

Improving photosynthate allocation dynamic simulations of crops under water stress conditions

Wei Xu^{a,b}, Wen Zhang^a, Yongqiang Yu^a, Qing Zhang^{a,*}

^a Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China

^b Meteorological Service Center for the Core Areas of the Capital, Beijing Meteorological Service, Beijing 100029, China

Email address: zhangqing@mail.iap.ac.cn

删除[authors]: ^b College of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

Abstract

Accurately simulating crop photosynthate allocation under water stress is critical for predicting both food security and ecosystem carbon inputs. Current crop models often rely on static or growth-stage-fixed allocation coefficients, which limits their ability to capture the physiological plasticity of crops responding to fluctuating environmental conditions. This study develops a water-driven, stage-dependent carbon allocation scheme within the Agro-C model to better represent crop responses to soil moisture variability. The scheme dynamically adjusts photosynthate allocation coefficients for roots (PR) and leaves (PL), integrates the yellow-to-green leaf ratio (YGR), and incorporates a water stress-induced leaf senescence module. By coupling carbon allocation to both soil moisture and crop development, the approach improves the representation of physiologically regulated allocation processes and enhances the realism of crop simulations. Model evaluation using extensive observation datasets for maize and wheat demonstrates substantial improvements in simulation accuracy, with R^2 values reaching 0.77–0.95 for aboveground biomass (AGB) and 0.62–0.83 for belowground biomass (BGB). These results underscore the importance of dynamically representing carbon allocation under water stress and offer an improved framework for simulating carbon–water interactions in agroecosystems.

删除[authors]: sequestration (SOC

删除[authors]:).

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: linking

Key words: Crop model, Water stress, Irrigation, photosynthate allocation

删除[authors]: <sp>

1. Introduction

The intensification of climate change and increasing pressure on freshwater resources have led to more frequent and severe drought events worldwide (Boretti & Rosa, 2019; Lesk et al., 2016; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2022). Water availability is a key factor regulating crop growth and productivity, as sufficient water promotes biomass accumulation and yield, whereas water deficit can cause substantial reductions (Zlatev & Lidon, 2012). In addition to its direct effects on crop growth, water stress fundamentally alters the allocation of assimilated carbon among plant organs, thereby influencing both plant development and soil carbon inputs.

Maize (*Zea mays L.*) and wheat (*Triticum spp.*), as major global staple crops, are highly sensitive to water availability (Hu et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2025). Water availability strongly influences crop growth by regulating photosynthesis, biomass production, and carbon allocation among plant organs. Under moderate drought, crops often allocate more carbon to roots, thereby promoting root growth and improving water use efficiency (Chen et al., 2019; Oktem, 2008). However, severe water deficit suppresses carbon assimilation, reduces both aboveground and belowground biomass, and ultimately limits yield formation (Khatun et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021). Crop responses also vary with developmental stage, and species. For example, wheat generally exhibits enhanced root allocation under mild drought but inhibited root development under severe water stress (Wang et al., 2024; Xue et al., 2003). whereas excessive water conditions, such as waterlogging, impair root function and disrupt carbon allocation (Manghwar et al., 2024). Although recent studies have quantified relationships between water availability and biomass allocation (Xu et al., 2025), incorporating these dynamic responses into crop models remains a major challenge.

Photosynthate allocation is a key process linking carbon assimilation to vegetation growth in terrestrial ecosystem models, whereas it is typically represented using empirical, fixed, or stage-based allocation schemes (Hijmans et al., 1994; Wolf et al., 2003). In the Agricultural Production Systems sIMulator (APSIM), photosynthate allocation among organs is regulated by developmental stage, with

删除[authors]: Beyond
删除[authors]: Under drought conditions, crops dynamically adjust
删除[authors]: to optimize resource acquisition. Moderate water deficit may promote
删除[authors]: enhance
删除[authors]: by increasing carbon allocation belowground
删除[authors]:), whereas
删除[authors]: drought
删除[authors]: and
删除[authors]: limiting
删除[authors]: In wheat, drought
删除[authors]: are
删除[authors]: -dependent, with increased
删除[authors]: stress
删除[authors]: deficit
删除[authors]:). In contrast,
删除[authors]: can
删除[authors]: patterns
删除[authors]: partitioning
删除[authors]: yet
删除[authors]: partitioning
删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning
删除[authors]: <sp>

carbon allocated to leaves during the early vegetative growth stage and progressively shifted to stems, reproductive organs, and grains (Keating et al., 2003). In the Carnegie–Ames–Stanford Approach model (CASA) (Field et al., 1995) and the Denitrification-Decomposition (DNDC) model (Li et al., 2011), biomass allocation is largely based on fixed parameters, with the root to shoot ratio (RSR) varying only by vegetation type. In ecosystems, photosynthate allocation is a highly flexible process that responds to changing resource availability, particularly soil moisture conditions, and plays a critical role in regulating both plant growth and soil carbon input. Therefore, developing a mechanistic representation of photosynthate allocation that explicitly accounts for environmental controls is essential for improving model accuracy and physiological realism (Hu et al., 2023).

删除[authors]: The

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: In reality, assimilate partitioning

Moreover, the impacts of water deficit on crops involve multiple aspects of plant growth and development, and it remains challenging to quantitatively and precisely describe water stress in crop models. Most crop models use a water stress coefficient (K_s) based on supply–demand balance to adjust assimilate allocation and estimate biomass under stress (Saseendran et al., 2014). For instance, in the APSIM (McCown et al., 1996), CropSyst (Stöckle et al., 1994), and Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT) (Jones et al., 2003), the water stress factor is defined as $K_s = 1 - AT / PT$, where AT is the actual daily water uptake and PT is the potential transpiration. When soil water supply is insufficient to meet the crop's transpiration or evapotranspiration demand, the plant experiences water stress.

