

Resolving effects of leaf pigmentation changes and plant residue on the energy balance of winter wheat cultivation in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model

5 Ke Yu¹, Yang Su^{1,2,3}, Ronny Lauerwald^{2,4}, Philippe Ciais¹, Yi Xi¹, Haoran Xu¹, Xianglin Zhang², Nicolas Viovy¹, Amie Pickering⁵, Marie Collard⁶, Daniel S. Goll¹

¹Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE/IPSL, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, 91191, France

²UMR ECOSYS, INRAE AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, Palaiseau, 91120, France

10 ³Département d'Informatique, École Normale Supérieure-PSL, Paris, 75005, France

⁴Department Geoscience, Environment & Society-BGEOSYS, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

⁵Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust (GWCT), The Allerton Project, Loddington, Leicestershire, United Kingdom

⁶Département durabilité, systèmes et perspectives, Centre wallon de Recherches agronomiques (CRA-W), 6800 Libramont, Belgique

15 *Correspondence to:* Ke Yu (ke.yu@lsce.ipsl.fr)

Ke Yu (ke.yu@lsce.ipsl.fr), Yang Su (yang.su@ens.fr), Ronny Lauerwald (ronny.lauerwald@inrae.fr), Philippe Ciais (philippe.ciais@lsce.ipsl.fr), Yi Xi (yi.xi@lsce.ipsl.fr), Haoran Xu (haoran.xu@lsce.ipsl.fr), Xianglin Zhang (xianglin.zhang@inrae.fr), Nicolas Viovy (nicolas.viovy@lsce.ipsl.fr), Amie Pickering (apickering@gwct.org.uk), Marie Collard (ma.collard@cra.wallonie.be), Daniel S. Goll (daniel.goll@lsce.ipsl.fr)

20

Abstract. Crop management impacts climate not only through changes in carbon stocks and greenhouse gas budgets, but also through changes in the heat budget. However, the latter aspect is not yet covered by existing cropping system models. The coupling of dedicated crop models with land surface models may be an attempt to quantify those effects, but is hampered by the simplistic representation of surface albedo as a mix of soil albedo and a static vegetation albedo controlled by vegetation cover. Here, we developed ORCHIDEE-CROP, a land surface model integrating the cropping system model STICS, by incorporating time-varying albedo from crop pigmentation during foliar yellowing and post-harvest crop residue soil cover. We further parameterized the effect of crop residues on surface roughness and soil evaporation affecting the heat budget and partitioning between latent and sensible heat fluxes. Using 10 site simulations, we quantified the impacts of these processes on soil temperature, soil moisture, water and heat fluxes of winter wheat crops. Incorporating foliar yellowing and post-harvest residue cover increased surface albedo by an average of 0.07 ± 0.03 during the foliar yellowing period and 0.02 ± 0.02 during the residue cover period, accordingly inducing surface cooling by -0.42 ± 0.65 °C and -1.39 ± 1.07 °C. During each period, sensible heat flux changed by -0.03 ± 2.34 W m⁻² and 1.30 ± 11.52 W m⁻², while latent heat flux decreased by -1.23 ± 1.78 W m⁻² and -3.59 ± 3.90 W m⁻². Spatiotemporal variability in these effects was driven by site-specific

25
30

meteorology and soil properties. Simulations of drying climate scenarios reveal that crop residues left on the field can progressively increase plant available water over multiple years under dry conditions. This study underscores that crop pigmentation has a minor influence on water-heat process, while residues moderately modulate surface energy partitioning with significant spatial heterogeneity, and demonstrates the potential of its management for climate mitigation. The refined modelling framework enables simultaneous assessment of the biogeochemical and biophysical impacts of field operations on the Earth System.

1 Introduction

Agriculture and climate are interconnected by greenhouse gas, energy and water budgets (IPCC, 2014; Wu et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2024). These interactions create a dual challenge that agricultural systems are both vulnerable to climate change impacts (e.g., droughts, extreme weather) and significant contributors to global emissions. Adaptive management practices are therefore critical for enhancing agricultural resilience and sustainability while simultaneously reducing the anthropogenic disturbances of the environment and climate. To quantify complex spatiotemporal climate impacts of management practices, coupling land surface models with dedicated crop modules represents a promising strategy. These models are effective tools for simulating biophysical and biogeochemical processes at the agriculture-climate interface, such as crop physiological growth, yield dynamics, and the exchange of carbon, water, and energy between agroecosystems and the atmosphere (Brisson et al., 2003; Fisher et al., 2014; McDermid et al., 2017). By capturing these processes, land surface models provide essential insights for projecting future climate-agriculture feedbacks under varying management scenarios (Arora et al., 2023; Timlin et al., 2024). However, a key limitation arises from the inconsistency between the diversity and complexity of real-world agricultural management practices and their overly simplistic representations in current land surface models. This gap significantly hinders the ability of land surface models to reliably predict climate impacts, particularly at regional or farm-specific scales where management decisions are highly required (Fisher et al., 2020).

A key example of the limited ability of land surface models in representing biophysical processes of agriculture-climate interactions is their treatment of crop albedo dynamics.

Surface albedo, as the fraction of incoming solar radiation that is reflected by the soil and crops, plays a critical role in both radiative and non-radiative climate processes (Seneviratne et al., 2018). Crops and their residues exhibit distinct albedo due to specific traits (e.g., leaf pigmentation, canopy structure) and management practices (e.g., tillage, residue retention, irrigation). For example, existing research shows an averaged albedo of 0.16-0.19 for winter wheat (Şerban et al., 2011; Sieber et al., 2022; Lei et al., 2024), of 0.18-0.20 for soybean (Costa et al., 2007; Lei et al., 2024), and of 0.15-0.18 for corn (Jacobs et al., 1990, Lei et al., 2024). These albedo differences directly affect global climate by changing the radiative forcing at the top of the atmosphere (Stephens et al., 2015). In addition, changes in surface albedo modify the surface energy balance, potentially redistributing energy into latent and sensible heat fluxes as a non-radiative process. However, land surface models generally use simplistic parameterization of static soil and crop albedo. When temporal dynamics are

included, they are typically limited to changes in the fractional coverage of soil and vegetation. (Dalglish et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2016; Hoogenboom et al., 2024). Lacking the mechanisms to represent changes in crop pigmentation, they are unsuited to quantify climate effects of managements or crop breeding which affect crop residue or crop pigmentation (e.g., no tillage, pale crops) (Drewry et al., 2014).

70 Winter wheat, as a major cereal crop, undergoes distinct phenological stages with changeable crop pigmentation to modulate surface reflectivity (Zhang et al., 2022). During its growth cycle, winter wheat transitions from chlorophyll-dominated green leaves to senescent yellow leaves post-maturity, where reduced chlorophyll levels expose light-reflecting carotenoids (Féret et al., 2017). Additionally, crop residues left on the field post-harvest introduce additional albedo variability compared with
75 bare soil in conventional tillage systems, with the extent of this fluctuation depending on the baseline bare soil albedo and residue management practices (Simão et al., 2021). Generally higher albedo of vegetation than bare soil in most croplands in Europe possibly induces an increase in surface albedo when covering residues on the soil (Pique et al., 2023). Such physiological development of winter wheat and residue coverage thus the impact the climate by surface albedo, offsetting a portion of warming from greenhouse emissions. However, it is difficult for current land surface models to quantify and evaluate these effects because they are generally ignored or parameterized using simplified assumptions (Davin et al., 2014;
80 Seiber et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2024).

This study simulates the biophysical impacts of winter wheat phenology and residue management on surface energy balance through albedo-mediated processes in the ORCHIDEE-CROP land surface model. To achieve this, we improved the model by refining the representation of foliar pigmentation and crop residue effects on albedo dynamics, as well as their influence on soil evaporation and surface roughness based on observations from 10 European cropland sites. Section 2 details the
85 datasets and methodology used for model parameterization. We briefly review the baseline modeling representation of surface albedo, hydrology, roughness, and energy fluxes before introducing our modifications in ORCHIDEE-CROP. These improvements refine albedo dynamics, soil evaporation, and surface roughness, with two simulations for evaluating the albedo-mediated impact of residue retention conducted under both current and drying climate scenarios. Section 3 presents the results of these refinements, while Section 4 analyses the contribution of albedo changes, driven by foliar pigmentation
90 and crop residues, on modulating surface temperature, latent heat, and sensible heat fluxes. We also discuss the potential of crop residue management for climate adaptation and mitigation. Finally, Section 5 summarizes our findings and conclusions. By incorporating albedo dynamics influenced by crop pigmentation and residue management, this study enhances the realism of coupled cropland surface models and demonstrates its impacts on field-level energy balance under present and future idealised climate.

95 **2 Data and methods**

The improvement of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model is illustrated in Fig. 1 and structured into 6 subsections: (1) Datasets (section 2.1); (2) Introduction of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model (section 2.2); (3) New parameterization of the ORCHIDEE-

CROP model (section 2.3); (4) Model calibration (section 2.4); (5) Model simulations (section 2.5); (6) Model evaluation (section 2.6).




Figure 1 The procedure of parameterization of crop and residue albedo (α_{surf} and α_{res}), soil evaporation (E_{soil}) and surface roughness (Z_0) in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model. Panel (A) illustrates the input datasets for albedo calibration. α_{soil} and α_{surf} are bare soil albedo (α_{soil}) and surface albedo (α_{surf}), respectively. f_{crop} and f_{soil} are the gridded fractions of crop (f_{crop}) and residues (f_{res}), respectively. SW_IN and SW_OUT are half-hourly incoming (SW_IN) and outgoing (SW_OUT) solar radiance observed at 7 eddy-covariance (EC) sites. Panel (B) shows the identification of foliar yellowing and residue covering periods based on time series of α_{surf} (black curve) and leaf area index (LAI , green curve). T_{0-5} represent the dates of maximum LAI (T_0 , green dotted vertical line), albedo increase start (T_1 , orange dotted vertical line), harvest (T_2 , grey dotted vertical line) and albedo increase end (T_3 , shallow-blue dotted vertical line), 30 days after harvest (T_4 , grey solid vertical line) and tillage (equals to 90 if no tillage) (T_5 , dark-blue dotted vertical line). α_{min} and α_{max} are the minimum and maximum surface albedo on T_1 and T_3 . The shallow-green, orange, yellow and brown areas show the conceptual growing, maturity, residue covering and bare soil periods of winter wheat. Panel (C) describes trend fittings for crop albedo (α_{crop}) and α_{res} . Features in two plots have the same meanings with the ones in Panel (B). $f_{crop,yellowing}$ is the fraction of crop during the foliar yellowing period. RC is the duration of T_2 and T_5 . k_1, k_2, k_3 and k_4 are the fitting parameters during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods. Day and t are the days since T_1 and T_2 . Panel (D) illustrates parameterization of

115 α_{surf} as a weighted combination of α_{crop} , α_{res} and α_{soil} in ORCHIDEE-CROP model. The daily α_{surf} in orange in the upper plot is derived from the new calibrated process based on k_1 - k_4 , compared to the old model (plot below). Panel (E) presents parameterization of surface-atmosphere exchange. β is the soil conductance; r_{au} , $speed$, C_d , q_{surf} and q_{air} are the air density (r_{au}), wind speed, drag coefficient (C_d), saturated surface air moisture (q_{surf}) and specific humidity (q_{air}), respectively.

