hand, the highest NDVI values are found in winter and spring seasons due to the development of the vegetation cycles. On the other hand, summer seasons usually have low NDVI values corresponding show lower NDVI values that corresponds to bare soil conditions except in the presence of irrigated summer crops. Thus, S2 and S3 NDVI are highly correlated for low NDVI values (usually in summer) the S2 and S3 are highly correlated whereas.

However, the correlation decreases for high NDVI values with because of the peak of the vegetation development (in spring) the correlation between S2 and S3 decreases.

### 4.2 Comparison between $S^2MP_{S152}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ comparison to $S^2MP_{S1S2}$

Figure 4 shows the Pearson correlation ($R$), bias and standard deviation of the difference (STDD) between the between $S^2MP_{S152}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ maps for the 6 study regions. A very good agreement between the two data sets was found in the six all the regions with $R \geq 0.9$, bias $\leq 0.04 \text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ ($S^2MP_{S1S3}$ minus $S^2MP_{S1S2}$) and $STDD \leq 0.03 \text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$ for most of the areas. However, some differences in terms of bias can be seen between the two data sets in the northwest of the Spanish region (Fig 4c), in the areas with significant forests cover in the France southwest region (Fig 4i) and in narrow areas of the Tunisian region (Fig 4f).

The somewhat higher differences in the Spanish and France southwest regions are seen over pixels covered by a mix of forests, forests with a small fraction of croplands and herbaceous vegetation (dominated by forests), while the see the Spanish
region in panels B and C from Fig. 1). The somewhat larger differences in some narrow areas of Tunisia is due to heterogeneous land cover around several river basins with rolling topography, sparse forests as well as grasslands.

As discussed above, these small differences are expected due to the use of differences seen between S3 NDVI estimated at 1-km resolution instead of and S2 NDVI at 100 m resolution, which are then aggregated only for croplands and herbaceous vegetation areas within the 1-km² pixels (Sect. 4.1) and the different way of aggregating the S1 backscatter coefficients (Sect. 3.1). However, taking into account the overall very good agreement of between $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ maps, for the sake of simplicity and clarity, in the following sections only $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ Section 4.3 only $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ is compared to the other HR datasets.

### 4.3 Comparison General comparison of $S^2MP_{S1S2}$--$S^2MP_{S1S3}$ against the HR SM datasets

Figures 5, 6 and 7 present the comparison of $S^2MP_{S1S2}$--$S^2MP_{S1S3}$ against CoperSSM, CoperSWI as well as SMAPS1 over the six study regions in terms of bias, standard deviation of the difference (STDD), and Pearson correlation ($R$), respectively. Some diagonal structures can be seen in the maps comparing $S^2MP_{S1S2}$--$S^2MP_{S1S3}$ to CoperSSM in Spain and in the southwest of France. These artifacts, most pronounced in the Pearson correlation maps but also present in the bias and STDD maps, come from the CoperSSM data as previously discussed by Bazzi et al. (2019). Indeed, the artifacts are seen on the sub-swaths of the S1 product showing a big difference between the SM estimations in the CoperSSM at the same SM estimation date. Bazzi et al. (2019) showed that the difference of the SM estimation at both sides of the sub-swath at a given date of the CoperSSM map can reach 0.11 m³ m⁻³.

#### 4.3.1 Absolute values Comparison of the order of magnitude

Figure 5 shows that $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ show a bias in the range from -0.1 to 0.1 m³ m⁻³ with respect to the other HR products over most of the pixels within the six regions of study. However, there are areas in the Spanish, Tunisian and France domains, where $S^2MP_{S1S2}$--$S^2MP_{S1S3}$ shows a dry bias of absolute value larger than 0.1 m³ m⁻³. This is also particularly the case in the southwest of France, with respect to CoperSSM and CoperSWI as well as with respect to SMAPS1 in Australia and North America. For these regions and HR datasets, the bias is negative over the whole area. For all the other combinations of regions and HR products, the bias values are both positive and negative. For instance, the bias distribution of $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ with respect to In general, there is no clear relationship between the sign of the bias and the dominant land cover class. However, in the case of the comparison between $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ and SMAPS1 in the France southwest region, the bias distribution is splitted in two (Fig. 5i). The bias is wet A wet bias is observed in the west part of the region and dry corresponding to forests areas with low fractions of croplands and herbaceous vegetation, while a dry bias is found in the east part. There is no clear relationship between this behavior and the dominant land cover class. However corresponding to areas dominated by croplands (Panels B and C from Fig. 1). In addition, the dry bias observed in the east part of the Tunisian region corresponds to an area of salted lakes, named Sebkha, whose water and moisture contents can vary significantly according to climate.
Figure 6 shows that the STDD values of $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ with respect to CoperSSM and CoperSWI are lower than 0.05-0.06 m³ m⁻³ over almost all the pixels within the 4 regions where the Copernicus datasets are available.