删除[authors]: coefficient

However, in contrast, crop water supply primarily depends on root water uptake from the soil (Steudle, 2000). Water transport within the plant is driven by the water potential gradient along the soil–plant–atmosphere continuum, which sustains plant water status and transpiration. Root water uptake is controlled not only by the water potential gradient between soil and roots, but also by root hydraulic conductivity. Thus, plant water uptake capacity is jointly determined by these two factors (Wang et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2023). In addition, root system architecture, root length density, and the spatial distribution of soil moisture further influence the

删除[authors]: reality

删除[authors]: governed

删除[authors]: above

删除[authors]: <sp>

86 efficiency of water acquisition, thereby regulating plant water status and its response
87 to water stress (Javaux et al., 2008). Hence, incorporating root water uptake processes
88 provides a more physiologically meaningful basis for representing water stress in crop
89 models.

90 Therefore, to better represent crop responses to water stress, this study optimizes
91 the Agro-C model—a biogeophysical framework for simulating crop growth and SOC
92 dynamics (Huang et al., 2009; Yu et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2017).
93 Specifically, the optimized model incorporates a process-based root water uptake
94 module to quantify crop water status and introduces a moisture-driven dynamic
95 photosynthate allocation scheme that adjusts carbon allocation according to crop
96 developmental stage and water deficit. Focusing on maize and wheat as representative
97 C4 and C3 crops, we aim to: (1) quantify the non-linear responses of leaf and root
98 allocation coefficients (PL and PR) to soil water availability while incorporating a
99 drought-induced leaf senescence module (YGR) to represent declines in
100 photosynthetic capacity; (2) improve the water module of the Agro-C model by
101 integrating root water uptake characteristics, allowing water stress to be represented
102 based on crop physiological responses; and (3) validate the model’s performance in
103 capturing carbon trade-offs under extreme water regimes.

104 2. Methods and materials

105 2.1 Data Sources

106 Based on the datasets used for the meta-analysis by Xu et al. (2025), we further
107 screened studies for model calibration and validation by the following criteria: (i) the
108 study must report belowground biomass (BGB) or aboveground biomass (AGB) for
109 one or more crop growth stages; (ii) the study must provide irrigation amounts or soil
110 moisture conditions throughout the crop growth period; (iii) the study must report
111 fertilizer inputs during the cropping period; and (iv) background and ancillary
112 information such as geographic coordinates, altitude, planting area, planting density,
113 soil type, and bulk density must be described. Meteorological data for the crop

删除[authors]: address current limitations in modeling

删除[authors]: varying

删除[authors]: availability

删除[authors]: we replace its conventional stage-dependent partitioning strategy with

删除[authors]: newly developed,

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: Up

删除[authors]: <sp>

growing period were obtained from *ERA5* (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/>).

We collected 608 observations of AGB and BGB (315 for maize and 293 for wheat) from 21 published studies, including 198 at maturity and 411 at earlier developmental stages. In 12 studies (maize: 214, wheat: 164), AGB and BGB were recorded at multiple key growth stages, and these data were used for model calibration. In contrast, 9 studies (maize: 101, wheat: 129) reported AGB and BGB only at maturity or vegetative stages, and these data were used for model validation. The geographic distribution of the dataset is shown in Fig. S1.

2.2 Simulations of the crop growth responses to the budgets of soil water conditions in the Agro-C model

In Agro-C model, Huang et al. (2009) simulated soil water content based on the principle of soil water balance, using precipitation and actual evapotranspiration at the canopy level. The effects of soil water on photosynthesis were represented as follows:

$$E_{w(i)} = \begin{cases} 0 & W_{(i)} \leq W_p \\ \frac{W_{(i)} - W_p}{W_l - W_p} & W_p < W_{(i)} < W_l \\ 1 & W_l < W_{(i)} \leq W_{upper} \\ 0.5 \times (1 + \frac{W_{(i)} - 1}{W_{upper} - 1}) & W_{(i)} \geq W_{upper} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where W_p represents the soil water content at the wilting point ($\text{cm}^3 \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$), while W_l and W_{upper} denote the lower and upper limits of optimal soil water content ($\text{cm}^3 \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$), respectively. The calculations of W_p , W_l , and W_{upper} were calculated following the original Agro-C model described by Huang et al. (2009) using the site-specific soil properties as model inputs. $W_{(i)}$ is the daily mean soil water content in the 0–40 cm layer ($\text{cm}^3 \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}$). The daily soil moisture $W_{(i)}$ is calculated by balancing precipitation and actual evapotranspiration, as expressed in the following equation:

$$W_{(i)} = W_{(i-1)} + \frac{PRE_{(i)} - EA_{(i)}}{h} \quad (2)$$

$PRE_{(i)}$ and $EA_{(i)}$ represent daily precipitation (mm) and evapotranspiration (mm), respectively, while h denotes soil depth (mm). We assumed that precipitation is

删除[authors]: Totally we

删除[authors]: and

删除[authors]: (1)

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: cm^{-3}

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: W_u

删除[authors]: cm^{-3}

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: cm^{-3}

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: $\langle \text{math} \rangle$

删除[authors]: PRE_i

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: EA_i

删除[authors]: $\langle \text{sp} \rangle$

retained within the 0–40 cm soil layer, neglecting runoff and vertical percolation. Evapotranspiration was determined jointly by the leaf area index (LAI) and potential evapotranspiration (ET_0) (Ritchie, 1998). ET_0 was calculated using the Priestley–Taylor equation (Priestley and Taylor, 1972).