120 2.1 Datasets

2.1.1 Daily surface albedo from site observation

To derive surface albedo (α_{surf} , unitless) from site observation, we obtained the half-hourly incoming and outgoing solar radiance (SW_IN and SW_OUT (W m⁻²)) from 2000 to 2020 at 8 wheat cultivated sites (BE-Lon, CH-Oe2, DE-Geb, DE-Kli, DE-RuS, FR-Aur, FR-Gri, FR-Lam) from the Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) Data Portal (Dumont et al., 2023; Schmidt et al., 2023; Buysse et al., 2023; Brut et al., 2023; Brümmer et al., 2023; Tallec et al., 2023; Bernhofer et al., 2023). Data were quality-controlled and gap-filled using uniform methods (Pastorello et al., 2020). We applied a coarse-resolution cloud cover filtering based on the daily moderate-resolution imaging spectroradiometer (MODIS) MO(Y)D04_L2 product (<https://ladsweb.modaps.eosdis.nasa.gov/>) to exclude days with very low incoming shortwave radiation at the surface which would prevent us from adequately estimating α_{surf} . The daily shortwave mid-day α_{surf} was calculated from average values of SW_IN and SW_OUT from 11:00 to 13:00 Central European Summer Time at each site (Lin et al., 2022):

$$\alpha_{surf} = \frac{SW_OUT}{SW_IN} \quad (1)$$

At 6 farms across 2 ClieNFarm sites (UK-Rookery, UK-Winwick, UK-Allerton, BE-AH, BE-BM, BE-LB) where direct radiation measurements were unavailable, we estimated surface albedo at 5-day intervals and 300-m resolution using Sentinel-2 (S2) reflectance data. A 10% cloud cover threshold was applied for quality filtering, and retrievals followed the framework developed by Lin et al. (2023). We only chose years when winter wheat was cultivated for all 10 sites and obtained 33 winter wheat years.

2.1.2 Meteorological data from site observation

We utilized the half-hourly meteorological observations from flux towers in the winter wheat years at 8 ICOS sites to force the ORCHIDEE-CROP model. The observations include SW_IN , surface pressure (Pa), near-surface specific humidity (kg kg⁻¹), rainfall rate (kg m⁻² s), snowfall rate (kg m⁻² s), near-surface air temperature (K), and near-surface eastward and northward wind components (m s⁻¹). The FLUXNET_DATA tool was applied (<https://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/orchidee/wiki/Scripts/FluxnetValidation/DataProcessing>) to fill in the flux-towers data gaps using 6-hourly ERA-interim products (Vuichard and Papale, 2015). We then averaged all gap-filled variables to a 6-hour time step to meet the requirement of the model input. At 2 ClieNFarm sites with no flux observations, the meteorological

145 variables from 6-hourly 0.5° CRU-JRA product (v2.4) (Friedlingstein et al, 2022), were utilized as climate forcing data in this model.

In 10-year simulations for the current climate scenario from 2010 to 2020 (section 2.5), the processed climate forcing data from each year obtained from the ICOS Data Portal was used to drive the model. In the drying climate scenario from 2010 to 2020 we utilized ICOS climate forcing data from the year with the lowest annual rainfall at each site to drive the model. The
150 yearly-averaged meteorological variables in the driest year for the drying climate scenario are presented in Table S2.

2.1.3 Site management information

Management practices for winter wheat years at all sites (Table S1) were obtained from a crop management database provided by site managers. Key practices, including sowing, harvesting, and tillage dates, were prepared as input for the ORCHIDEE-CROP model.

155 2.1.4 Bare soil albedo from satellite observations

A high-resolution 5-day, 300-m European bare soil albedo (α_{soil} , unitless) dataset, derived from 10 m S2 α_{surf} data from 2018 to 2020, was used as forcing for the ORCHIDEE-CROP model (Yu et al., in review). This dataset demonstrated sufficient skills in resolving daily soil dynamics at the field scale in European fragmented croplands (Yu et al., in review). The new soil dataset was linearly aggregated to 0.5° and a daily time step to align with the spatiotemporal resolution of this
160 model.

2.1.5 LAI from satellite observations

Due to the absence or sporadic leaf area index (LAI , $m^2 m^{-2}$) measurements found at ICOS sites (Table S3), we used satellite-based LAI datasets to indicate the continuous winter wheat growth at sites. The 4-day, 500-m LAI product from the MODIS (MCD15A3H) was used to extract the LAI of each site (Myneni et al., 2015). Daily LAI dynamics were derived through
165 linear interpolation combined with a Savitzky-Golay filter (window length=15) to smooth the trend and remove the outliers. The LAI comparison between MODIS product and site measurements is shown in Fig. S2. We used MODIS LAI products but not S2 as the latter lacks data before 2018 to match site observations available.

2.2 Introduction of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model

The ORCHIDEE-CROP model is a branch version of the process-based land surface model, ORCHIDEE (Krinner et al.,
170 2005), which incorporates a generic crop phenology and harvest module, along with simplified nitrogen fertilization parameterization based on the process-based STICS formalism (Wu et al., 2016). It simulates biophysical and biogeochemical interactions in croplands, as well as plant productivity and harvested yield. A detailed model description is available in Wu et al. (2016). This study employs a version calibrated on LAI , flowering and harvesting dates, and crop yield

for winter wheat and maize as the starting version (<https://github.com/yangsssu/ORCHIDEE-CROP.git>). The derived climate and management information drive the model as forcing data (sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3). Winter wheat is the only vegetation type considered in this analysis. To assess the impact of physiological development of winter wheat and residue coverage on surface energy balance and water-energy fluxes, we describe below the key processes governing surface energy balance (section 2.2.1), α_{surf} dynamics (section 2.2.2), hydrology (section 2.2.3), the surface roughness (section 2.2.4), as well as crop growth and development (section 2.2.5).

180 2.2.1 Surface energy balance

The ORCHIDEE-CROP model simulates the surface energy budget by:

$$R_n = LE + H + G \quad (2)$$

Where the net radiation (R_n , $W\ m^{-2}$) governs land-atmosphere water and heat exchange, driven by the partitioning of LE , sensible heat fluxes (H , $W\ m^{-2}$) and soil heat fluxes (G , $W\ m^{-2}$). R_n is determined by the net short-wave radiation budget (S_n , $W\ m^{-2}$) and the net long-wave radiation budget (L_n , $W\ m^{-2}$) (Ducoudré et al., 1993).

$$R_n = S_n + L_n = (1 - \alpha_{surf}) \times SW_IN \downarrow + L \downarrow - L \uparrow \quad (3)$$

Where $L\downarrow$ is the down-welling longwave radiation (a model input variable). $L\uparrow$ is the upwelling longwave radiation emitted by the land surface, which is estimated by surface temperature (T_{surf} , K) (a model input variable) based on Stefan-Boltzmann law.

190 Since α_{surf} directly influences R_n , we next describe its formulation in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model.

2.2.2 Surface albedo dynamics

The model calculates α_{surf} in step t for both the visible and near-infrared domains by the area-weighted sum of foliar albedo (α_{crop} , unitless) and α_{soil} :

$$\alpha_{surf}(t) = (1 - f_{crop}(t)) \times \alpha_{soil}(t) + f_{crop}(t) \times \alpha_{crop,constant} \quad (4)$$

195 Where $f_{crop}(t)$ and $1-f_{crop}(t)$ represent the fractions of winter wheat and bare soil covering the surface area of the model pixel; $\alpha_{crop,constant}$ of winter wheat is set as the default value of 0.1 and 0.3 for visible and near-infrared ranges of α_{crop} , respectively. $\alpha_{soil}(t)$ is derived from daily α_{soil} dataset (section 2.1.4). Since α_{surf} affects radiation absorption, it influences soil moisture availability and, consequently, soil evaporation (E_{soil}).

2.2.3 Hydrology

200 The ORCHIDEE-CROP model computes soil water budget by considering the three reservoirs of canopy interception, snow packing and 11 soil layers (MacBean et al., 2020). The water fluxes at soil surface include water input to the soil by throughfall, snowmelt and irrigation, and water output from soil by surface runoff, bare soil evaporation and drainage. Here, we mainly described the calculation of E_{soil} and the soil water content (SWC , $kg\ m^{-2}$) in different soil layers.

The ORCHIDEE-CROP model calculates LE by accounting for snow sublimation, canopy interception and transpiration, E_{soil} and floodplain evaporation. A β -model is used to compute E_{soil} by inducing a series of resistances.

$$E_{soil}(t) = (1 - \beta_1) \times (1 - \beta_5) \times \beta_4 \times r_{au} \times v \times C_d \times (q_{surf} - q_{air}) \quad (5)$$

Where β_1 , β_4 and β_5 represent the surface to atmosphere resistances for snow sublimation (β_1), soil evaporation (β_4) and floodplain evaporation (β_5), respectively; r_{au} (kg m^{-3}), v (m s^{-1}), C_d (m s^{-1}), q_{surf} (kg kg^{-1}), and q_{air} (kg kg^{-1}) are the air density, wind speed, drag coefficient, saturated surface air moisture, and specific humidity, respectively.

Soil moisture dynamics are governed by a diffusive multi-layer soil hydrology scheme with 27 soil layers (up to 2 m), based on moisture diffusion principles (Richards, 1931; de Rosnay et al., 2002; Wu et al., 2016). It uses the 1D Richards equation with soil volumetric water content as the state variable in its saturated form, instead of the pressure head (Campoy et al., 2013).

2.2.4 Surface roughness

Surface roughness (Z_0 , m) plays a critical role in regulating near-surface turbulence and the water-heat exchange process between the surface and atmosphere (Meier et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2024). E_{soil} depends on Z_0 , which modulates atmospheric turbulence and moisture transfer. The ORCHIDEE-CROP model uses the averaged drag coefficients for momentum and heat for winter wheat to compute the grid-averaged roughness height.

$$Z_0(t) = f_{crop}(t) \times \left(\frac{C_k}{\log \left(\frac{Z_{tmp}}{\max(\text{Height} \times Z_{0,h}, Z_{0,bare})} \right)} \right)^2 \quad (6)$$

Where $Z_0(t)$ is the daily roughness height over each grid cell. C_k (-) is the von Karman constant, which equals to 0.35. Z_{tmp} (m) represents the maximum height of the first atmospheric layer and is determined by air pressure, air temperature, and air density. It is the reference height used for flux calculations and is set to a minimum of 10 m above the ground. This ensures that it remains higher than the canopy height, maintaining the stability of the logarithmic function used in flux calculations. Height (m) is the winter wheat height which is a time-invariant constant and set to 1.1 m in ORCHIDEE-CROP model. For comparison, maximum Height of winter wheat during growing seasons measured at 5 sites has an average of 0.97 m (Table S3). $Z_{0,h}$ equals to 1/16, which is utilized to estimate the roughness height above the canopy. $Z_{0,bare}$ (m) is set as 0.01 m for roughness length of bare soil. Z_0 for the bare soil can be derived by:

$$Z_0(t) = (1 - f_{crop}(t)) \times \left(\frac{C_k}{\log \left(\frac{Z_{tmp}}{Z_{0,bare}} \right)} \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

The ORCHIDEE-CROP model computes a grid effective roughness height (H_{rough} , m) for deriving water-heat fluxes. It combines the zero-plane displacement height (Z_{dis} , m) which is an equivalent height for the absorption of momentum, and the weighted height of vegetation with the maximum f_{crop} ($f_{crop,max}$) for winter wheat in each grid (H_{ave} , m):

$$H_{rough} = H_{ave} - Z_{dis} \quad (8)$$

$$Z_{dis} = H_{ave} \times H_{dis} \quad (9)$$

$$H_{ave} = H_{ave} + f_{crop,max} \times Height \quad (10)$$

235 H_{dis} (m) is used to determine the Z_{dis} based on H_{ave} , which equals to 0.75.

2.2.5 Crop growth and development

Crop development in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model is based on the crop model STICS (Wu et al., 2016). For winter wheat, the crop module simulates nine developmental stages of crop growth and grain filling (Fig. 2.1 in Brisson et al., 2008). The timing and duration of each stage are calculated based on growing degree days, adjusted by limiting functions for photoperiod, vernalization and limited factors (e.g., water and nitrogen). Transitions between stages occur when the threshold values of growing degree days are reached.