However, the STDD obtained with respect to SMAPS1 (Fig. 6c,i,l) are often much higher and can reach 0.12 Higher values close to 0.08-0.10 m³ m⁻³. These significant differences are specifically observed in the west part of the Spanish region, and do not exceed 0.06 m³ m⁻³, sparsely in the southwest and southeast of France. In Australia and North America, the STDD with respect to SMAPS1 are quite similar to those found in Spain, Tunisia, and France (Fig. 6c,f,i,l), where values can reach $0.08-0.12$ m³ m⁻³ in the southeast and northwest parts of the Australia and North America regions, respectively. There is no clear and unique relationship with the dominant land cover class. For instance, the STDD with respect to SMAPS1 in the southwest of France is higher over the forests than over the croplands dominated areas, while in the North America region the STDD was found to be lower over the forest (see panels B and C from Fig. 1).

4.3.2 **Comparison of the temporal dynamics**

4.3.3 **Temporal dynamics**

Overall, $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and CoperSSM show a high correlation (above 0.7-0.8) over almost all the pixels within all the regions of study (Figs. 7a,d,g,j). In contrast, lower values are found for the correlation between $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and CoperSWI (maximum values of 0.6-0.7 and values lower than 0.4 in many large areas, Figs. 7b,e,h,k). Finally, the lowest correlation values are obtained with respect to the as well as between $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and SMAPS1 dataset (Figs. 7c,f,i,l,m,n). $R$ rarely exceed 0.7 and values lower than 0.6 are observed in many large areas.

In the Spanish region, the highest $R$ values are obtained in the areas dominated by croplands. The lowest values are found in the northwest and in a few spots in the south and the center of the region. In all cases, those are areas with heterogeneous land cover over heterogeneous pixels dominated by forests (Panels B and C from Fig. 1). Similar spatial features are observed in the three maps comparing $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and SMAPS1 (Figs. 7a-c) but with lower values of correlation a,b,c. However, lower $R$ values are found with respect to CoperSWI. The areas of high correlation with respect to SMAPS1 show higher values than with respect to CoperSWI but the areas with low correlation also show lower values than with respect to. In addition, the comparison against CoperSWI, which are below 0.5 in a few spots in the south and the center of the region.

In Tunisia (Fig. 7d-f), the correlation values obtained in the north are quite good with values of 0.8-0.9 with respect to CoperSSM and 0.6-0.7 with respect to SMAPS1. The values $R$ drop in the south, southeast and southwest to values lower than 0.3, especially near the 0.5. The decrease in the southwest can be partly explained by the proximity of coasts,
where mixed land cover pixels include urban areas. The correlation with respect to CoperSWI (Fig. 7e) is only higher than 0.5 for the regions where the 1-km\(^2\) pixels are dominated by croplands. The comparison between \(S^2 MP_{S153}\) and SMAPS1 results in a large range of correlations. Only the very north areas dominated by croplands show correlations above 0.6 (Panels B and C from Fig. 1). \(R\) close to 0.4-0.5 are found in the east and west parts of the region. Values lower than 0.2 are observed in the center of the region over heterogeneous pixels around several river basins that were also highlighted in Section 4.2 with Figure 4f.

In the France southwest region (Fig. 7g-i), there is a clear frontier from the areas where the pixels are the distribution of \(R\) is quite homogeneous over the whole area and does not vary significantly according to pixels dominated by croplands with respect to the areas dominated by forests (Panel B from Fig. 1). In the case of the correlation \(R\) values with respect to CoperSSM, \(R\) values remain higher than 0.7 for are mainly above 0.8 over most of the areas dominated by forests. However in the case of the correlation-pixels while the values drop to 0.5 with respect to CoperSWI. The comparison between \(S^2 MP_{S153}\) and SMAPS1 shows \(R\) closer to 0.6 in general but really low correlation values (below 0.2) appear over several pixels. The same pattern is observed in the France southeast region (Fig. 7j-l), but correlations are only significant with respect to CoperSSM and in regions over areas dominated by croplands.

The correlations between \(S^2 MP_{S153}\)

\(R\) between \(S^2 MP_{S153}\) and SMAPS1 reach 0.6-0.7 in Australia, 0.7-0.8 in Australia and North America (Fig. 7m). Similar moderate to low correlation values are obtained in North America (n) with no clear relationship with the land cover type (Fig. 7n).

### 4.3.3 Comparison over areas dominated by croplands and herbaceous vegetation

### 4.3.4 Comparison as a function of land cover

As discussed above, the correlation maps show some features related to the dominant land cover class, in particular, higher correlations are found for areas dominated by croplands and herbaceous vegetation.

To get further insight into the effect of the dominant land cover analysis over croplands and herbaceous vegetation, \(S^2 MP_{S153}\) was exclusively compared to CoperSSM, CoperSWI and the homogeneity of the land cover within the 1-km\(^2\) pixels. Table 2 gives the median Pearson correlation SMAPS1 over pixels where one of these two land cover classes is dominant. For each region and land cover, a set of metrics (\(R\)) of \(S^2 MP_{S153}\) with respect to CoperSSM, CoperSWI and SMAPS1 for pixels dominated by bias and STDD is computed in two ways. One set is computed by only taking into account pixels covered by less than 75% of croplands or herbaceous vegetation. The other set is computed by only taking into account pixels covered by at least 75% of croplands and herbaceous vegetation into different extend: (i) “mixed” pixels in which croplands or herbaceous vegetation are the dominant land cover class in any proportion and (ii) “homogeneous” pixels in which croplands or herbaceous vegetation represent at least 75% of the 1-km\(^2\) area.