In simulating vegetation photosynthesis, the Agro-C model does not account for water stress. Instead, the model determines whether irrigation is required by calculating the difference between soil water content (SWC) and the thresholds defined by the wilting point (W_p) and field capacity (FC).

$$W_{diff} = W_{(i)} - ((W_{FC} - W_p) \times 0.5 + W_p) \quad (3)$$

where W_{FC} represents the field capacity ($cm^3 \cdot cm^{-3}$). When $W_{diff} < 0$, the crop is considered to require irrigation. The irrigation method is defined as follows:

$$W_{(i)} = \frac{(W_{(i)} + 100)}{h} \quad (4)$$

2.3 Modelling adjustments of the water dynamics and the responsive crop photosynthate allocation

The pre-optimized Agro-C model did not explicitly account for actual irrigation inputs. To represent field irrigation practices, the optimized water module incorporates the daily irrigation amount ($W_{Irr,(i)}$) during the crop growing season as a model input. Soil moisture ($W_{(i)}$) is subsequently calculated using the recorded precipitation and irrigation data for each study site, together with the crop water supply and water demand.

$$W_{(i)} = \begin{cases} W_{(i-1)} + \frac{PRE_{(i)} + W_{Irr,(i)} - ET_{c,(i)}}{h} & \Delta W_{(i)} \leq 0 \\ W_{(i-1)} + \frac{PRE_{(i)} + W_{Irr,(i)} - W_{u,(i)}}{h} & \Delta W_{(i)} > 0 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta W_{(i)}$ (mm) is the difference between the daily crop water requirement ($ET_{c,(i)}$, mm) and the actual daily water uptake ($W_{u,(i)}$, mm).

$$\Delta W_{(i)} = ET_{c,(i)} - W_{u,(i)} \quad (6)$$

When $\Delta W_{(i)} > 0$, drought stress exists; when $\Delta W_{(i)} < 0$, the crops require sufficient

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

删除[authors]:).

删除[authors]: <math> \quad (3)

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

删除[authors]: cm^3

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

删除[authors]: <math>

删除[authors]: assimilates partitioning

删除[authors]: In the optimized Agro-C model, crop wate ...

设置格式[authors]: 缩进: 首行缩进: 0 字符

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

删除[authors]: -

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, ...

删除[authors]: 5

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: 非倾斜

删除[authors]: <sp>

water.

$ET_{c(i)}$ is calculated based on crop evapotranspiration and crop coefficient (K_c):

$$ET_{c(i)} = K_c \times ET_0 \tag{7}$$

The K_c values at different growth stages were derived from *FAO-56* (Allen et al., 2005).

Roots are the primary organs for water and nutrient acquisition. The root water uptake $W_{u(i)}$ (mm) is driven by the water potential gradient between the soil and the root xylem, and regulated by the daily root hydraulic conductivity ($C_{r(i)}$, MPa⁻¹) of that layer (Hafner et al., 2020).

$$W_{u(i)} = \Delta \Psi_{(i)} \times C_{r(i)} \tag{8}$$

The root-soil water potential difference $\Delta \Psi_{(i)}$ is primarily determined by the soil water potential $\Psi_{s(i)}$ (MPa), as root water potential $\Psi_{r(i)}$ (MPa) within a relatively stable range through osmoregulation (Dodd et al., 2010). The $\Psi_{r(i)}$ can be treated as an empirical constant derived from literature (Munns and Tester, 2008; Novák et al., 2005). The $\Psi_{s(i)}$ can be calculated using the van Genuchten water retention function (van Genuchten, 1980).

$$\Psi_{s(i)} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[\left(\frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{W_{(i)} - \theta_r} \right)^{1/m} - 1 \right]^{1/n}, \quad m = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \tag{9}$$

where θ_s denotes the saturated soil moisture content (cm³ cm⁻³), θ_r denotes the residual soil moisture content (cm³ cm⁻³). The α and n represent the empirical parameters of van Genuchten related to soil texture. These parameters were derived according to the parameterization scheme of the original Agro-C model (Huang et al., 2009).

$$\Delta \Psi_i = (\Psi_{s(i)} - \Psi_{r(i)}) \tag{10}$$

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

删除[authors]:) :

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

删除[authors]: (6

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

删除[authors]: rate per unit volume of soil

删除[authors]: m³·m⁻³·s⁻¹

删除[authors]: of that layer

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾斜

删除[authors]: s⁻¹·

删除[authors]: <math> \tag{7}

删除[authors]: <math>

删除[authors]: dynamics of $($

设置格式[authors]: 字体颜色: 背景 2

删除[authors]: plants tend to maintain <math>

删除[authors]: For model simplification under well-watered conditions, <math>

删除[authors]: <math> \tag{8}

删除[authors]: <sp>

186 The root hydraulic conductivity ($C_{r(i)}$) represents the water flux from a unit
187 volume of soil per unit water potential gradient. It is calculated as the product of the
188 total root surface area in that soil volume and the intrinsic hydraulic conductance per
189 unit root surface area (Lp_r , $m \cdot d^{-1} \cdot Mpa^{-1}$).