The maturity and harvesting dates were decided by the growing degree days and grain water content in the crop development processes of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model. The threshold of meeting harvesting conditions was calibrated following the procedure described by Su et al. (2025). Parameters governing the growing degree day requirements for key phenological stages were optimized using observed phenological records (planting, flowering, and harvest dates) from 2890 DWD climate stations across Germany (949 sites for maize and 1941 for wheat; https://opendata.dwd.de/climate_environment/). The optimal parameter sets for wheat and maize were identified by minimizing the root-mean-square error (RMSE) between simulated and observed harvest dates across all sites.

2.3 New parameterization of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model

250 Foliar yellowing of winter wheat after maturation and crop residues remaining on the field after harvest affect α_{surf} and turbulent fluxes but are currently not accounted for. As such, the absence of these key processes presents a gap in understanding and modeling the impact of winter wheat on regional energy and water cycles. We enhanced the ORCHIDEE-CROP model by introducing empirical functions describing α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 dynamics as a function of time, f_{crop} and f_{res} for foliar yellowing and crop residues. In addition, to align the total crop development period (from sowing to harvest) between simulations and observations at each site, the duration between maturity and harvesting in ORCHIDEE-CROP was calibrated using recorded harvesting dates at each site. In each winter wheat year at each site, simulations were performed iteratively with potential maturity-harvest intervals ranging from 5 to 40 days at 2-day increments. The optimal duration for each case was identified when the simulated harvest date matched the recorded management date. The calibrated durations are summarized in Table S1. It means that the durations of foliar yellowing before harvesting vary across all sites in the new model, compared to the default 14 days in the old model.

2.3.1 Improving albedo dynamics during the foliar yellowing periods

The foliar yellowing period in this model is defined as starting from the maturity date (nmat) and ending on the harvesting date based on analysis of observed α_{surf} dynamics at 10 sites (section 2.4.1).

We replaced Eq. (4) with an equation which uses time varying $\alpha_{crop}(t)$ instead of a $\alpha_{crop,constant}$:

$$\alpha_{surf}(t) = (1 - f_{crop}(t)) \times \alpha_{soil}(t) + f_{crop}(t) \times \alpha_{crop}(t) \quad (11)$$

To simulate the increase in α_{crop} after maturation and before harvesting we chose the following function:

$$\alpha_{crop}(t) = \alpha_{yellowing,start} \times (k_1 \times t + k_2) \quad (12)$$

Where $\alpha_{yellowing,start}$ is the simulated α_{crop} on the first day during the foliar yellowing period. k_1 and k_2 represent the fitting parameters that are calibrated at the multi-site scale (see below).

Here, we assumed that f_{crop} remains constant during the foliar yellowing periods ($f_{crop,yellowing}$).

2.3.2 Improving albedo dynamics during the residue covering periods

The residue covering period starts from the harvesting date and ends 90 days after harvesting, or earlier if tillage occurs (section 2.4.1). As α_{surf} continuously increases after harvesting due to the light-colored and evenly distributed straws, we used the segmentation function to describe α_{surf} dynamics from increase to decrease during this period.

The α_{surf} at each time step can be represented by the area-weighted sum of α_{soil} and α_{res} :

$$\alpha_{surf}(t) = (1 - f_{res}(t)) \times \alpha_{soil}(t) + f_{res}(t) \times \alpha_{res}(t) \quad (13)$$

$$\alpha_{res}(t) = \alpha_{yellowing,start} \times (k_1 \times t + k_2) \text{ if } t \in \text{albedo increase phase;}$$

$$\alpha_{res}(t) = \alpha_{max} \times (k_3 \times e^{-k_4 \times t}) \text{ if } t \in \text{albedo decrease phase; otherwise, } \alpha_{res}(t) = 0 \quad (14)$$

Where α_{max} is the simulated α_{crop} on the last day of the albedo increase phase. $(1 - f_{res}(t))$ represent the daily variation of bare soil fraction.

Here, f_{res} during the albedo increase phase equals to $f_{crop,yellowing}$ and linearly decreases during the albedo decrease stage from $f_{crop,yellowing}$:

$$f_{res}(t) = f_{crop,yellowing} \text{ if } t \in \text{albedo increase phase; } f_{res}(t) = f_{crop,yellowing} \times (1 - \frac{t}{RC}) \text{ if } t \in \text{albedo decrease phase; otherwise, } f_{res}(t) = 0 \quad (15)$$

RC is the maximum residue covering period, either equals to 90 days or the tillage date; k_3 and k_4 represent the fitting parameters that need to be calibrated at the site scale (see below).

2.3.3 Considering the impact of crop residue on soil evaporation during the residue covering periods

Crop residues covering part of soil surface decrease E_{soil} by increasing the soil-to-atmosphere resistance (Horton et al., 1996). The current ORCHIDEE-CROP model does not consider the impact of crop residue on E_{soil} . Previous site-scale observations generally show a 20-50 % reduction in E_{soil} due to the presence of wheat residue compared with bare soil (Unger et al., 1986; Lascano, 1996; Ramos et al., 2024). Based on Eq. (5), we assumed a maximum initial soil conductance (β_4 , unitless) reduction of 50 % at the highest f_{res} (Zhao et al., 2020; Raes et al., 2022), with a progressive increase of conductance as daily f_{res} declines during the residue cover period:

$$E_{soil}(t) = (1 - \beta_1(t)) \times (1 - \beta_5(t)) \times (1 - 0.5 \times f_{res}(t)) \times \beta_4(t) \times r_{au}(t) \times v(t) \times C_d(t) \times (q_{surf}(t) - q_{air}(t))$$

295

(16)

The meanings of all variables are the same as the ones in Eq. (5).

2.3.4 Considering the impact of crop residue on surface roughness during the residue covering periods

300 The initial version of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model assumed that Z_0 after harvest equals that of bare soil coverage, omitting that (parts of the) stalks remain. To represent the impact of crop residues on Z_0 during the residue covering periods, we assumed that the Height of plant changes from 1.1 m for winter wheat to 0.5 m for crop residues which was found to be optimal for the cutting height for harvest efficiency and soil and water conservation (MacMaster et al., 2000). f_{crop} is replaced with f_{res} . The new Z_0 and H_{rough} are therefore computed by:

$$Z_0(t) = f_{res}(t) \times \left(\frac{C_k}{Z_{tmp}} \right)^2 \quad (17)$$

$$Z_{tmp} = \log(\max(0.5 \times Z_{0,h}, Z_{0,bare}))$$

$$H_{rough} = f_{crop,max} \times 0.5 - f_{crop,max} \times 0.5 \times H_{dis} \quad (18)$$

305

2.4 Model calibration

The parameters of α_{surf} dynamics were calibrated using data from 10 sites with 33 winter wheat site-years. α_{surf} and LAI observations were applied to identify foliar yellowing and residue covering periods at the available sites (Table S1).

2.4.1 Identifying the periods of foliar yellowing and residue covering from site observation

310 At the site scale, we assumed that foliar yellowing (i.e., α_{surf} increase) begins when maturity is reached due to the absence of observational data supporting a temporal gap between them.

In the model, α_{surf} starts to increase with a delay after maximum LAI is reached and ends with a delay after harvest. Post-harvest α_{surf} dynamics were divided into two stages: (1) an initial α_{surf} increase driven by light-colored, evenly distributed straw, followed by (2) a α_{surf} decline due to the dominating effects of decomposition of residues.

315 α_{surf} dynamics were parameterized by identifying critical temporal thresholds. The minimum α_{surf} between the LAI peak and harvest marked the onset of foliar yellowing, which is approximately 14.64 ± 10.75 days pre-harvest computed by site observation. This delay is close the assumed delay between maturity date and harvest in ORCHIDEE-CROP of 14 days. The maximum α_{surf} , constrained to occur in 30 days post-harvest, divided residue-driven α_{surf} into an increase phase (harvest to maximum α_{surf}) and a decline phase from post-maximum α_{surf} to tillage. Without tillage, the residue covering period
320 persists for 90 days post-harvest (Kriauciuniene et al., 2012). On average, the maximum α_{surf} occurs 13.36 ± 10.35 days after harvest based on site identification. Due to the lacking information of maximum α_{surf} during residue covering period in the

old model, we utilized 15 days after harvesting as the boundary of these two phases in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model at all sites for simplification.

2.4.2 Parameter optimization of albedo dynamics

325 Daily α_{surf} and α_{soil} observations, as well as and information on area of bare soil exposure were utilized to calibrate the empirical parameters k_1 , k_2 , k_3 and k_4 for α_{crop} and α_{res} (Eqs. 12 and 14). The $\alpha_{yellowing,start}$ (Eq. 12) was replaced by the α_{surf} observation at the beginning of the foliar yellowing period. The simulated f_{crop} from the old model and calculated f_{res} (Eq. 13) were used due to the lack of observation of fraction changes.

Data collected from 10 sites with 28 winter wheat years (N = 485 daily α_{surf} observation) were used to train k_1 , k_2 , k_3 and

330 k_4 in Eqs. 12 and 14. Data from the remaining 5 sites with 5 winter wheat years (N = 179 daily α_{surf} observation) were utilized for testing. Finally, calibrated k_1 , k_2 , k_3 and k_4 were parameterized in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model to simulate the albedo dynamics affected by foliar yellowing and residue covering for all 10 sites.

2.5 Model simulations

Simulations were performed for 10 sites (Table S1) with the new ORCHIDEE-CROP model version and with the original

335 version of this model (Table 1) for the years for which observations were available. The experiments aimed to evaluate the impact of the parameterizations of α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 on water-energy cycles during the foliar yellowing and residue covering periods. In the following, we used ORC-D for the model version before modifications. To test the respective impacts of the 5 model modifications we used 5 different configurations of the improved model. Configuration ORC-AE accounts for changes in α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods. Configuration ORC-A includes only the

340 modified α_{surf} , while ORC-E incorporates adjustments to both β_4 and Z_0 . To further disentangle the individual impacts of β_4 and Z_0 , ORC- Z_0 modifies only the Z_0 , and ORC- β refers to only the modification of the β_4 . Prepared climate forcing data (section 2.1.2), soil texture (sand, silt and clay contents) and crop management information (i.e., sowing date, tillage date, residue covering periods) (section 2.1.3) at each available site were applied to drive the model. Note that all other management practices prescribed in this model (e.g., nitrogen fertilization) were set as default due to the lack of historical

345 implementation records. There is no irrigation consideration in this analysis.