Over pixels in Europe (Spain, Tunisia, France) where croplands represent less than 75% of the 1-km\(^2\) area,
In the Spanish region, $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ area, $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ is better correlated to CoperSSM ($R \sim 0.7-0.8$) than CoperSWI ($R \sim 0.55-0.65$) and SMAPS1 ($R \sim 0.45-0.65$) when pixels become more homogeneous. The same pattern can be observed in. In general, high $R$ values are found in Spain (0.54-0.63), moderate values (0.28-0.63) are observed in France and low values are found in Tunisia (0.37-0.38). In addition, $R$ values obtained in Australia and North America with respect to SMAPS1 are comparable to those found in Spain. Absolute bias between $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ and the 3 HR datasets in Spain (0.01 m$^3$m$^{-3}$) are lower or similar to those found in the other regions. The strongest absolute bias is observed in North America with respect to SMAPS1 with 0.07 m$^3$m$^{-3}$. According to the STDD values, no particular trend is observed over the southwest and southeast of France when $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ is compared to 6 regions of study and values range from 0.04 to 0.09 m$^3$m$^{-3}$. For most of the regions and comparisons, the correlation values significantly increase (+0.05-0.1) over pixels that contain at least 75% of croplands. In overall, absolute bias and STDD values remain similar but sometimes there is a slight decrease (-0.01 m$^3$m$^{-3}$).

Taking into account pixels where herbaceous vegetation represent less than 75% of the area, $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ is only better correlated to CoperSSM and CoperSWI over croplands. Correlations between $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and SMAPS1 significantly drop in those regions ($R \sim 0.2-0.5$) over croplands as well as herbaceous vegetation areas. In addition, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ shows very low correlations with respect to the other SM HR data sets in Spain and the southwest of France. In general, high $R$ values are found in Spain (0.64-0.67), moderate values (0.36-0.69) are observed in France and low values are found in Tunisia ($R \sim 0.2-0.55$) for the both land cover types. However, the correlations obtained between $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and SMAPS1 0.32-0.36.

In addition, $R$ values obtained in Australia and North America ($R \sim 0.5-0.55$) are higher than with respect to SMAPS1 are comparable to those found in the southwest of France. Absolute bias between $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ and the 3 HR datasets in Tunisia (0.01-0.02 m$^3$m$^{-3}$) are lower or similar to those found in France the other regions. The strongest absolute biases are observed in the southwest of France with 0.09 m$^3$m$^{-3}$ for CoperSWI and SMAPS1, respectively. The STDD is higher with respect to SMAPS1 and can reach 0.07, 0.08 and Tunisia, both over croplands and herbaceous vegetation.

Compared to the other HR data sets, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ shows generally higher correlations over croplands than over 0.10 m$^3$m$^{-3}$ in Tunisia, Spain, and in the southwest of France, respectively. In contrast with croplands, the correlation values does not systematically increase over pixels that contain at least 75% of herbaceous vegetation. In addition, there is a clear improvement in correlation of $S^2MP_{S1S2}$. There is no significant change concerning the STDD and in overall the absolute bias increases with respect to the other data sets when the land cover within the pixel is homogeneous, in particular over croplands—almost all the HR datasets (+0.01-0.043 m$^3$m$^{-3}$).

It is noteworthy that the bias is significantly higher over herbaceous vegetation than over croplands in Spain and in the southwest of France, while the STDD is quite similar regardless the region of study. In addition, higher $R$ values are found over herbaceous vegetation in Spain. In Tunisia, the correlation and absolute bias values are among the lowest both over croplands and herbaceous vegetation. Low absolute biases can be partly explained by the fact that the region is really dry with desert areas implying a small SM dynamic range with very low values regardless the estimation algorithm used.
4.4 Evaluation against in-situ data

Table 3 presents the evaluation of the different CR and HR SM products with respect to in-situ data in terms of bias, STDD and Pearson correlation $R$ of the original time series ($R$) as well as Pearson correlation of the anomalies time series ($R^a$). The highest bias is obtained for CCISM with 0.07. In addition, Figure 8 shows examples of time series of the different HR and CR datasets at 6 in-situ stations used in this study (one for each region).

The highest absolute biases with respect to in-situ measurements are obtained for $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ and $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ with -0.06 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$. The SMAP products, $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ as well as, closely followed by CoperSWI with 0.05 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$. SMOSNRT, SMOSL3, CCISM and SMAPS1 show the lowest bias ($\leq 0.005$ absolute biases with 0.03 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ in absolute value) with respect to in-situ data.

The highest STDD with respect to in-situ measurements are obtained for CoperSSM (0.08 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) and lowest STDD (0.04 SMOSL3 (0.07 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) are obtained for CoperSSM and CCISM, respectively. $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$, as most of the data sets, shows an in between value. The other datasets show comparable STDD with 0.05 or 0.06 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$.