190
$$C_{r(i)} = (M_{r(i-1)} \times S_r) \times Lp_r \quad (11)$$

191 where $M_{r(i-1)}$ is the root dry mass per unit soil volume ($g \cdot m^{-3}$), S_r is the specific root
192 surface area ($m^2 \cdot g^{-1}$). To avoid circular dependency and ensure numerical stability,
193 $W_{u(i)}$ was calculated using root biomass from the previous time step. The term ($M_{r(i-1)}$
194 $\times S_r$) thus gives the root surface area density. Values of Lp_r for maize (Steudle, 2000;
195 Cai et al., 2022; Rishmawi et al., 2023; Protto et al., 2024) and wheat (Cai et al., 2022;
196 Yang et al., 2023) at different developmental stages were obtained from the literature.

197 2.4 Calibration of photosynthate allocation coefficients in the Agro-C model

198 In the Agro-C model, the crop development index (DVI) is defined as 0 at
199 emergence, 1 at heading for wheat or silking for maize, and 2 at maturity. The DVI is
200 divided into 21 intervals at increments of 0.1. Within each interval, the proportion of
201 assimilates allocated to leaves (PL) and roots (PR) is fixed (Huang et al., 2009), while
202 the proportion allocated to stems is calculated as $1 - (PL + PR)$. During the vegetative
203 growth stage, the allocation of dry matter to roots and leaves decreases with
204 development, whereas during the reproductive stage, all assimilates are allocated
205 exclusively to grains (Table S1).

206 Jiang et al. (2018) demonstrated that under water stress, the photosynthate
207 allocation ratios to roots, stems, and leaves all vary with water availability. Therefore,
208 in the Agro-C model, the pre-optimized allocation ratios for leaves and roots need to
209 be appropriately adjusted ($\Delta PL_{(i)}$ and $\Delta PR_{(i)}$) to enable the model to capture assimilate
210 allocation mechanisms under different water conditions. The calibrated allocation
211 coefficients for leaves and roots ($PL_{N(i)}$ and $PR_{N(i)}$) are thus obtained by adding the
212 adjustment terms to the pre-optimized coefficients ($PL_{O(i)}$ and $PR_{O(i)}$).

213
$$PL_{N(i)} = PL_{O(i)} + \Delta PL_{(i)} \quad (12)$$

删除[authors]: s

删除[authors]:

删除[authors]: <math> \quad (9)

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]:)

删除[authors]: root water uptake (<math>)

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]:)

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman
Regular, 非倾斜

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman, 非倾
斜

删除[authors]: partitioning

设置格式[authors]: 字体颜色: 自动设置, 字距调整: 1 磅

删除[authors]: -

设置格式[authors]: 非上标/ 下标, (复杂文种)阿拉伯语(沙
特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

设置格式[authors]: 非上标/ 下标, (复杂文种)阿拉伯语(沙
特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: 10

删除[authors]: <sp>

214
$$PR_{N(i)} = PR_{O(i)} + \Delta PR_{(i)} \quad (13)$$

设置格式[authors]: 非上标/ 下标, (复杂文种)阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

215 In the initial stage of model calibration, before clarifying the relationships of
 216 $\Delta PL_{(i)}$ and $\Delta PR_{(i)}$ with water availability, constant values of $\Delta PL_{(i)}$ and $\Delta PR_{(i)}$ were
 217 preliminarily assigned. The feasibility of these values was then evaluated by
 218 comparing the simulated aboveground and belowground biomass (Sim_AGB,
 219 Sim_BGB) with the observed values (Obs_AGB, Obs_BGB). If both ratios
 220 Sim_AGB / Obs_AGB and Sim_BGB / Obs_BGB exceeded 80%, the assigned $\Delta PL_{(i)}$
 221 and $\Delta PR_{(i)}$ were considered acceptable (Fig. 1).

删除[authors]: (11

222 After the initial calibration of the model, correlation equations between $\Delta PL_{(i)}$,
 223 $\Delta PR_{(i)}$, and $\Delta W_{(i)}$ were developed. These equations were then used to replace the
 224 initially assigned constant values, thereby providing a more accurate and explicit
 225 representation of the changes in photosynthate allocation coefficients under soil water
 226 stress.

删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning

227 Drought stress accelerates leaf senescence, abscission, and mortality, thereby
 228 altering the yellow-to-green leaf ratio (YGR) (Seleiman et al., 2021). In addition to
 229 calibrating the photosynthate allocation coefficients, we also adjusted the YGR
 230 parameter in the pre-optimized Agro-C model. Specifically, correlation equations
 231 between the increment of the yellow-to-green leaf ratio ($\Delta YGR_{(i)}$) and $\Delta W_{(i)}$ were
 232 developed to represent the calibrated YGR ($YGR_{N(i)}$) under dynamically varying soil
 233 water conditions.

删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning

234
$$YGR_{N(i)} = YGR_{O(i)} + \Delta YGR_{(i)} \quad (14)$$

设置格式[authors]: 非上标/ 下标, (复杂文种)阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

235 where $YGR_{O(i)}$ represents the yellow-to-green leaf ratio in the pre-optimized Agro-C
 236 model.

删除[authors]: (12

237 To simplify the model, we further incorporated the DVI as an additional
 238 independent variable in the above equations, thereby accounting for the combined
 239 effects of water availability and crop developmental stage on photosynthate
 240 allocation.

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Italic

删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning

删除[authors]: <sp>




Fig. 1 Flowchart of Agro-C model parameter optimization


2.5 Data input and model evaluation

The input variables included: meteorological data (solar radiation, sunshine duration, daily maximum and minimum temperature, and precipitation); soil data (bulk density, sand and clay content, and total nitrogen content); phenological data (for wheat: emergence, heading, and maturity; for maize: emergence, tasseling, and maturity); and management practices (irrigation amount, fertilizer N application rate, and timing of application).