Table 1 Simulation experiments

Names of experiments	Surface albedo	Soil conductance	Surface roughness	Crop & residue fraction	Test purpose
ORC-D	no change	no change	no change	no change	-
ORC-AE	1.foliar albedo increases with	1.change with new crop fraction during	1.change with new crop fraction	1.crop fraction keeps constant during foliar	combined impacts of

	time during foliar yellowing; 2. residue albedo decreases with time during residue covering	foliar yellowing; 2. change with residue fraction during residue covering;	during foliar yellowing; 2. change with residue fraction during residue covering;	residue surface albedo, soil resistance and surface roughness during two periods
ORC-A	1.foliar albedo increases with time during foliar yellowing; 2. residue albedo decreases with time during residue covering	no change	no change	1.crop fraction keeps constant during foliar yellowing; 2. residue fraction decreases with times during residue covering; isolated impact of surface albedo during two periods
ORC-E	no change	1.change with new crop fraction during foliar yellowing; 2. change with residue fraction during residue covering;	1.change with new crop fraction during foliar yellowing; 2. change with residue fraction during residue covering;	1.crop fraction keeps constant during foliar yellowing; 2. residue fraction decreases with times during residue covering; combined impact of soil resistance and surface roughness during two periods
ORC- β	no change	1.change with new crop fraction during foliar yellowing; 2. change with residue fraction during residue covering;	no change	1.crop fraction keeps constant during foliar yellowing; 2. residue fraction decreases with times during residue covering; isolated impact of soil resistance during two periods
ORC- Z_0	no change	no change	1. change with new crop fraction during foliar yellowing; 2. change with	1. crop fraction keeps constant during foliar yellowing; 2. residue fraction decreases with times during isolated impact of surface roughness during two periods

residue fraction residue covering;
during residue
covering;

*“no change” means variables are the ones from the initial version of the ORCHIDEE-CROP model;

“During both periods” means either during the foliar yellowing or the residue covering period.

350 In addition, we conducted a 10-year simulation (2010-2020) under current and idealised drying climate scenarios to quantify the cumulative effects of residue soil cover on water and heat fluxes for the new and old models at 6 sites if 10-year climate forcing data is available (Table S2). The meteorological forcing data for both scenarios followed the methodology described in Section 2.1.2, where the current climate scenario used observed annual climate data from ICOS, and the drying climate scenario was driven by climate forcing from the driest year (the lowest annual rainfall). At each site, the sowing and
355 harvesting dates were the averages of the years where observations were available. The residue covering periods were assumed to persist for 60 days following winter wheat harvest in each year.

2.6 Sensitivity analysis

We performed sensitivity tests of the major parameters (i.e. k_1 , k_4 , β_4 , Height, duration of α_{surf} increase during residue covering period (D_{up})) linking to the α_{surf} variation and the responses of the energy and water budgets, particularly for the
360 ones without enough constraints from field observations. The sensitivity test was conducted by changing the parameters by $\pm 10\%$, $\pm 20\%$ and $\pm 30\%$ from the initial calibrated values. Their impacts on T_{surf} , H , E_{soil} and LE were evaluated.

2.7 Model evaluation

We evaluated the performance of ORCHIDEE-CROP with and without modification against observations of α_{surf} at site scale. The sites used for evaluation were independent from the ones used for calibration of α_{surf} .
365 We computed the coefficient of determination (R^2) and RMSE as quality indicators for simulation-observation comparison of α_{surf} during the site calibration and model simulation processes (Wright 1921, Carbone and Armstrong 1982):

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_i^n (y_i - f_i)^2}{\sum_i^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (19)$$

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_i^n (f_i - y_i)^2}{n}} \quad (20)$$


Where n and i are the number of data and the data i in n in dataset; y_i and f_i are the value of observed data i and the value of
370 fitted data i ; $\bar{y}$ is the mean of the observed data.

With the calibration of the simulation of harvesting date for all sites, we further compared the surface temperature (T_{surf}), LE , H from simulations of the old and new models and observation during the foliar yellowing and residue covering periods.

3 Results

3.1 Evaluation of surface albedo dynamics in the refined ORCHIDEE-CROP model

375 The comparison between the predicted (ORC-AE configuration) and observed surface albedo (α_{surf}) shows a good performance with an R^2 of 0.54 during the foliar yellowing period and of 0.62 during the residue covering period for 5 sites. The corresponding RMSE has values of 0.04 and 0.03, respectively (Fig. 2). The least-squares regression in these two fitting models captures the mean tendency of the data but fails to reproduce extreme variations, as it minimizes average errors rather than explaining outliers.



380 **Figure 2** The comparison of daily surface albedo (α_{surf}) predictions based on the new parameterization (Fig. 1) with independent observation from 5 sites in Europe during (a) the foliar yellowing and (b) residue covering periods, with coefficient of determination (R^2) and root mean square error ($RMSE$) in the bottom-right corners. The dotted black line is the 1:1 line.

385 ORC-AE captured observed α_{surf} evolution during the yellowing and crop residue periods at all 5 sites. Using FR-Gri as an example (Fig. 3), the initial version of ORCHIDEE-CROP (ORC-D) without considering their effects on α_{surf} dynamics shows substantial biases in α_{surf} during the same period. The results of α_{surf} at all 5 sites can be found in Fig. S4. α_{surf} increases with the development of crops LAI in spring due to the enhanced reflected solar radiation of leaves compared to darker soil followed by a stable period before crops reach maturity. After the crop has reached maturity, the yellowing of aboveground crop biomass increases α_{surf} . This increase is reversed after harvest as dead and dying plant material (i.e., residues) start decomposing. Although the refined model can describe α_{surf} trends in both foliar yellowing and residue covering periods, substantial biases in α_{surf} remain for other periods which were not addressed in this study. This results from inaccuracies of estimating bare soil albedo (Yu et al., in review), from the growth of weeds which are not resolved in ORCHIDEE-CROP, and from the simplistic representation of vegetation albedo dynamics before maturity is reached.

395




Figure 3 The comparison of surface albedo (α_{surf}) predicted from the old (orange dots, ORC-AE) and new (red dots, ORC-D) ORCHIDEE-CROP models and observations at Grignon site in France (gray dots) in 2018. ORC-AE represents the new model version with effects of the modified α_{surf} and the refined soil conductance (β_4) and surface roughness (Z_0), while ORC-D suggests the initial version of the model. The observed α_{surf} is computed from site radiation measurements through the Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) Data Portal. The green, black and blue solid lines are the simulated start of the foliar yellowing period (shallow green area) ($T_{yellowing, start}$), harvesting date ($T_{harvest}$) and the end of residue covering period (shallow blue area) ($T_{res, end}$), respectively.

3.2 The impact of improved surface albedo, surface roughness and soil conductance on soil evaporation, surface temperature and soil water content

ORC-AE simulates slightly lower soil evaporation (E_{soil}) during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods than the standard version of ORCHIDEE-CROP (ORC-D), with averaged decreases of $-0.01 \pm 0.04 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-3.07 \pm 13.00\%$) and $-0.11 \pm 0.14 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-13.34 \pm 32.60\%$), respectively (Fig. 4a). The effects of soil conductance (β_4) and soil roughness (Z_0) reduced E_{soil} on average by $-0.01 \pm 0.03 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-2.86 \pm 9.91\%$) and $-0.09 \pm 0.12 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-9.69 \pm 38.16\%$) (ORC-E) during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods, respectively. Impacts on α_{surf} alone cause reductions of respectively $-0.01 \pm 0.04 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-2.30 \pm 15.50\%$) and $-0.06 \pm 0.10 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$ ($-9.59 \pm 22.43\%$) (ORC-A) for the same periods. The influence of crop residues on E_{soil} disappears within 40 days after residue coverage (Fig. S5a, Fig. S6a).




Figure 4 The average effect of model improvements for yellowing and residues cover on daily soil evaporation (E_{soil}), surface temperature (T_{surf}), the total soil water content up to 2 m (SWC), the maximum daily surface temperature (T_{max}), the latent heat flux (LE) and the sensible heat fluxes (H) across 12 sites. Shown are the simulated differences between three configurations of the refined model and old model: ORC-A represents the effect of the modified surface albedo (α_{surf}), ORC-E shows the effect of refined soil conductance (β_4) and surface roughness (Z_0), and ORC-AE suggests the effect of both modifications. The solid and dotted black lines within each box indicate the mean and median daily values across sites and timepoints, respectively. The box spans the interquartile range, covering the 25th percentile (lower bound) to the 75th percentile (upper bound). Black crossbars at the top and bottom represent the dataset's minimum and maximum values. The grey dotted vertical line in each plot represents zero on the y-axis.

The reduced E_{soil} in ORC-AE leads to a minor increase in soil water content (SWC) during the residue covering period among all sites, which is $4.31 \pm 3.58 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$ ($0.66 \pm 0.53\%$) over 2 m soil depth and averaged over the period (Fig. 4c). The combined effect is less than the sum of the changes caused by α_{surf} ($2.64 \pm 1.72 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$ ($0.41 \pm 0.26\%$), ORC-A) and by β_4 and Z_0 ($3.15 \pm 2.89 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$ ($0.49 \pm 0.44\%$), ORC-E). The water conservation effect persists to the end of year, with gradual infiltration into deeper soil layers (Fig. S7).

Incorporating changes in α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 in ORC-AE results in a reduction in surface temperature (T_{surf}) during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods with averaged cooling of $-0.42 \pm 0.65 \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}$ ($-1.78 \pm 2.49\%$) and $-1.39 \pm 1.07 \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}$ ($-5.94 \pm 4.05\%$) over all sites, respectively, compared to the ORC-D simulation (Fig. 4b). The factorial simulation experiments show that this cooling effect can be attributed to changes in α_{surf} (ORC-A), E_{soil} and Z_0 (ORC-E). Increased α_{surf} alone

leads to T_{surf} reductions of -0.41 ± 0.65 °C ($-1.74 \pm 2.50\%$) and -1.37 ± 1.04 °C ($-5.86 \pm 3.86\%$) on average during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods, respectively. Changes in β_4 and Z_0 cause a cooling of -0.31 ± 0.52 °C ($-1.33 \pm 1.99\%$) and -0.95 ± 0.88 °C ($-4.00 \pm 3.41\%$) for the same periods, respectively. Interaction between α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 (ORC-AE) lead to dampened overall effect compared to individual effects of these factors on T_{surf} . The reduction of T_{surf} tends to weaken over the 60 days of decreasing residue coverage (Fig. S5d, Fig. S6d).

3.3 The impact of improved surface albedo, surface roughness and soil conductance on latent and sensible heat flux

Compared with ORC-D simulation, the latent heat flux (LE) in ORC-AE is -1.23 ± 1.78 W m⁻² ($-2.22 \pm 9.64\%$) lower during foliar yellowing period and -3.59 ± 3.90 W m⁻² ($-13.08 \pm 31.57\%$) lower during residue covering periods (Fig. 4e). α_{surf} , β_4 and Z_0 have comparable impacts on LE during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods, with the changes of -1.46 ± 1.69 W m⁻² ($-2.20 \pm 12.37\%$) and -2.17 ± 2.98 W m⁻² ($-9.72 \pm 21.30\%$) induced by α_{surf} (ORC-A), and of -0.63 ± 1.44 W m⁻² ($-1.14 \pm 7.73\%$) and -2.82 ± 3.44 W m⁻² ($-9.30 \pm 37.30\%$) induced by β_4 and Z_0 (ORC-E), respectively. Different from H , the effect of crop residues on LE did not last beyond the residue covering period but ended in approximately 55 days within the residue covering period (Figs. S5b and S6b).

The corresponding changes in the sensible heat flux (H) are minor during the yellowing period, with an averaged decrease of -0.03 ± 2.34 W m⁻² ($-1.50 \pm 6.24\%$) and moderate during the residue covering with averaged increase of 1.30 ± 11.52 W m⁻² ($4.62 \pm 43.29\%$), compared to the ORC-D simulation (Fig. 4f). Related to α_{surf} impacts (ORC-A), the surface-atmosphere energy exchange (ORC-E) in the two periods exerts a stronger influence on H with averaged increases of 3.46 ± 1.04 W m⁻² ($4.75 \pm 7.35\%$) and 15.44 ± 13.61 W m⁻² ($28.61 \pm 35.29\%$) during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods, respectively.