The highest in general, higher correlation values are obtained for the coarse resolution data (0.65-0.68) and the lowest for the $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ and CoperSSM Sentinel-only HR data sets (0.44-0.48 CR data (0.67-0.77) than for the HR data (0.53-0.74).

The HR lowest correlations are found for the Sentinel-only HR datasets with 0.53 for CoperSSM, 0.56 for $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ and 0.59 for $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$. Concerning the HR data obtained from merging approaches, SMAPS1 still shows a value lower than the CR datasets with 0.64 but CoperSWI shows the third best value with 0.74, just after SMAPL3E (0.77) and SMAPS1SMAPL3 (0.76) show intermediate values (0.60-0.64).

Regarding the correlation of the anomalies time series, CoperSWI gets SMAPL3E and SMAPL3 get the highest $R^a$ with respect to in-situ data with 0.49, closely followed by SMAPL3E with 0.46 in-situ measurements with 0.59 and 0.58. CoperSSM and $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$, SMAPS1, and $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ show the lowest performances with $R^a$ equal to 0.25 and 0.26. $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ gets a higher value with 0.18, 0.36, which is also better than two CR data sets: SMOSL3 ($R^a \sim 0.30$) and SMOSNRT ($R^a \sim 0.33$), 0.35 and 0.37 respectively.

The CR time series have a temporal revisit roughly five times higher than those from $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$, $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$, CoperSSM and SMAPS1 (Fig. 8). In order to understand if the low temporal revisit of the HR data affects their performances against in-situ measurements, one observation out of five was removed from the CR time series and the metrics were re-computed (not presented). However, no significant differences in terms of $R$, bias and STDD were found.

The performances of the two Sentinel-only HR datasets averaged at 25-km resolution ($S^2 MP^*_{S1S2}$, $S^2 MP^*_{S1S3}$: CoperSSM*) with respect to in-situ data-in-situ measurements are comparable to the performances obtained for the original 1-km data sets. The performance of the merged ASCAT+S1 (datasets ($S^2 MP_{S1S2}$, $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$, CoperSSM, CoperSWI*) averaged at 25-km resolution is also similar to that of the 1-km resolution data set (CoperSWI*). In contrast, for the SMAPS1* data set, which is a downscaled product, the correlation increases from 0.60-0.64 at 1-km resolution (SMAPS1) to 0.69-0.79 at 25-km resolution, which is the highest correlation found among all the datasets. In addition, the STDD and bias
slightly decrease. $R^a$ also increases from $0.26 - 0.35$ at 1-km resolution to $0.32 - 0.44$ at 25-km resolution, but it does not reach the values of $R^a$ obtained for the SMAP-only products ($SMAPL3$ and $SMAPL3E$) products ($0.43 - 0.46$ with $0.58 - 0.59$).

5 Discussion

The four HR data sets evaluated in this study have been $S^2MP$, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$, CoperSSM, CoperSWI and SMAPS1 are all HR datasets that were produced with different approaches. Two products were obtained by merging S1 data with ASCAT (CoperSWI) and SMAP (SMAPS1), respectively. $S^2MP_{S1S2}$, $S^2MP$ and CoperSSM are based on Sentinel-only. The last one is computed from local temporal variations of the S1 backscatter coefficients time series following the method of Wagner (1998). In contrast, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ uses electromagnetic modelling to compute a database predicting backscatter coefficients from $S^2MP$ provides SM estimates derived from a NN that uses a database gathering backscatter coefficients and HR NDVI from Sentinel as inputs. The NN was initially trained on a synthetic database containing backscatter coefficients and surface characteristics such as SM and vegetation status (approximated by NDVI). This database is in turn used to train a neural network to predict SM from S1 backscatter coefficients and HR NDVI estimations, that were predicted from electromagnetic modelling.

Initially, the $S^2MP$ algorithm by El Hajj et al. (2017) was limited to croplands and the use of only providing SM estimates over croplands at 10-m resolution using NDVI derived from S2 optical images. In the framework of this study, the algorithm has been extended to provide SM estimates at 1-km resolution also over herbaceous vegetation areas. In addition, two methodologies are used to mimic vegetation dynamics. In the first approach, and S2 was replaced by S3. However, despite the different ways of aggregating the S1 backscatter coefficients and radar signal and the differences between S3 and S2 NDVI are estimated over croplands and herbaceous vegetation areas at a 100-m resolution and then they are aggregated within 1 km$^2$ pixels (Sect. 4.1 with Figs. 3 and 2). $S^2MP_{S1S2}$. In the second approach, instead of using S2 NDVI, S3 NDVI are obtained directly at a resolution of 1 km ($S^2MP_{S1S2}$).