If irrigation amounts ($W_{irr(i)}$) were recorded at the experimental sites for each crop growth stage, the values were directly input according to the recorded dates. If no specific irrigation amounts were available but the relative available soil water (RAW) during the growing season was recorded, the given RAW was used as the upper threshold (W_t) to estimate irrigation. Irrigation was triggered when the model-simulated RAW dropped 10% below the site-defined threshold. The soil relative water content used in the model was calculated as follows:

$$RAW = \frac{W(i) - W_P}{W_{FC} - W_P} \times 100\% \quad (15)$$

where $W(i)$ is the actual soil water content (v/v), W_P is the crop wilting point (v/v), and



删除[authors]:

删除[authors]:)

删除[authors]: $\quad (13)$

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Italic, 倾斜

删除[authors]: <sp>

W_{FC} is the field capacity of the soil (v/v).

Irrigation amount was calculated as follows (Ge et al., 2012):

$$W_{irr(i)} = (W_t - W_{(i)}) \times \rho \times h \times 0.1 \tag{16}$$

where W_t is the target upper limit of soil water content (v/v), ρ is the soil bulk density (g cm⁻³), and h is the thickness of the soil layer considered (cm).

We used the coefficient of determination (R²) and the root mean squared error (RMSE) as evaluation metrics to assess prediction accuracy, which are defined as follows:

$$R^2 = \frac{\sum_i (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \tag{17}$$

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{n}} \tag{18}$$

where n is the number of test samples, y_i is the i observed value, $\bar{y}$ is the mean of all observed values, $\hat{y}_i$ is the i simulated value.

3. Results

3.1 Optimization equations for photosynthate coefficients in response to soil moisture variation

3.1.1 Parameter optimization equations

To facilitate computation and maintain a balance between physiological resolution and numerical stability, the DVI was divided into 0.2 intervals, each representing a distinct growth stage relevant to crop development. To better capture the intra-stage variation of allocation coefficients, DVI itself was also included as an independent variable in the equations (Tables 1 and 2). The equations in Tables 1 and 2 are empirical parameterization functions describing the responses of ΔPR, ΔPL, and ΔYGR to water deficit (ΔW) at different DVI stages. The appropriate equation should be selected according to the crop type, DVI interval, and ΔW value during model

设置格式[authors]: 缩进: 首行缩进: 2 字符

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Italic, 倾斜

删除[authors]: = (W_u

删除[authors]: 14

删除[authors]: W_u

删除[authors]: $\tag{15}$
$\tag{16}$

删除[authors]: <math>

删除[authors]: <math>

删除[authors]: <math>

删除[authors]: simulate

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: <sp>

282 simulation.

283 Consistent with the pre-optimized allocation scheme of the model, we assumed
284 that no leaf senescence occurred during the early vegetative stage ($DVI < 0.6$ for
285 maize, $DVI < 0.8$ for wheat), with $YGR_N = 0$; and during the late reproductive stage
286 ($DVI > 1.4$), assimilates were allocated only to grains, with the leaf allocation
287 coefficient set to zero. In the pre-optimized Agro-C model, assimilate allocation to
288 roots (PR_N) was also assumed to cease once the crop entered the reproductive stage
289 under sufficient water supply. However, our previous study (Xu et al., 2025) indicated
290 that under water stress, assimilates may continue to be allocated to roots during the
291 reproductive phase to facilitate water uptake and sustain growth. In addition, during
292 the grain-filling to maturity stages ($DVI=1.4-2.0$), crops gradually enter physiological
293 senescence, and fine roots undergo necrosis and shedding, leading to reduced root dry
294 matter accumulation. Therefore, we further refined the root allocation scheme during
295 the reproductive stage, building upon the pre-optimized framework.

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: root systems—particularly

删除[authors]: —

删除[authors]: accumulation of

删除[authors]: .

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]:

设置格式[authors]: 两端对齐, 缩进: 首行缩进: 2 字符, 段落间距段前: 6 磅, 段后: 6 磅, 行距: 1.5 倍行距, 无孤行控制

删除[authors]: <sp>

Table 1 Wheat increments of Root (ΔPR) and Leaf (ΔPL) Allocation Coefficients, Yellow-to-Green Leaf Ratio (ΔYGR), and Water Balance Difference (ΔW_g) Equation