The direct α_{surf} impacts cause an averaged increase of 0.14 ± 2.22 W m⁻² ($-0.76 \pm 5.07\%$) and 1.41 ± 10.09 W m⁻² ($5.69 \pm 46.00\%$), respectively, during the same periods. Consistent with T_{surf} , the weakening influence of crop residues on H lasts 60 days after residue covering periods (Fig. S5c, Fig. S6c).

3.4 Effect of soil residues on soil water availability on multi-year timescale

The 10-year simulation for current climate shows a minor short-lived increase in SWC at the 12.5 % soil depth (relative root depth of winter wheat in ORCHIDEE-CROP model) due to the presence of crop residues. Averaged over the simulation length and across 6 sites, total SWC is 0.19 ± 0.27 kg m⁻² ($1.24 \pm 1.56\%$) higher than in the simulation without crop residues (Fig. 5a). There was no statistically significant carry-over effect of SWC savings in one growing season to another at any site. This is because increased drainage losses compensated for reduced bare soil evaporation (Fig. S8). Soil temperature (T_{soil}) at 12.5 % soil depth penetrable by winter wheat roots decreased by an average of -0.19 ± 0.44 °C ($-5.67 \pm 5.22\%$) over the 60 days of residue covering periods and across sites, and there is no significant cooling effect during the 60-day residue covering periods over 10 years (Fig. 5b). The largest reduction in T_{soil} occurs after harvest coinciding with largest increase in α_{surf} due to residue presence compared to simulation without residue effects.




Figure 5 The 10-year cumulative effect of new parameterization of surface albedo (α_{surf}), surface roughness (Z_0) and soil conductance (β_4) on (a) soil water content (SWC) and (b) simulated daily soil temperature (T_{soil}) at 12.5 % soil depth under current and drying climate scenarios at 6 sites from 2011 to 2020. Monthly temperature and rainfall are obtained from the meteorological variables of 6-hourly 0.5° CRU-JRA product (v2.4), shown in (c) and (d). Shown are differences between results from ORC-AE and ORC-D. ORC-AE represents the new model version with effects of the modified α_{surf} and the refined β_4 and Z_0 , while ORC-D suggests the initial version of the model.

The 10-year simulation for drying climate shows a similar increase in SWC at 12.5 % soil depth due to the presence of crop residue with that for current climate, average over the simulation length and across sites of $0.22 \pm 0.21 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$ ($2.11 \pm 1.07\%$) higher than in the simulation without crop residues (Fig. 5a). Compared with current scenario, the retention of SWC due to decreased E_{soil} in drying scenario is comparable but exhibits no significant annual trend. However, it leaves more residual moisture available for the next growing season, potentially enhancing crop development by weakening water stress. This effect likely arises because water loss is governed primarily by evaporation in a drying scenario, as diminished water input (e.g., rainfall) (Fig. 5d) restricts both runoff and infiltration. Consequently, the E_{soil} suppression by crop residues substantially increases soil water retention, underscoring their critical role in mitigating drought stress. We further found that SWC increase at 50 % soil depth has a statistically significant trend at all sites (not shown). This might be explained as, the absence of an annual trend at 12.5 % soil depth likely results from the rapid response of superficial SWC to short-term climate variability such as sporadic rainfall events, whereas the significant trend at 50 % soil depth reflects the cumulative

effect of reduced E_{soil} and enhanced deep-water retention over time. Average T_{soil} at 12.5 % soil depth decreases with a statistically significant trend by an average of -0.28 ± 0.57 °C ($-6.90 \pm 3.00\%$) over years (Fig. 5b). Compared with current climate, the drying condition drives a larger magnitude of T_{soil} decrease with the largest α_{surf} increase.

485 3.5 Sensitivity of energy and water processes to parameters

Sensitivity analyses reveal pronounced nonlinear responses of land surface water and energy processes to parameter dynamics (Fig. S13). For T_{surf} , k_1 exhibits the highest sensitivity, as it governs the rate and ceiling of 15-day surface albedo increase and consequently modulates available surface radiation during the residue covering period (Fig. S13a). A $\pm 30\%$ perturbation in k_1 induces 8.69% and 30.78% enhancements in surface cooling, respectively. In contrast, T_{surf} is only
 490 weakly affected by the hydrological parameter β_4 (-4.46% / $+2.98\%$ change in surface cooling for $\pm 30\%$ variations), consistent with the scenario simulations (Fig. 4b). The parameter D_{up} also shows limited influence on T_{surf} (-8.35% / $+2.53\%$ change in cooling for $\pm 30\%$ variations).

For E_{soil} , β_4 is the dominant control (Fig. S13b). A decrease or increase in β_4 from the baseline by 30% results in a 62.48% reduction or 100.85% increase in the decline of E_{soil} , respectively. The parameters k_1 , k_4 , and D_{up} also influence E_{soil} , with
 495 a $\pm 30\%$ variation leading to -32.40% / -35.53% , -17.72% / $+22.35\%$, and -29.49% / -18.57% changes, respectively.

For H , D_{up} exerts the strongest control, followed by k_1 and β_4 (Fig. S13c). Adjusting these parameters by $\pm 30\%$ alters H by -10.53% / $+56.34\%$, -42.55% / $+36.77\%$, and -27.60% / $+27.33\%$, respectively. β_4 is also the most sensitive parameter for LE , reflecting its dependence on E_{soil} . $\pm 30\%$ variations in β_4 yield $+89.78\%$ / -62.16% changes in LE (Fig. S13d). In contrast, the strong sensitivity of E_{soil} to k_1 does not propagate to LE , with only -2.66% / $+8.21\%$ changes observed under equivalent
 500 k_1 perturbations (Fig. S13c and d).

4. Discussion

4.1 Surface energy and land-atmosphere interaction jointly regulate surface temperature during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods

Foliar yellowing and residue coverage cool the surface across all sites by regulating the surface energy balance and
 505 redistributing net radiation to latent and sensible energy fluxes (Fig. 4a). The larger surface temperature (T_{surf}) decrease in ORC-A than that in ORC-E reveals that the cooling from the reduced net radiation (R_n) due to increased α_{surf} dominates the change in T_{surf} . This is in line with previous work, which indicated that no-tillage systems with residue coverage on European scale cooled the surface by about 2 °C during hot summer days due to increased α_{surf} (Davin et al., 2014).

While foliar yellowing and residue coverage induce an albedo-driven cooling effect across all 10 European sites, the
 510 interplay between surface energy available and the surface-atmosphere water-heat exchange causes substantial variation in the strength and periods of cooling. The increased surface roughness (Z_0) due to winter wheat and residue coverages in these two periods enhances surface-atmosphere turbulent heat exchange, potentially promoting more efficient heat dissipation and surface cooling (Winckler et al., 2019; Meier et al., 2022). For example, isolating the impact of increased Z_0 due to foliar

yellowing and residue coverage (ORC- Z_0), both contribute more to the cooling impact than ORC- β across all sites (Fig. S9a).
 515 However, the extent to which this surface cooling persists also depends on the hydrological fluxes between surface and
 atmosphere. Crop residues potentially warm the surface by decreasing soil evaporation (E_{soil}) (Hu et al., 2018). It can be
 realized by lowering soil conductance (β_4) via shielding the soil from direct solar radiation and wind, and by reducing near-
 surface wind speed and enhancing aerodynamic drag via increasing Z_0 (Fig. 4a, Fig. S9c). Different from residue coverage,
 foliar yellowing has a minor influence on E_{soil} due to the continuous winter wheat coverage on the soil (Fig. 4a). The
 520 associated decline in transpiration, driven by reduced stomatal conductance under lower net radiation, contributes to
 potential warming (not shown). Residue-induced suppression of E_{soil} during residue coverage and α_{surf} -induced decline in
 transpiration during foliar yellowing, both redirect energy partitioning from latent heat flux (LE) towards sensible heat flux
 (H), likely offsetting surface cooling (Ramos et al., 2024).

4.2 Distinct controls on LE and H during foliar yellowing and residue covering periods

525 To isolate the drivers of turbulent flux changes during crop yellowing and residue cover periods, we analyzed results from
 two key model configurations: the surface-atmosphere interaction experiments (ORC-E) and the radiative forcing
 experiments (ORC-A). Our simulations revealed that less surface energy available with a higher albedo during crop
 yellowing and the residues cover period, together with the subsequently altered turbulent fluxes, contributed to a weak
 reduction in LE during these periods (Fig. 4e, Fig. S5b, Fig. S9d). In contrast, the surface-atmosphere interactions (ORC-E)
 530 dominate an increased H in both periods (Fig. 4f and Fig. S5c), and this effect was primarily mediated by Z_0 (Fig. S9b).

The different underlying drivers behind changes in LE and H can be explained by the following: LE represents the energy
 needed for water vaporization and depends on available energy and moisture transport efficiency (Chen et al., 2020). In
 contrast, H is driven by direct surface-atmosphere heat transfer via conduction and convection, governed by the land-air
 temperature gradient and turbulent heat exchange (Myhre et al., 2018). For example, we found that during the residue
 535 covering period, the change in H induced by effects of residues on β_4 and Z_0 (ORC-E) is much larger than by effects via
 α_{surf} alone (ORC-A) (Fig. 4f). This is consistent with earlier findings pointing to a critical role of surface-atmosphere
 interactions in shaping energy partitioning and near-surface thermal dynamics (Koster et al., 2004; Seneviratne et al., 2010;
 Dare-Idowu et al., 2021; Denissen et al., 2022; Hsu et al., 2023). An opposite change in H during foliar yellowing and
 residue covering periods reflect the varying influence of land cover and surface properties on energy dynamics, driven by
 540 different ground covers (i.e. crops and residues) (McDermid et al., 2018).

The individual impacts of α_{surf} (ORC-A) and of surface-atmosphere exchange (ORC-E) on the changes in LE and H differ
 from the combined effect of both (ORC-AE), especially during the residue covering period (Fig. 4). This indicates a strong
 nonlinear interaction between energy and water dynamics driven by crop residues (Hsu et al., 2021). For example, the
 decreased LE reduces H during the residue covering period by weakening near-surface turbulence, leading to a significant
 545 negative impact on H not explained by ORC-A and ORC-E alone (Fig. 4f). The complex feedback mechanisms between

radiation partitioning and surface-atmosphere coupling (Hsu et al., 2021; Hsu et al., 2022) demands for modelling solutions which take into account both and their interactions.

It should be noted that the averaged difference in surface energy fluxes (i.e. LE and H) over all sites between the new and old models are generally modest (Fig. 4e and f) and at similar magnitudes as model uncertainty, which masks a substantial spatiotemporal variability in residue effects during the residue covering period. Temporally, residue-induced albedo enhancement peaks within the first 15 days after harvest and weakens as residues decompose, causing short-lived but locally significant perturbations in water and heat fluxes (Fig. 3, Fig. S4-S5). The residue impact on the water-heat processes persists for an additional 1-2 months beyond residue removal through tillage or natural decomposition (Fig. S6). Spatial variations in climate, soil properties, and management practices amplify local differences in residue impacts. For example, we found that during the residue covering period, BE-Lon exhibits the largest mean relative decrease in LE in the new model compared to the old model ($-27.69 \pm 11.62\%$), whereas the change at DE-Geb is minimal ($-6.10 \pm 33.48\%$). This contrast arises because the higher soil moisture and sandy texture at BE-Lon support greater evaporative fluxes, whereas the limited soil water and clay-rich soil at DE-Geb favor energy dissipation as sensible rather than latent heat (Dumont et al., 2023; Buysse et al., 2023). In addition, long-term simulations show the accumulated residue impact on heat budgets. The 10-year simulation under the drying climate scenario shows a low but statistically significant cooling trend, with a yearly average of -0.3 °C (Fig. 5). This demonstrates that even modest instantaneous flux changes can generate meaningful long-term surface cooling effects.