The results of this study show that when the target resolution is 1 km, and $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ are in very good agreement over the 6 study regions (Sect. 4.2 with Fig. 4). Thus, these results imply that it is possible to replace S2 NDVI by S3 NDVI in the $S^2MP$ approach without losing skill. Regarding the comparison to In addition, although the higher temporal revisit of S3 compared to S2 does not allow the $S^2MP$ algorithm to provide SM estimates more frequently because the effective revisit is that of S1 (see Fig. 8), the production of the SM daily maps using S3 instead of S2 is easier and faster. S2 and S3 NDVI are derived from optical measurements remotely sensed from space that are highly dependent on the cloud cover situation. Both S2 or S3 NDVI can be unreliable during long rainy or cloudy periods (> 15 days) over specific regions. However, the higher temporal revisit of S3 allows the instruments onboard S3 to retrieve more optical images without cloud conditions than those onboard S2. This results in a better estimation of the vegetation cycle through the NDVI computation. Finally, less processing steps are required thanks to the availability of NDVI estimates already provided in the 1-km VEGETATION-like product from Copernicus (see Sec. 2.1.3).
According to Bazzi et al. (2019), the other Sentinel-only product (CoperSSM), high correlations have been found over croplands and herbaceous areas (Tab. 2). Different SM dynamics are actually noticeable, e.g., in the forested areas of southwestern France (Fig. 1 and 7). $S^2MP$ algorithm tends to provide unreliable SM estimates when the NDVI used exceeds 0.7. NDVI above this value correspond to well-developed vegetation and even if it is more common to have NDVI lower than 0.7 with S3 than with S2 (Figure 2) due to averaging effects, using S3 NDVI does not solve the problem. Indeed, in the particular cases of well-developed vegetation, the problem does not arise from the S2 of S3 NDVI itself, but from the C-band SAR signal which fails to penetrate the vegetation cover.

In addition, slightly better results of $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ with respect to in-situ measurements compared to

Regarding the comparisons between the HR datasets carried in Section 4.3, $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ shows a temporal dynamic closer to those of CoperSSM were found (Table 3). This is also true for the bias even if the, CoperSWI and SMAPS1 over semi-dry areas such as in Spain, North America and Australia. However, the correlation drops significantly over very dry zones (Tunisia). Over semi-humid areas (France), the temporal dynamic between $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ and CoperSSM retrievals have previously been sealed against the in-situ data. Most of the ground sites are representative of croplands and herbaceous regions. Therefore is in better agreement than with respect to CoperSWI and SMAPS1. The order of magnitude (bias and STDD) between $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ and the other HR datasets is quite similar regardless the study region, the land cover as well as the climate zone (rather dry or humid). In addition, it is difficult to evaluate the relative performance against in situ measurements over noteworthy to highlight that differences in terms of bias and STDD are not systematically reduced over homogeneous pixels covered by croplands or herbaceous vegetation. It means that inherent biases exist between the algorithms and they might persist over other land cover types for which more differences would be expected, e.g., forest cover. On the other hand classes such as over forests (if the $S^2MP$ approach is extended to forests).

At the moment, by construction, the $S^2MP$ algorithm starts being out of its application domain when considering pixels dominated by forests cover. On the other hand, the This is also the case for the change detection approach use to produce CoperSSM. Indeed, the SM indices computation does currently not account for vegetation dynamics, which can lead to biases with respect to in-situ data over areas covered by seasonal and dense vegetation. In addition, for most applications the CoperSSM indices should also as well as those from CoperSWI should be transformed into SM time series and this will be problematic without reference SM values under forest to scale them. Therefore, an extension of the $S^2MP$ approach algorithm to forest areas would definitely be interesting to provide HR SM mapping over large regions inside and outside Europe.

SM retrievals In this study, most of the SM measurements used from the ground stations were representative of croplands and herbaceous regions. Hence, the relative performances of the HR datasets ($S^2MP$, CoperSSM, CoperSWI, SMAPS1) were not assessed over dense vegetation areas.

In addition, slightly better results of $S^2MP_{S1S3}$ with respect to in-situ measurements compared to those of CoperSSM were found, except for the bias (Table 3).

SM estimates using the $S^2MP$ approach algorithm were already evaluated against in situ in situ measurements along with other HR and CR data sets datasets by El Hajj et al. (2018) and compared to CGLS SM by Bazzi et al. (2019). In their evaluation with respect to in situ data, El Hajj et al. (2018) found that the El Hajj et al. (2018), the authors found that
the data set shows lower correlations than SMAPL3 and SMAPL3E but higher correlations than SMOSNRT, SMOSL3 and SMAPS1. In contrast, in the current study, the $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ shows a lower correlation against in situ data than the other products. These differences can be due to the fact that the analysis was only carried out in the south of France during a different time period (from January 2016 to June 2017).