$a + b \times \Delta W_{(g)} + c \times DVI + d \times \Delta W_{(g)}^2 + e \times \Delta W_{(g)} \times DVI + f \times DVI^2$										
DVI		a	b	c	d	e	f	R ²	n	Range
(0.0, 0.2]	ΔPR	0.16	-0.29	-0.51	-0.13	1.47	1.40	0.06		[-0.1, 0.05]
	ΔPL	-0.56	3.32	6.83	1.72	-19.62	-17.95	0.13	438	[0.05, 0.15]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.2, 0.4]	ΔPR	0.98	-0.62	-4.80	0.27	1.76	5.24	0.57	2150	[-0.2, 0.1]
	ΔPL	-8.73	-2.84	50.93	0.81	8.29	-72.50	0.20		[-0.1, 0.29]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.4, 0.6]	ΔPR	0.20	0.12	-1.92	-0.02	-0.17	2.24	0.18		[-0.26, 0.1]
	ΔPL	-1.99	-1.43	7.92	0.01	2.32	-7.10	0.10	2567	[-0.16, 0.39]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.6, 0.8]	ΔPR	0.21	-0.11	-1.16	0.02	0.10	1.08	0.47		[-0.1, 0.0]
	ΔPL	-2.35	-0.51	9.15	0.14	0.71	-8.33	0.16	655	[-0.15, 0.35]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.8, 1.0]	ΔPR	-0.03	0.01	-0.49	0.00	-0.01	0.58	0.49		[-0.12, 0.15]
	ΔPL	-5.28	0.37	11.31	0.05	-0.64	-5.64	0.07	439	[-0.17, 0.46]
	ΔYGR	-0.57	-0.28	0.84	0.01	0.32	-0.72	0.05		[-0.43, 0.25]
(1.0, 1.2]	ΔPR	3.98	0.79	-7.82	0.00	-0.66	3.77	0.24		[-0.06, 0.06]
	ΔPL	-27.75	-1.10	54.01	0.07	0.95	-26.12	0.14	388	[0.0,0.36]
	ΔYGR	-21.40	-0.95	45.10	-0.06	0.92	-23.86	0.52		[-1.8, 0.4]
(1.2, 1.4]	ΔPR	-4.72	-0.01	7.46	-0.04	0.06	-2.97	0.14		[-0.1, 0.05]
	ΔPL	1.40	0.42	-1.82	-0.01	-0.30	0.59	0.17	305	[0.0, 0.2]
	ΔYGR	-8.49	6.08	12.73	-0.06	-4.76	-6.02	0.35		[-3.85, 0.68]
(1.4, 1.6]	ΔPR	-21.91	-1.31	28.98	-0.02	0.86	-9.60	0.12		[-0.06, 0.0]
	ΔPL				0.00				304	
	ΔYGR	-273.12	-5.71	379.64	-0.21	4.35	-133.41	0.14		[-5.0, 0.0]
(1.6, 1.8]	ΔPR	30.50	1.87	-38.69	0.00	-1.14	12.22	0.09		[-0.06, -0.03]
	ΔPL				0.00				288	
	ΔYGR	-510.13	1.23	612.27	0.69	-1.96	-184.75	0.11		[-6.4, 0.0]
(1.8, 2]	ΔPR	9.68	-9.64	-9.06	-0.26	5.31	2.04	0.16		[-0.06, 0.0]
	ΔPL				0.00				268	
	ΔYGR	-551.31	285.62	548.12	8.42	-157.41	-136.47	0.18		[-7.5, 0.0]

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Italic, (复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

删除[authors]: *

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Regular

删除[authors]: *

删除[authors]: *

删除[authors]: *

删除[authors]:)*

删除[authors]: *

删除[authors]: <sp>

299 Table 2 Maize increments of Root (ΔPR) and Leaf (ΔPL) Allocation Coefficients,
300 Yellow-to-Green Leaf Ratio (ΔYGR), and Water Balance Difference ($\Delta W_{(i)}$) Equation
301

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman Italic,
(复杂文种) 阿拉伯语(沙特阿拉伯)

a + b × ΔW _(i) + c × DVI + d × ΔW _(i) ² + e × ΔW _(i) × DVI + f × DVI ²										
DVI		a	b	c	d	e	f	R ²	n	Range
(0.0, 0.2]	ΔPR	-0.15	-0.70	-0.09	0.53	3.76	-1.05	0.98		[-0.2, -0.1]
	ΔPL	0.19	0.56	0.07	-0.42	3.01	0.84	0.89	435	[0.19, 0.23]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.2, 0.4]	ΔPR	0.60	-1.09	-6.22	0.34	3.84	11.35	0.89		[-0.25, -0.2]
	ΔPL	-3.09	4.20	24.02	-1.22	-14.89	-43.57	0.90	383	[0.05, 0.22]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.4, 0.6]	ΔPR	5.47	-0.67	-26.86	0.00	1.52	31.64	0.92		[-0.25, 0.0]
	ΔPL	1.47	0.12	-5.41	0.07	-0.42	4.32	0.76	389	[0.0, 0.22]
	ΔYGR				0.00					
(0.6, 0.8]	ΔPR	-0.89	0.80	2.22	0.02	-1.11	-1.38	0.23		[-0.05, 0.05]
	ΔPL	-1.51	-0.09	3.44	0.00	0.13	-2.27	0.62	348	[-0.1, 0.11]
	ΔYGR	2.26	-2.84	-5.48	-0.09	3.97	3.36	0.24		[-0.03, 0.2]
(0.8, 1.0]	ΔPR				0.00					
	ΔPL	29.56	-0.43	-69.90	0.00	0.48	41.16	0.88	332	[-0.2, 0.11]
	ΔYGR	-65.17	0.40	151.25	0.00	-0.10	-87.51	0.43		[-0.07, 0.35]
(1.0, 1.2]	ΔPR	-6.08	1.11	9.59	-0.01	-1.01	-3.62	0.66		[0.0, 0.12]
	ΔPL	-118.10	2.26	206.59	0.07	-1.74	-90.19	0.42	308	[0.05, 0.45]
	ΔYGR	12.14	-0.05	-19.86	-0.05	0.03	7.99	0.42		[-0.14, 0.3]
(1.2, 1.4]	ΔPR	117.85	-1.74	-172.01	0.04	1.18	62.85	0.38		[0.0, 0.12]
	ΔPL	-213.00	3.34	311.30	-0.07	-2.28	-113.67	0.37	321	[0.0, 0.4]
	ΔYGR	120.52	-2.50	-175.84	0.05	1.72	64.04	0.40		[-0.48, 0.17]
(1.4, 1.6]	ΔPR	174.42	9.21	-247.65	0.13	-6.55	87.92	0.54		[-0.05, 0.12]
	ΔPL				0.00				338	
	ΔYGR	229.20	11.38	-326.10	0.16	-8.11	115.83	0.53		[-0.5, 0.0]
(1.6, 1.8]	ΔPR	259.85	3.67	-295.73	-0.03	-1.96	84.05	0.31		[-0.15, 0.0]
	ΔPL				0.00				370	
	ΔYGR	-838.08	6.24	1010.12	0.12	-4.20	-304.31	0.62		[-0.3, 0.15]
(1.8, 2]	ΔPR	0.80	3.13	-1.45	-0.20	-1.60	0.53	0.34		[-0.15, 0.0]
	ΔPL				0.00				439	
	ΔYGR	-246.13	16.95	263.13	0.90	-9.58	-70.43	0.38		[-0.6, 0.3]