4.3 Implication for climate change mitigation and adaptation

With approximately 60 % of global croplands having higher T_{surf} than surrounding natural biome types, elevated temperatures, particularly during extreme heat and drought events, pose a major issue for crop yields and food security (Lobell et al., 2012; Lesk et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2024). Our simulations across all sites suggest that residue coverage alleviates heat stress by decreasing maximum surface temperature (T_{max}) during approximately 20-day residue covering period and for up to 90 days afterward (Figs. S5e and S6e). This result aligns with previous findings on the cooling effect of crop residues (Davin et al., 2014; Webber et al., 2018; Su et al., 2022). Reduced surface T_{max} after crop harvest mitigates heat stress on soil biota, providing a more favorable growing environment for subsequent crop cycles (Hatfield et al., 2015). Sustained temperatures above 30 °C can stress mesophilic soil microbes, inhibiting decomposition and nutrient cycling (Pietikäinen et al., 2005). Our simulations show that residue cover reduces T_{max} beyond 30 °C on 26 % of days during the residue period and 3.8 % of days afterward, underscoring its role in regulating soil thermal condition. This buffering effect modifies microbial activity and soil organic matter decomposition rates depending on specific climate and environment, thereby influencing greenhouse gas emissions from soil respiration (Knight et al., 2024).

The increase in H during residue covering period reveals an increased surface-air temperature gradient due to the decreased T_{surf} , possibly leading to a warmer lower atmosphere which cannot be quantified by the land surface model only (Fig. 4, Fig.

S5c, Fig. S6c). This shift in energy partitioning from LE to H , driven by reduced E_{soil} due to residue coverage, might mitigate surface warming but could intensify regional heat stress. Consequently, it introduces uncertainty regarding the role of crop residues as a climate mitigation strategy. Notably, the use of fixed air temperature forcing data partially explains the increase in H because the constant air temperature ignores atmospheric feedback (Luyssaert et al., 2014). As a result, the climate mitigation potential of residue management remains uncertain, and its regional impact on energy partitioning cannot be fully determined. It is essential to consider not only surface cooling but also changes in air temperature, as the latter is more directly linked to climate dynamics. A coupled simulation, feasible with ORCHIDEE-CROP, would be needed for future studies.

Soil water content (SWC) dynamics play a key role in regulating the land-atmosphere interactions, as the increase in surface soil SWC , as due to residue effects on roughness and soil resistance, can decrease H partitioning via promoting E_{soil} (Myhre et al., 2018). The 10-year simulations further highlight that residue coverage has the potential to increase SWC and thereby buffer drought stress, particularly under drier conditions with fewer rainfall events (Fig. 5, Fig. S8). In such condition, SWC remains high in the upper 1 m soil for extended periods of up to 3 months. An earlier review suggested that dry soil condition might result in soil compaction and reduced hydraulic conductivity (Singh et al., 2018). It limits infiltration and slow downward water percolation, which might hinder the underlying mechanism of the SWC retention in the upper soil detected by ORCHIDEE-CROP model. Notably, soil texture modulates this effect. For example, rapid water infiltration into deeper layers in sandy soils with high drainage reduces surface SWC availability for cooling and plant uptake (Fatichi et al., 2020; Wankmüller et al., 2024), highlighting how soil hydraulics constrain residue efficacy. The sustained SWC also fosters soil biota activity (e.g., fungi, earthworms), which enhance soil structure through aggregate formation and organic matter decomposition (Li et al., 2009). Improved soil structure increases water-holding capacity, creating a positive feedback loop where residue-induced SWC retention supports biological activity, which in turn amplifies long-term moisture retention. This synergy reveals that residue effects on SWC persist beyond immediate rainfall events, particularly in water-limited systems. External factors such as tillage timing and precipitation frequency also affect the biophysical impacts of crop residues (Konapala et al., 2020). Early tillage, as observed at the FR-Gri site in 2018 (three weeks after harvest), leaves more SWC in the topsoil while removing the residue cover, temporarily boosting E_{soil} and LE after the end of residue covering (Fig. S3). The strong soil water retention capacity of the silt loam soil at this site further contributed to this effect (Houot et al., 2000). This process underscores the importance of management practices in regulating the diverse hydrological and thermal effects of residue covering. Targeted strategies are also essential to optimize water utilization, particularly facing warmer and drier climates (Swain et al., 2025).

4.5 Uncertainty and Limitations

Despite improvements in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model to simulate crop albedo changes from yellowing and residues and their biophysical climate impacts, there remain uncertainties and limitations.

610 The ORCHIDEE-CROP model has biases in simulating water and energy fluxes, and the performance of the new model in capturing water-energy fluxes does not improve to the previous version when evaluated against site-level measurements at six sites (Fig. S10). Both the new and old models overestimate LE and H during foliar yellowing periods, while underestimating LE and overestimating H during residue covering periods. This overestimation during foliar yellowing periods might come from a systematically excessive vegetation–atmosphere coupling strength for crops in ORCHIDEE itself compared with observation (Zhang et al., 2022). Observations indicate that LE is higher during periods of residue coverage compared to periods of bare soil (Fig. S12). However, it is not clear to what extent the observed difference in LE between periods is driven by differences in weather conditions or the presence/absence of residues. One possible source of bias during the residue covering period may be the simplification of model parameters. In the present version of ORCHIDEE-CROP, the effects of crop residues on surface-atmosphere coupling are quantified by modulating β_4 and Z_0 . Both variables are described with uniform assumptions to balance model complexity with the scarcity of data to constrain parameterization. Specifically, the impact of residues on β_4 was represented by an initial reduction factor of 0.5 at the start of the residue covering (Section 2.3.3). While residue influence on Z_0 was prescribed using a fixed residue height (0.5 m), derived from the average of measurements across five winter-wheat sites (section 2.3.4, Table S3). These parameter choices are uniform across all sites and therefore cannot explicitly represent local variation in residue characteristics, soil properties, atmospheric conditions and management practices. As a result, the model is incapable of fully resolving site-specific residue impacts, which potentially contributes to the bias of simulated LE and H at certain sites.

The sensitivity analysis also highlights the uncertainties introduced by parameter selection (Fig. S13). The β_4 and k_1 exert strong control over the spatiotemporal partitioning of available energy between LE and H . The use of fixed parameter values and limited calibration at a few sites inevitably contributes to model uncertainty and constrains the representation of local variability.

We manually adjusted the total conductance of soil evaporation, transpiration and interception in ORCHIDEE-CROP by scaling it with $1+f_{soil}$ during residue cover periods (Chapin et al., 2011). The simulations showed improved agreement with observed T_{surf} , LE and H (Fig. S11), indicating that the net biophysical impact of residue cover is enhancing surface-atmosphere water and heat exchanges despite inhibiting soil evaporation, which is not well described in the current model. A test of quantifying the residue impact on E_{soil} at 15 field experiments distributed globally shows that residue cover exceeding 80% leads to an approximately 20-30% reduction in E_{soil} during the residue covering period (not shown). Therefore, the assumed 50% initial decline in β_4 in the improved model (Eq.16) might overestimate residue impacts, potentially explaining the lower E_{soil} and LE simulated across sites in the new model compared with both the initial model version and observations (Fig. S10).

640 In addition, specific hydrological processes impacted by crop residues were not accounted for here, such as water interception on the surface of residues, and uptake/release of water from residues (Kozak et al., 2007, Swella et al., 2015). Rainfall interception by residues alters the timing and magnitude of soil water input and enhances evaporation from residue

surfaces, thereby modifying surface moisture and heat exchanges (Mitchell et al., 2012; Thapa et al., 2021). However, contrasting evaporation drivers in soil and residue layers introduce complexity to surface evaporation processes. The omission of these processes likely increases model uncertainty in biophysical simulations under variable rainfall conditions. The input data used to drive the model introduces several structural uncertainties. First, while site-based meteorological forcing (e.g., air temperature, wind speed, humidity) ensures high representativeness, at two ClieNFarm sites meteorological observations were missing and simulations were instead driven by the 6-hourly 0.5° CRU-JRA (v2.4) product. This substitution inevitably limits the ability of our model to reproduce site-specific water and energy dynamics. Second, the bare soil albedo dataset used to estimate surface albedo carries uncertainties related to quality-restricted training samples (Yu et al., in review). For example, the vegetation index thresholding used to identify bare soil may also include mixed surfaces such as crop residues, introducing bias in soil albedo retrievals. Also, the spatial aggregation from 300 m to 0.5° smooths the field variability of bare soil albedo, reducing the reliability of the model simulation. Third, the incomplete representation of management practices in our model, including fertilizer and pesticide application as well as physical operations like tillage, limits the model's capacity to reproduce observed variations in crop phenology, soil water content, and surface fluxes across years.

Based on these concerns, evaluating residue effects requires a context-specific approach that accounts for the interactions among climate, soil, and crop characteristics. Process-based land surface models provide an effective framework for such assessments at varying scales, as they explicitly represent the coupled biophysical and ecological mechanisms controlling surface energy and water exchanges. This approach provides an opportunity to guide residue management strategies under variable environmental settings. Future model developments should include explicit residue modules and site-specific parameterization to better capture spatial heterogeneity in residue impacts on energy and water fluxes. For example, integrating the canopy interception modules developed by crop models to ORCHIDEE-CROP is a good strategy to better represent the residue impact on the hydrological dynamics, such as CropSyst and RZWQM (Kozak et al., 2007). Moreover, an open-sourced global database from dedicated field trials monitoring energy exchange is required for parametrizing and evaluating this model development.

5. Conclusion

Here we improved the simulation of winter wheat cultivar in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model by taking into account the impact of foliar yellowing and crop residues on water and energy balance of winter wheat cultivations based on observations from 10 cropland sites. The simulated surface energy budget and partitioning of latent and sensible heat fluxes show a cooling impact of residues and crop yellowing. A complex interplay between radiative and turbulent processes controls the strength of these effects. The improved ORCHIDEE-CROP model, with its representation of land surface albedo, surface roughness, and soil conductance for residue covering, provides a valuable tool for quantifying biophysical impacts and guiding localized residue management strategies at regional to global scale. By identifying optimal residue management

675 practices, this approach can contribute to sustainable agriculture and inform policy development in the context of climate warming.

Code and data availability

The model code used in this study is archived at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15230286> (Yu et al., 2025). All the data and
680 the codes for data analysis and figure creation are available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15234443> (Yu 2025). All data used in this study are publicly available. The original ecosystem flux data at available sites can be derived from the Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) Data Portal at <https://data.icos-cp.eu/>. The MODIS LAI data (MCD15A3H) can be downloaded from Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center (<https://lpdaac.usgs.gov/products/mcd15a3hv006/> DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MCD15A3H.006>). The MODIS
685 aerosol product (MO(Y)D04_L2) can be downloaded from Level-1 and Atmosphere Archive & Distribution System Distributed Active Archive Center (<https://ladsweb.modaps.eosdis.nasa.gov/> DOI: https://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MOD04_L2.061). The Sentinel-2 bare soil albedo datasets can be downloaded from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15271053> (Yu 2025).

690 **Author contributions**

DG, RL, and PC conceptualized and designed the study. KY modified and implemented the model, conducted formal analysis of the results, and led the writing of the original draft with contributions from all co-authors. AP and MC contributed data curation by providing management information from ClieNFarm sites. All authors participated in reviewing, editing, and finalizing the manuscript.

695

Competing interests

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Acknowledgements

700 The authors gratefully acknowledge the ClieNFarm project partners for providing spatial datasets (shapefiles) and detailed management practice records for winter wheat fields within their agricultural sites. We also extend our thanks to the ORCHIDEE model development team for their technical support and expertise during the model implementation process.