Moreover, in situ measurements than all the other HR and CR products. However, in El Hajj et al. (2018), SM estimates from the $S^2MP$ algorithm were only derived over croplands while in our study, the $S^2MP$ SM retrievals were performed both for SM estimation was performed both over croplands and herbaceous vegetation. However, the results of the current study are in good agreement with those of El Hajj et al. (2018) in terms of bias. In both studies, $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ shows low bias compared to in situ measurements, similar to or lower than the CR data sets. Regarding the $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ and CoperSSM comparison by Bazzi et al. (2019), it is interesting to note. Moreover, their analysis was only carried out in the south of France during a different time period (from January 2016 to June 2017). In Bazzi et al. (2019), the authors found that $S^2MP_{S1S2}$ is better correlated to in situ data than all the other HR and CR products together (Table 3). The results of our study are also in perfect agreement with the findings by Ojha et al. (2021), who showed over several regions in France and Spain that two merged products, SMAPS1 and SMAP + DISPATCH (Merlin et al., 2012), were better correlated to in situ data than the CR data. This was also found by Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2019) who datasets (Tab. 3). This can be partly explained by the fact that the HR datasets provide SM estimates using C-band measurements while the CR datasets used in this study are computed using L-band measurements. Indeed, SMOS and SMAP were specifically designed to measure surface SM, which was not the case for the Sentinel satellites. Regarding the higher performances of the CR datasets over the HR ones with respect to in situ measurements, Bauer-Marschallinger et al. (2019) also demonstrated that 25-km resolution SM estimates from ASCAT were better correlated to in situ measurements within the Italian Umbria region that those of the 1-km resolution CoperSSM. The results of our study are also in perfect agreement with the findings by Ojha et al. (2021), who showed over several regions in France and Spain that two merged products, SMAPS1 and SMAP + DISPATCH (Merlin et al., 2012), were better correlated to in situ data than the CR data. This implies that the gain in resolution brought by merging data of different resolutions comes at the expense of introducing uncertainties in the resulting HR data set.

When aggregated to CR. Finally, it is noteworthy that the performances of the SMAPS1 aggregated from 1-km data to 25-km resolution (CR) increase to values similar to those of the SMAPL3 data. This implies that the gain in resolution brought by merging data of different resolutions comes at the expense of introducing uncertainties in the resulting HR data set.

Obviously, this study was limited to comparisons over six 6 regions of $10^4$ km$^2$ within a 3-years to 1-year time period, so the results cannot be straightforwardly extended to a global scale. However, it is noticeable that the HR products provide SM estimates using C-band measurements while the CR data sets used in this study are computed using L-band measurements. Indeed, SMOS and SMAP were specifically designed to measure surface SM the results of the study shows that the use of S3 NDVI as input to the $S^2MP$ algorithm leads to SM estimates comparable to those obtained with S2 NDVI. However, HR
SM estimates does not necessarily lead to better performances with respect to in-situ measurements than CR SM estimates. In particular, retrieval algorithms only based on Sentinel measurements ($S^2 MP$, which was not the case for the Sentinel satellites, CoperSSM) need improvements before reaching performances comparable to those used with the HR merged or CR datasets. However, the $S^2 MP$ datasets still have two advantages over CoperSSM. They currently show better performances against in-situ measurements and are able to provide SM estimates outside of Europe. Hence, it would be interesting to extend the $S^2 MP$ algorithm to all the types of land cover and to provide SM estimates over the entire Globe. The objective would be to produce the first Sentinel-only SM dataset available at global scale and to perform deeper comparisons against $SMAP+S1$ over large areas. However, the estimation of SM using the $S^2 MP$ algorithm outside of Europe would remain challenging due to the in-homogeneous spatial and temporal coverage of S1 (Bauer-Marschallinger et al., 2019).

6 Conclusions

The goal of this study was to adapt the $S^2 MP$ approach, originally designed to retrieve SM at the plot scale-10-m resolution over agricultural fields, to a 1-km resolution, which allows to replace S2 by S3 NDVI and to significantly improve the NDVI temporal sampling. In addition, the approach was extended to herbaceous land cover areas in addition to croplands and tested in six regions over four continents to assess its performances beyond previous evaluations in Southern France. Very good agreement was found between the S1+S2, S3 and the S1+S3+S2 $S^2 MP$ maps in terms of correlations for the 6 regions ($R \geq 0.9$), bias ($\text{bias} \leq 0.04 \,m^3 \,m^{-3}$) and standard deviation of the difference ($\text{STDD} \leq 0.03 \,m^3 \,m^{-3}$) for the 6 regions, meaning that it is possible to replace S2 by S3 NDVI.

The $S^2 MP$ maps were then compared to those of the 1-km surface SM product provided by CGLS (CoperSSM), which is also a Sentinel-only based data set. In contrast to $S^2 MP$, the CGLS surface SM is a local index. CoperSSM provides local indices of SM variations, and for many applications, it has. For many applications, they have to be scaled against a reference to transform the variation index variations to actual SM in volumetric units ($m^3 \,m^{-3}$) before being used. Then, $S^2 MP$ was also compared to two HR merged datasets: (i) the SWI dataset from CGLS combining S1 and ASCAT measurements (CoperSWI) as well as (ii) the SMAP+S1 dataset. As for the surface SM data set, the SWI data had to be scaled into absolute SM values. CGLS products only provide retrievals estimates over the European continent and the Mediterranean basin.