删除[authors]: <sp>

3.1.2 Response of photosynthate allocation coefficients to soil moisture changes

We further analyzed the variation in assimilate allocation coefficients (PR, PL, and YGR) in response to soil moisture levels during key growth stages, including the jointing stage, silking stage (maize), heading stage (wheat), and maturity (Fig. 2).

At the jointing stage (DVI = 0.4–0.6), maize PL significantly decreased with increasing soil moisture, while PR also showed a slight downward trend (Fig. 2(a)). In contrast, wheat PL was relatively insensitive to moisture changes, but under severe drought stress condition (RAW < 45%), wheat PR was significantly lower than under well-watered conditions (Fig. 2(d)). During the silking stage of maize (DVI = 1.0–1.2), both PL and YGR decreased with increasing soil moisture under moderate drought stress condition (RAW = 45–60%) and severe drought stress. However, under mild drought (RAW = 60–70%) to optimal moisture conditions, both PL and YGR increased with rising soil moisture. The PR exhibited a non-linear response, increasing first and then decreasing as moisture increased (Fig. 2(b)). Similarly, at the wheat heading stage (DVI = 1.0–1.2), the trend of PR and YGR was comparable to that of maize, whereas wheat PL continuously decreased with increasing soil moisture, which is in contrast to maize (Fig. 2(e)).

At the maturity stage (DVI = 1.8–2.0), photosynthates were no longer allocated to leaves but instead to grains. Under drought stress, maize YGR increased significantly (Fig. 2(c)). Moreover, excessive soil moisture condition (RAW > 85%) also led to higher YGR values than under optimal condition (RAW = 70–85%). The PR increased with rising soil moisture during this stage, as extreme drought caused premature root senescence and decay. Conversely, wheat PR and YGR decreased with increasing soil moisture during maturity (Fig. 2(f)). Notably, under severe drought conditions, wheat YGR was lower than under other moisture levels.





Fig. 2 Mean values and fitted curves of the leaf allocation coefficient (PL), root allocation coefficient (PR), and yellow-to-green leaf ratio (YGR) for maize and wheat at the jointing, silking/heading, and maturity stages under different soil moisture conditions, as simulated by the optimized Agro-C model. PL and PR share the left y-axis, whereas YGR is plotted on the right y-axis.

3.2 Model calibration and validation

3.2.1 Calibration results

We selected datasets that provided detailed records of AGB and BGB at multiple crop growth stages, and which included experimental treatments under different levels of water stress, to serve as the calibration dataset. This allowed for more accurate simulation of photosynthate allocation across developmental stages.

Overall, the optimized Agro-C model showed higher accuracy in simulating AGB, with R^2 values exceeding 0.56 across all growth stages. In contrast, the simulation accuracy for BGB was relatively lower, with R^2 values ranging from 0.33 to 0.72 (Fig. 3). Notably, the optimized Agro-C model performed well in simulating AGB at maturity (Fig. 3(c)), with R^2 values of 0.89 for maize and 0.68 for wheat. Improved accuracy in simulating AGB at maturity contributes to more reliable estimation of crop productivity. The optimized Agro-C model showed better



删除[authors]:

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: aboveground biomass (

删除[authors]:)

删除[authors]: belowground biomass (

删除[authors]:)

删除[authors]: assimilate partitioning

删除[authors]: <sp>

performance in simulating wheat BGB ($R^2 = 0.72$) at the jointing stage compared to maize ($R^2 = 0.65$). However, during the reproductive stage (silking to maturity for maize; heading to maturity for wheat), simulation accuracy was higher for maize. For maize, the optimized Agro-C model consistently achieved R^2 values above 0.63 across all growth stages, indicating a good performance.

Although the optimized Agro-C model showed relatively low R^2 values for simulating wheat BGB at heading and maturity stages (0.33 and 0.44, respectively; Fig. 3(e-f)), this was primarily attributed to physiological root senescence during late reproductive stages, leading to lower root biomass per unit area. Under such conditions, the absolute values of BGB were small, and even slight deviations between simulated and observed values could substantially reduce R^2 . Nevertheless, the RMSE for wheat BGB at heading and maturity were 8.45 and 8.23 gC m^{-2} , respectively, indicating relatively small deviations. Therefore, we consider the optimized Agro-C model to be reasonably reliable and practically applicable for simulating BGB for wheat during the later reproductive stages.




Fig. 3 Calibration results of the Agro-C model for aboveground biomass (AGB) and belowground biomass (BGB) of maize and wheat at the jointing, heading/grain-filling, and maturity stages. (a)-(c) show AGB calibration results; (d)-(f) show BGB calibration results. Blue circles represent maize, and green triangles represent wheat.