Financial support

705 This project is funded by ClieNFarms project (Grant Agreement ID: 101036822).

References

- Arora, V. K., Seiler, C., Wang, L., et al.: Towards an ensemble-based evaluation of land surface models in light of uncertain forcings and observations, *Biogeosciences*, 20, 1313–1355, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-1313-2023>, 2023.
- 710 Brisson, N., Gary, C., Justes, E., Roche, R., Mary, B., Ripoche, D., Zimmer, D., Sierra, J., Bertuzzi, P., Burger, P., Bussi re, F., Cabidoche, Y. M., Cellier, P., Debaeke, P., Gaudill re, J. P., H nault, C., Maraux, F., Seguin, B., and Sinoquet, H.: An overview of the crop model STICS, *Eur. J. Agron.*, 18, 309–332, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00110-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00110-7), 2003.
- Brut, A., Tallec, T., Granouillac, F., Zawilski, B., and Ceschia, E.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Lamasquere, 2022-12-31–2023-09-30, ICOS RI, doi:10.18160/5msrX-9-wdL5g31PzT0af3nO, 2023.
- 715 Buysse, P., Depuydt, J., and Loubet, B.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Grignon, 2022-12-31–2023-09-30, ICOS RI, doi:10.18160/jU9ftXkRFqo-dc91cDfOYuA8, 2023.
- Br mmer, C., Delorme, J., and Schrader, F.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Gebesee, 2019-12-31–2022-12-31, ICOS RI, doi:10.18160/4214v5CpbndEJTcT_3emXV8, 2023.
- Bernhofer, C., Eichelmann, U., Gr nwald, T., Hehn, M., Mauder, M., Moderow, U., and Prasse, H.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Klingenberg, 2017-12-31–2022-12-31, ICOS RI, doi:10.18160/G3z0eVc7TzZilyHYhW1l4syv, 2023.
- 720 Chen, C., Li, Y., Wang, X., et al.: Biophysical effects of croplands on land surface temperature, *Nat. Commun.*, 15, 10901, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-55319-2>, 2024.
- Chapin, F. S., Chapin, M. C., Matson, P. A., and Vitousek, P.: *Principles of Terrestrial Ecosystem Ecology*, Springer, New York, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9504-9>, 2011.
- 725 Carbone, R., and Armstrong, J. S.: Evaluation of extrapolative forecasting methods: Results of a survey of academicians and practitioners, http://repository.upenn.edu/marketing_papers/80, 1982.
- Costa, M. H., Yanagi, S. N. M., Souza, P. J. O. P., Ribeiro, A., and Rocha, E. J. P.: Climate change in Amazonia caused by soybean cropland expansion, as compared to caused by pastureland expansion, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L07706, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL029271>, 2007.
- 730 Campoy, A., Ducharne, A., Ch r y, F., Hourdin, F., Polcher, J., and Dupont, J. C.: Response of land surface fluxes and precipitation to different soil bottom hydrological conditions in a general circulation model, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118, 10725–10739, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50627>, 2013.
- de Rosnay, P., Polcher, J., Bruen, M., and Laval, K.: Impact of a physically based soil water flow and soil-plant interaction representation for modeling large-scale land surface processes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107(D11), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD000634>, 2002.
- 735 Denissen, J. M. C., Teuling, A. J., Pitman, A. J., et al.: Widespread shift from ecosystem energy to water limitation with climate change, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 12, 677–684, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01403-8>, 2022.
- Dalgliesh, N., et al.: *Field Protocol to APSoil characterisations*, Version 4, CSIRO, Australia, 2016.

- Ducoudré, N. I., Laval, K., and Perrier, A.: SECHIBA, a new set of parameterizations of the hydrologic exchanges at the land-atmosphere interface within the LMD atmospheric general circulation model, *J. Climate*, 6, 248-273, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1993)006<0248:SANSOP>2.0.CO;2, 1993.
- Dumont, B., Bogaerts, G., Chopin, H., De Ligne, A., Demoulin, L., Faurès, A., Heinesch, B., Longdoz, B., Manise, T., and Orgun, A.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Lonzee, 2022-12-31-2023-09-30, ICOS RI, <https://doi.org/10.18160/JmEjmkD1hSr4YIuo5Uu-L69a>, 2023.
- Dare-Idowu, O., Brut, A., Cuxart, J., Tallec, T., Rivalland, V., Zawilski, B., Ceschia, E., and Jarlan, L.: Surface energy balance and flux partitioning of annual crops in southwestern France, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 308-309, 108529, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108529>, 2021.
- Davin, E. L., Seneviratne, S. I., Ciais, P., Oliosio, A., and Wang, T.: Preferential cooling of hot extremes from cropland albedo management, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 111, 9757-9761, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317323111>, 2014.
- Drewry, D. T., Kumar, P., and Long, S. P.: Simultaneous improvement in productivity, water use, and albedo through crop structural modification, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 20, 1955-1967, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12567>, 2014.
- Féret, J.-B., Gitelson, A. A., Noble, S. D., and Jacquemoud, S.: PROSPECT-D: Towards modeling leaf optical properties through a complete lifecycle, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 193, 204-221, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.03.004>, 2017.
- Fisher, R. A., and Koven, C. D.: Perspectives on the future of land surface models and the challenges of representing complex terrestrial systems, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 12, e2018MS001453, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001453>, 2020.
- Fisher, J. B., Huntzinger, D. N., Schwalm, C. R., and Sitch, S.: Modeling the terrestrial biosphere, *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 39, 91-123, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012913-093456>, 2014.
- Fatichi, S., Or, D., Walko, R., et al.: Soil structure is an important omission in Earth System Models, *Nat. Commun.*, 11, 522, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-14411-z>, 2020.
- Friedlingstein, P., O'Sullivan, M., Jones, M. W., Andrew, R. M., Gregor, L., Hauck, J., Le Quéré, C., Luijkx, I. T., Olsen, A., Peters, G. P., Peters, W., Pongratz, J., Schwingshackl, C., Sitch, S., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Jackson, R. B., Alin, S. R., Alkama, R., Arneth, A., Arora, V. K., Bates, N. R., Becker, M., Bellouin, N., Bittig, H. C., Bopp, L., Chevallier, F., Chini, L. P., Cronin, M., Evans, W., Falk, S., Feely, R. A., Gasser, T., Gehlen, M., Gkritzalis, T., Gloege, L., Grassi, G., Gruber, N., Gürses, Ö., Harris, I., Hefner, M., Houghton, R. A., Hurtt, G. C., Iida, Y., Ilyina, T., Jain, A. K., Jersild, A., Kadono, K., Kato, E., Kennedy, D., Klein Goldewijk, K., Knauer, J., Korsbakken, J. I., Landschützer, P., Lefèvre, N., Lindsay, K., Liu, J., Liu, Z., Marland, G., Mayot, N., McGrath, M. J., Metzl, N., Monacci, N. M., Munro, D. R., Nakaoka, S.-I., Niwa, Y., O'Brien, K., Ono, T., Palmer, P. I., Pan, N., Pierrot, D., Pocock, K., Poulter, B., Resplandy, L., Robertson, E., Rödenbeck, C., Rodriguez, C., Rosan, T. M., Schwinger, J., Séférian, R., Shutler, J. D., Skjelvan, I., Steinhoff, T., Sun, Q., Sutton, A. J., Sweeney, C., Takao, S., Tanhua, T., Tans, P. P., Tian, X., Tian, H., Tilbrook, B., Tsujino, H., Tubiello, F., van der Werf, G. R., Walker, A. P., Wanninkhof, R., Whitehead, C., Willstrand Wranne, A., Wright, R., Yuan, W., Yue, C., Yue, X., Zaehle, S., Zeng, J., and Zheng, B.: Global Carbon Budget 2022, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 14, 4811-4900, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-4811-2022>, 2022.

- Hoogenboom, G., Porter, C. H., Shelia, V., et al.: Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT) Version 4.8.5, DSSAT Foundation, Gainesville, Florida, USA, 2024.
- Hatfield, J. L., and Prueger, J. H.: Temperature extremes: Effect on plant growth and development, *Weather Clim. Extrem.*, 10, 4-10, 2015.
- Hsu, H. and Dirmeyer, P. A.: Soil moisture-evaporation coupling shifts into new gears under increasing CO₂, *Nat. Commun.*, 14, 1162, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36794-5>, 2023.
- Hu, C., Zheng, C., Sadras, V. O., et al.: Effect of straw mulch and seeding rate on the harvest index, yield, and water use efficiency of winter wheat, *Sci. Rep.*, 8, 8167, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-26615-x>, 2018.
- Hsu, H., and Dirmeyer, P. A.: Nonlinearity and multivariate dependencies in the terrestrial leg of land-atmosphere coupling, *Water Resour. Res.*, 57, e2020WR028179, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028179>, 2021.
- Hsu, H., and Dirmeyer, P. A.: Deconstructing the soil moisture–latent heat flux relationship: The range of coupling regimes experienced and the presence of nonlinearity within the sensitive regime, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 23, 1041-1057, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-21-0224.1>, 2022.
- Houot, S., Topp, E., Yassir, A., and Soulas, G.: Dependence of accelerated degradation of atrazine on soil pH in French and Canadian soils, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 32, 615-625, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(99\)00191-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00191-9), 2000.
- Horton, P., Ruban, A. V., and Walters, R. G.: Regulation of light harvesting in green plants, *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.*, 47, 655-684, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.47.1.655>, 1996.
- Hatfield, J. L. and Prueger, J. H.: Temperature extremes: effect on plant growth and development, *Weather Clim. Extremes*, 10, 4–10, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2015.08.001>, 2015.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva, Switzerland, 2014.
- Jacobs, A. F. G., and van Pul, W. A. J.: Seasonal changes in the albedo of a maize crop during two seasons, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 49, 351-360, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1923\(90\)90006-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1923(90)90006-R), 1990.
- Konapala, G., Mishra, A. K., Wada, Y., et al.: Climate change will affect global water availability through compounding changes in seasonal precipitation and evaporation, *Nat. Commun.*, 11, 3044, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16757-w>, 2020.
- Koster, R. D., et al.: Regions of strong coupling between soil moisture and precipitation, *Science*, 305, 1138-1140, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1100217>, 2004.
- Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Ogée, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., and Prentice, I. C.: A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 19, GB1015, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GB002199>, 2005.
- Kriauciūnienė, Z., Velička, R., and Raudonius, S.: The influence of crop residues type on their decomposition rate in the soil: a litterbag study, *Žemdirbystė*, 99, 227-236, 2012.