The results showed that Overall, the $S^2 MP$ data set is well correlated to the 1-km surface SM product provided by CGLS in large areas of the 6 over the 4 regions of study -in Europe ($R \sim 0.7-0.8$. However, the correlations significantly drop in some areas of the 6 domains when the $S^2 MP$ maps are compared to those of the SWI product and those of SMAP+S1). Over almost all the pixels within the 6 regions, the standard deviation of the difference ($\text{STDD}$) between $S^2 MP$ and the CGLS products other HR datasets are lower than 0.06 $m^3 \,m^{-3}$ while the values obtained with respect to SMAP+S1 can reach $0.1 \,m^3 \,m^{-3}$. Then $m^3 \,m^{-3}$. In addition, the bias between $S^2 MP$ and the other HR data sets differ significantly inside a same region and can be strongly dry or wet ($\pm 0.1 \,m^3 \,m^{-3}$). The correlations between $S^2 MP$ and the other HR datasets improve over croplands when the 1-km pixels are become homogeneous but a similar behaviour
was not found for clearly found for the other metrics (STDD and bias) and over pixels where the dominant land cover class is herbaceous vegetation.

The HR products.

The \( S^2MP \) datasets were also evaluated with respect to in-situ-in-situ measurements along with coarser resolution data sets the 3 other HR datasets as well as with coarser resolution datasets from SMOS, SMAP and ESA CCI. The coarse resolution (CR) products show higher correlations (\( 0.65 \leq R \leq 0.68 \)) than the HR data sets (\( 0.44 \leq R \leq 0.64 \)). and the HR merged data sets datasets showed higher correlations than the HR Sentinel-only ones. However, as several SMAP and SMOS data sets, \( S^2MP \) also showed a very low \( S^2MP_{S1S2} \) showed the highest bias with respect to in-situ measurements in-situ measurements with \( -0.07 \, m^3 \, m^{-3} \). Finally, the STDD differ according to the data set dataset as well as the spatial resolution and range from \( 0.04-0.05 \) (with \( S^2MP_{S1S2} \) for example) to \( 0.08 \, m^3 \, m^{-3} \) for the ESA CCI product to the SWI product (CoperSWI).

In general, these results show that the HR datasets only based on Sentinel \( (S^2MP \) and CoperSSM) are not as competitive as the other HR merged and CR datasets with respect to in-situ measurements in terms of correlation and bias, but \( S^2MP \) still presents several advantages. In contrast to the HR data from Copernicus, the \( S^2MP \) data do not depend on auxiliary data to be scaled into volumetric units and can provide SM estimates outside of Europe. \( S^2MP_{S1S2} \) also shows lower STDD with respect to in-situ measurements than the Copernicus and the SMAP+S1 datasets. It would be interesting to extend the \( S^2MP \) algorithm gave promising results over the 6 regions of study. Of course, for some applications the approach should be extended to consider other land cover types than croplands and herbaceous. For instance, a 1 km resolution SM data sets over all land cover types to all the types of land cover and to provide SM maps at the globe scale, \( S^2MP_{S1S2} \) would be the first global SM dataset at 1-km resolution only based on Sentinel measurements. It would also allow to perform deeper comparisons against SMAP+S1 over large areas and \( S^2MP_{S1S2} \) could be used to assess climate impact at regional level in the future when 1-km SM times series are longer. Finally, However, a remaining challenge is to provide HR SM data with comparable spatio-temporal coverage and retrieval quality across different land cover types than those of the state-of-the-art coarse resolution products, such as the SMOS, SMAP and ESA CCI products.
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Table 1. In-situ measurements that were used in this study. The depths are quoted as two numbers: the first one is the upper depth, and the second one is the lower depth of the sensor. Both numbers are equal when the sensor is placed horizontally. The fourth column gives the number of sensors available for each region that provide SM measurements in 2019. These measurements were used to convert the relative indices from *CoperSSM* and *CoperSWI* into SM estimates with volumetric units (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$, Section 3.2). The number in parenthesis corresponds to the number of in-situ locations where the evaluations of the remotely sensed data were significant (P-value below 5%, Section 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Measurements</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Sensors</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain REMEDHUS</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0–0.05</td>
<td>20–19 (13)</td>
<td>Gonzalez-Zamora et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOSMANIA</td>
<td>Southwest of France</td>
<td>SMOSMANIA-0.05–0.05</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>Calvet et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOSMANIA</td>
<td>Southeast of France</td>
<td>SMOSMANIA-0.05–0.05</td>
<td>6–5 (0)</td>
<td>Calvet et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia OZNET</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0–0.05</td>
<td>11 (10)</td>
<td>Smith et al. (2012); Young et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCRN</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>USCRN-0.05–0.05</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>Bell et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia ARM</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>0.05–0.05</td>
<td>24 (13)</td>
<td>Cook (2016, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERGUELLIL</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0–0.05</td>
<td>6–5 (2)</td>
<td>Gorrab et al. (2015); Gorrab et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. **Panel A:** Global locations of the 6 regions of study. **Panel B:** Copernicus land cover maps of the 6 regions of study aggregated at 1-km spatial resolution. Only the dominant land cover type within a 1-km² pixel is shown. For instance, a pixel characterised as forests can contain 27% of forests, 26% of croplands, 24% of herbaceous vegetation and 23% of shrublands, or 90% of forests and 10% of herbaceous vegetation. The in-situ stations are shown as black dots. One black dot can correspond to several sensors since some of them have the same coordinates. **Panel C:** Proportion of croplands and herbaceous vegetation within each 1-km² pixel for the 6 regions of study. The proportion is expressed as a percentage ranging from 0 to 1. Pixels with no cropland or herbaceous vegetation at all are shown as white areas.
Figure 2. Correlation between S2 and S3 NDVI at 1-km grid scale over one year for the 6 study regions from January to December 2019.
Figure 3. Correlation between S2 and S3 NDVI at 1-km grid scale each month for the 6 study regions from January to December 2019. Months having no bars means that there is no correlation between S2 and S3 NDVI.
Figure 4. Comparison of $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$ with respect to $S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ over the regions of study in terms of Pearson correlation ($R$) as well as bias ($S^2 MP_{S1S2}$ minus $S^2 MP_{S1S3}$) and standard deviation of the difference ($STDD$) in m$^3$ m$^{-3}$. The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.
Figure 5. Comparison of $S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}}$ with respect to CoperSSM ($S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}} - S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}}$ minus CoperSSM), CoperSWI ($S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}} - S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}}$ minus CoperSWI) and SMAPS1 ($S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}} - S^2_{\text{MP}_{S1S3}}$ minus SMAPS1) over the regions of study in terms of bias in m$^3$ m$^{-3}$. The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.
Figure 6. Comparison of $S_{MP_{1,2}}$ with respect to $CoperSSM$, $CoperSWI$ and $SMAPS1$ over the regions of study in terms of standard deviation of the difference ($STDD$) in $m^3 m^{-3}$. The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.
Figure 7. Comparison of $S^2MP\textsubscript{123}$ with respect to $CoperSSM$, $CoperSWI$ and $SMAPS\textsubscript{1}$ over the regions of study in terms of Pearson correlation ($R$). The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.
Figure 8. Examples of SM time series from the different HR and CR datasets at 6 in-situ stations (one for each region).
Table 2. Comparison of $S_{MP}^1$ against the HR SM products CoperSSM, CoperSWI, and SMAPS1, in terms of Pearson correlation ($R$), bias and $STDD$, over 1-km$^2$ pixels where croplands and/or herbaceous vegetation are the dominant land cover classes, respectively. $M$ stands for “mixed” pixels in which croplands or herbaceous vegetation are the dominant land cover classes, respectively. The metrics are also derived according to the dominant degree of coverage of the land cover classes in any proportion while $H$ stands for “homogeneous”. One set of metrics is computed considering only pixels in which at least covered by less than 75% of the 1-km$^2$ area croplands or herbaceous vegetation. Another set of metrics is computed considering only pixels covered by at least 75% of croplands or herbaceous vegetation. Only median values are shown. The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Croplands $&lt; 75%$</th>
<th>Croplands $\geq 75%$</th>
<th>Herbaceous vegetation $&lt; 75%$</th>
<th>Herbaceous vegetation $\geq 75%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>STDD</td>
<td>$R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest of France</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast of France</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>CoperSSM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoperSWI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Evaluation of the HR and CR SM time series against in-situ measurements in terms of Pearson correlation ($R, R^a$), bias (remotely sensed minus ground based SM in [m$^3$ m$^{-3}$]) and standard deviation of the difference ($STDD$ in [m$^3$ m$^{-3}$]). The metrics were computed by taking into account the 6 regions of study together and only the median values are shown here. The symbol * indicates the HR datasets averaged at 25-km resolution. The analysis was performed from January to December 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^a$</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>STDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentinel-only high resolution data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 MP_{S1S2}$</td>
<td>0.48-0.59</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.003-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 MP_{S1S3}$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coper SSM</td>
<td>0.44-0.53</td>
<td>0.25-0.18</td>
<td>0.05-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merged high resolution data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coper SWI</td>
<td>0.64-0.74</td>
<td>0.49-0.46</td>
<td>0.06-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAPS1</td>
<td>0.60-0.64</td>
<td>0.26-0.35</td>
<td>-0.001-0.03</td>
<td>0.07-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coarse resolution data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAPL3</td>
<td>0.68-0.81</td>
<td>0.43-0.55</td>
<td>0.005-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAPL3E</td>
<td>0.68-0.81</td>
<td>0.46-0.52</td>
<td>0.002-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOSL3</td>
<td>0.65-0.69</td>
<td>0.30-0.49</td>
<td>0.04-0.03</td>
<td>0.07-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOSNRT</td>
<td>0.67-0.76</td>
<td>0.33-0.45</td>
<td>-0.004-0.02</td>
<td>0.06-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCISM</td>
<td>0.68-0.73</td>
<td>0.40-0.48</td>
<td>0.07-0.03</td>
<td>0.04-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High resolution data aggregated to coarse resolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 MP_{S1S2}^*$</td>
<td>0.49-0.58</td>
<td>0.33-0.38</td>
<td>0.01-0.06</td>
<td>0.05-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S^2 MP_{S1S3}^*$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coper SSM*</td>
<td>0.43-0.53</td>
<td>0.22-0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coper SWI*</td>
<td>0.62-0.73</td>
<td>0.48-0.47</td>
<td>0.06-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAPS1*</td>
<td>0.69-0.79</td>
<td>0.32-0.44</td>
<td>0.01-0.02</td>
<td>0.05-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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