- 805 Knight, C. G., Nicolitch, O., Griffiths, R. I., et al.: Soil microbiomes show consistent and predictable responses to extreme events, *Nature*, 636, 690-696, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08185-3>, 2024.
- Kozak, J. A., Ahuja, L. R., Green, T. R., and Ma, L.: Modelling crop canopy and residue rainfall interception effects on soil hydrological components for semi-arid agriculture, *Hydrol. Process.*, 21, 229–241, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6235>, 2007.
- 810 Lesk, C., Anderson, W., Rigden, A., et al.: Compound heat and moisture extreme impacts on global crop yields under climate change, *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, 3, 872-889, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00368-8>, 2022.
- Lobell, D., Sibley, A., and Ortiz-Monasterio, J. I.: Extreme heat effects on wheat senescence in India, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 2, 186-189, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1356>, 2012.
- Lascano, R. J. and Baumhardt, R. L.: Effects of crop residue on soil and plant water evaporation in a dryland cotton system, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 54, 69-84, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00863560>, 1996.
- 815 Luysaert, S., Jammet, M., Stoy, P., et al.: Land management and land-cover change have impacts of similar magnitude on surface temperature, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 4, 389-393, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2196>, 2014.
- Lin, X. W., et al.: Estimating 10-m land surface albedo from Sentinel-2 satellite observations using a direct estimation approach with Google Earth Engine, *ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.*, 194, 1-20, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2022.09.016>, 2023.
- 820 Li, S.-X., Wang, Z.-H., Malhi, S. S., Li, S.-Q., Gao, Y.-J., and Tian, X.-H.: Nutrient and water management effects on crop production, and nutrient and water use efficiency in dryland areas of China, *Adv. Agron.*, 102, 223–265, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(09\)01007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(09)01007-4), 2009.
- Lei, C., Chen, J., Ibáñez, I., Sciusco, P., Shirkey, G., Lei, M., Reich, P., and Robertson, G. P.: Albedo of crops as a nature-based climate solution to global warming, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 19, 084032, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad5fa2>, 2024.
- 825 McDermid, S. S., Montes, C., Cook, B. I., Puma, M. J., and Kiang, N. Y.: The sensitivity of land-atmosphere coupling to modern agriculture in the Northern Midlatitudes, *J. Clim.*, 32, 465-484, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0799.1>, 2019.
- Meier, R., Davin, E. L., Bonan, G. B., et al.: Impacts of a revised surface roughness parameterization in the Community Land Model 5.1, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 15, 2365–2393, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-2365-2022>, 2022.
- McDermid, S. S., Mearns, L. O., and Ruane, A. C.: Representing agriculture in Earth System Models: Approaches and priorities for development, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 9, 2230-2265, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016MS000749>, 2017.
- 830 Myhre, G., Samset, B. H., Hodnebrog, Ø., et al.: Sensible heat has significantly affected the global hydrological cycle over the historical period, *Nat. Commun.*, 9, 1922, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04307-4>, 2018.
- Myneni, R., Knyazikhin, Y., and Park, T.: MCD15A3H MODIS/Terra+Aqua Leaf Area Index/FPAR 4-day L4 Global 500m SIN Grid V006, NASA EOSDIS Land Processes DAAC, <https://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MCD15A3H.006>, 2015.
- 835 MacBean, N., Scott, R. L., Biederman, J. A., Ottlé, C., Vuichard, N., Ducharne, A., Kolb, T., Dore, S., Litvak, M., and Moore, D. J. P.: Testing water fluxes and storage from two hydrology configurations within the ORCHIDEE land surface model across US semi-arid sites, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 24, 5203-5230, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-5203-2020>, 2020.

- Mitchell, J. P., Singh, P. N., Wallender, W. W., Munk, D. S., Wroble, J. F., Horwath, W. R., and Scow, K. M.: No-tillage and high-residue practices reduce soil water evaporation, *California Agriculture*, 66 (2),
840 <https://doi.org/10.3733/ca.v066n02p55>, 2012.
- Piccoli, I., Sartori, F., Polese, R., and Berti, A.: Carbon dynamics after five decades of different crop residue management in temperate climate, *EGUsphere* [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-1497>, 2023.
- Pastorello, G., Trotta, C., Canfora, E., et al.: The FLUXNET2015 dataset and the ONEFlux processing pipeline for eddy covariance data, *Sci. Data*, 7, 225, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0534-3>, 2020.
- 845 Pique, G., Carrer, D., Lugato, E., Fieuzal, R., Garisoain, R., and Ceschia, E.: About the assessment of cover crop albedo potential cooling effect: risk of the darkening feedback loop effects, *Remote Sens.*, 15, 3231, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15133231>, 2023.
- Pietikäinen, J., Pettersson, M., and Bååth, E.: Comparison of temperature effects on soil respiration and bacterial and fungal growth rates, *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.*, 52, 49-58, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsec.2004.10.002>, 2005.
- 850 Ramos, T. B., Darouich, H., and Pereira, L. S.: Mulching effects on soil evaporation, crop evapotranspiration and crop coefficients: a review aimed at improved irrigation management, *Irrig. Sci.*, 42, 525-539, <https://doi-org.insu.bib.cnrs.fr/10.1007/s00271-024-00924-8>, 2024.
- Richards, L. A.: Capillary conduction of liquids through porous mediums, *Physics*, 1, 318-333, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1745010>, 1931.
- 855 Raes, D., Steduto, P., Hsiao, T. C., and Fereres, E.: AquaCrop reference manual: Chapter 2 – Calculation procedures (Version 7.0), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, <http://www.fao.org/aquacrop>, 2022.
- Seneviratne, S. I., et al.: Investigating soil moisture–climate interactions in a changing climate: A review, *Earth-Sci. Rev.*, 99, 125-161, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2010.02.004>, 2010.
- Singh, R., Serawat, M., Singh, A., and Babli, A.: Effect of tillage and crop residue management on soil physical properties, *J.*
860 *Soil. Salin. Water Qual.*, 10, 200-206, 2018.
- Simão, L. M., Easterly, A. C., Kruger, G. R., and Creech, C. F.: Winter wheat residue impact on soil water storage and subsequent corn yield, *Agron. J.*, 113, 276-286, <https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20459>, 2021.
- Stephens, G. L., O'Brien, D., Webster, P. J., et al.: The albedo of Earth, *Rev. Geophys.*, 53, 141-163, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014RG000449>, 2015.
- 865 Swain, D. L., Prein, A. F., Abatzoglou, J. T., et al.: Hydroclimate volatility on a warming Earth, *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, 6, 35-50, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-024-00624-z>, 2025.
- Sieber, P., Böhme, S., Ericsson, N., and Hansson, P.-A.: Albedo on cropland: Field-scale effects of current agricultural practices in Northern Europe, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 321, 108978, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2022.108978>, 2022.
- Schmidt, M., Becker, N., Dolfus, D., Esser, O., Graf, A., Kettler, M., and Kummer, S.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Selhausen
870 Juelich, 2022-12-31–2023-09-30, ICOS RI, <https://doi.org/10.18160/xpWUVHGaByDhVAM-dlOlBO2o>, 2023.

- Şerban, G., Cotfas, D. T., and Cotfas, P. A.: Significant differences in crop albedo among Romanian winter wheat cultivars, *Romanian Agric. Res.*, 28, 1-7, 2011.
- Su, Y., Lauerwald, R., Makowski, D., Viovy, N., Guilpart, N., Zhu, P., Gabrielle, B., & Ciais, P. Future warming increases the chance of success of maize-wheat double cropping in Europe. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 170, 127723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2025.127723>, 2025.
- 875 Swella, G. B., Ward, P. R., Siddique, K. H. M., and Flower, K. C.: Combinations of tall standing and horizontal residue affect soil water dynamics in rainfed conservation agriculture systems, *Soil and Tillage Research*, 147, 30-38, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2014.11.004>, 2015.
- Timlin, D., Paff, K., and Han, E.: The role of crop simulation modeling in assessing potential climate change impacts, *Agrosyst. Geosci. Environ.*, 7, e20453, <https://doi.org/10.1002/agg2.20453>, 2024.
- 880 Tommasi, P., Moors, E. J., Jans, W., Elbers, J., Ceschia, E., Tallec, T., Bernhofer, C., Grünwald, T., Moureaux, C., Manise, T., Ligne, A., Cellier, P., Loubet, B., Larmanou, E., and Ripoche, D.: ORCHIDEE-CROP (v0), a new process-based agro-land surface model: model description and evaluation over Europe, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9, 857-873, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-857-2016>, 2016.
- 885 Tallec, T., Ceschia, E., Granouillac, F., Claverie, N., Zawilski, B., Brut, A., Lemaire, B., and Gibrin, H.: ETC L2 ARCHIVE, Aurade, 2018-12-31-2022-12-31, ICOS RI, <https://doi.org/10.18160/HTw1RNIVsnlRmfW07QHieuLj>, 2023.
- Thapa, R., Tully, K. L., Cabrera, M., Dann, C., Schomberg, H. H., Timlin, D., Gaskin, J., Reberg-Horton, C., and Mirsky, S. B.: Cover crop residue moisture content controls diurnal variations in surface residue decomposition, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 308-309, 108537, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108537>, 2021.
- 890 Unger, P. W. and Parker, J. J.: Residue placement effects on decomposition, evaporation, and soil moisture distribution, *Agron. J.*, 60, 469-472, <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1968.00021962006000050008x>, 1968.
- Vuichard, N., and Papale, D.: Filling the gaps in meteorological continuous data measured at FLUXNET sites with ERA-Interim reanalysis, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 7, 157-171, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-7-157-2015>, 2015.
- Wankmüller, F. J. P., Delval, L., Lehmann, P., et al.: Global influence of soil texture on ecosystem water limitation, *Nature*, 895 635, 631-638, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08089-2>, 2024.
- Winckler, J., Reick, C. H., Bright, R. M., and Pongratz, J.: Importance of surface roughness for the local biogeophysical effects of deforestation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 124, 8605-8618, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD030127>, 2019.
- Webber, H., Ewert, F., Olesen, J. E., et al.: Diverging importance of drought stress for maize and winter wheat in Europe, *Nat. Commun.*, 9, 4249, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06525-2>, 2018.
- 900 Wright, S.: Correlation and causation, *J. Agric. Res.*, 20, 557-585, 1921.
- Wu, X., Vuichard, N., Ciais, P., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Wang, X., Magliulo, V., Wattenbach, M., Vitale, L., Di Tommasi, P., Moors, J., Jans, W., Elbers, J., Ceschia, E., Tallec, T., Bernhofer, C., Grünwald, T., Moureaux, C., Manise, T., Ligne, A., Cellier, P., Loubet, B., Larmanou, E. and Ripoche D.: ORCHIDEE-CROP (v0), a new process-based agro-land

- surface model: model description and evaluation over Europe, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 9, 857-873, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-857-2016>, 2016.
- Yu, K., Su, Y., Ciais, P., Lauerwald, R., Ceschia, E., Makowski, D., Xu, Y., Abbessi, E., Bazzi, H., and Tallec, T.: Quantifying albedo impact and radiative forcing of management practices in European wheat cropping systems, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 19, 074042, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad6929>, 2024.
- Yu, K.: Datasets and processing codes for the work<Resolving effects of leaf pigmentation changes and plant residue on the energy balance of winter wheat cultivation in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model> Zenodo [Data set], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15234443>, 2025.
- Yu, K.: S2 bare soil albedo in European cropland regions used for "Resolving effects of leaf pigmentation changes and plant residue on the energy balance of winter wheat cultivation in the ORCHIDEE-CROP model" Zenodo [Data set], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15271053>, 2025
- Zhang, Y. H., Yang, Y. B., Chen, C. L., Zhang, K. T., Jiang, H. Y., Cao, W. X., and Yan, Z. H.: Modeling leaf color dynamics of winter wheat in relation to growth stages and nitrogen rates, *J. Integr. Agric.*, 21, 60-69, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(20\)63319-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(20)63319-6), 2022.
- Zhang, X., Jiao, Z., Zhao, C., et al.: Review of land surface albedo: variance characteristics, climate effect and management strategy, *Remote Sens.*, 14, 1382, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14061382>, 2022.
- Zhang, Y., Narayanappa, D., Ciais, P., Li, W., Goll, D., Vuichard, N., De Kauwe, M. G., Li, L., and Maignan, F.: Evaluating the vegetation–atmosphere coupling strength of ORCHIDEE land surface model (v7266), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 15, 9111-9125, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-9111-2022>, 2022.
- Zhao, Y., Mao, X., and Shukla, M. K.: A modified SWAP model for soil water and heat dynamics and seed–maize growth under film mulching, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 292-293, 108127, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.108127>, 2020.