设置格式[authors]: 非上标/ 下标

删除[authors]:

删除[authors]:)-(

删除[authors]:)-(

删除[authors]: <sp>

3.2.2 Validation results

Due to limited availability of experimental data, the criteria for selecting the validation dataset were less stringent than those applied to the calibration dataset. Therefore, datasets that included detailed records of water use during the crop growth period (regardless of whether water stress treatments were applied) and biomass data for one or more growth stages were included in the validation dataset.

Compared with the pre-optimized Agro-C model, the optimized Agro-C model showed substantial improvements in simulating assimilate production for both maize and wheat (Fig. 4). For maize, the simulation accuracy for AGB improved from $R^2 = 0.70$ and $RMSE = 153.15 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$ to $R^2 = 0.95$ and $RMSE = 66.03 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$. Similarly, the BGB simulation improved from $R^2 = 0.49$ and $RMSE = 20.55 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$ to $R^2 = 0.61$ and $RMSE = 11.18 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$. Likewise, for wheat, the optimized Agro-C model significantly improved the simulation accuracy for both AGB and BGB, achieving R^2 values of 0.74 ($RMSE = 60.26 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$) for AGB and 0.48 ($RMSE = 19.43 \text{ gC m}^{-2}$) for BGB, compared to the pre-optimized Agro-C model, which simulated AGB and BGB much lower R^2 values of 0.31 and 0.42, respectively. The validation dataset comprised several water-stress treatments, and the pre-optimized Agro-C model simulation accuracy declined under these conditions due to the absence of water stress-responsive allocation parameters in the pre-optimized structure.

Similar to the calibration results, the optimized Agro-C model exhibited significantly higher accuracy in simulating AGB than BGB for the validation dataset. However, after parameter optimization, the average differences between simulated and observed BGB for maize and wheat were only 5.19 and -2.52 gC m^{-2} , respectively (Fig. S2), indicating relatively small deviations. In addition, compared to the pre-optimized Agro-C model, the optimized Agro-C model exhibited consistently smaller deviations from the observed values (Fig. S2), suggesting a relatively reliable parameter calibration scheme.

删除[authors]: simulate

删除[authors]: <sp>




Fig. 4 Validation results of the pre-optimized and optimized Agro-C model for simulating aboveground biomass (AGB) and belowground biomass (BGB) of maize and wheat. (a) and (b) show the validation results for maize AGB and BGB, respectively; (c) and (d) show the validation results for wheat AGB and BGB, respectively. Blue circles and green triangles represent the simulation results from the optimized model, while orange hollow circles and triangles represent the simulation results from the pre-optimized Agro-C model for maize and wheat, respectively.

3.3 Simulating photosynthate under different RAW

删除[authors]: photosynthetic biomass

Based on the observed patterns, four distinct soil moisture regimes were defined: severe drought ($RAW < 45\%$), mild-to-moderate drought ($RAW = 45\text{--}70\%$), optimal moisture ($RAW = 70\text{--}85\%$), and excessive moisture ($RAW > 85\%$). Simulations of maize and wheat AGB and BGB were conducted under each condition (Figs. 5-8).

Since the pre-optimized Agro-C model did not adequately account for crop growth under water-deficit conditions, its performance in simulating photosynthate production under water stress ($RAW < 70\%$) was unsatisfactory, resulting in low R^2 values and relatively high RMSE. However, under optimal moisture conditions, the pre-optimized model performed well, particularly in simulating AGB, demonstrating its high applicability in well-watered environments. The optimized Agro-C model showed marked improvements across all moisture regimes. The R^2 of AGB simulation for maize ranged from 0.77 to 0.95, and for wheat from 0.80 to 0.89,

删除[authors]:

删除[authors]: <sp>

respectively (Figs. 5 and 7), demonstrating that the optimized Agro-C model performed well in simulating AGB across different soil moisture conditions. This strong performance enhances its applicability for crop productivity estimation and quantification of straw return to the field. For wheat BGB, the optimized Agro-C model achieved R^2 values of 0.77–0.83 (Fig. 8), greatly improving the accuracy compared to the pre-optimized Agro-C model (R^2 in 0.52–0.78), which previously exhibited large errors in simulating wheat BGB. Under varying soil moisture conditions, the optimized Agro-C model achieved R^2 values of 0.62 to 0.74 for simulating maize BGB, consistently outperforming pre-optimized Agro-C model. Notably, the accuracy of the optimized Agro-C model was significantly improved under severe and mild-to-moderate drought, highlighting its enhanced responsiveness to water stress.




Fig. 5 Simulated aboveground biomass (AGB) of maize under different relative available soil water (RAW) conditions using the pre-optimized Agro-C model and the optimized Agro-C model. Blue circles represent simulation results from the optimized Agro-C model, and orange circles represent those from the pre-optimized Agro-C model.





Fig. 6 Simulated belowground biomass (BGB) of maize under different relative available soil water (RAW) conditions using the pre-optimized Agro-C model and the optimized Agro-C model. Blue circles represent simulation results from the optimized Agro-C model, and orange circles represent those from the pre-optimized Agro-C model.



删除[authors]: <sp>

Fig. 7 Simulated aboveground biomass (AGB) of wheat under different relative available soil water (RAW) conditions using the pre-optimized Agro-C model and the optimized Agro-C model. Green triangles represent simulation results from the optimized Agro-C model, and orange triangles represent those from the pre-optimized Agro-C model.




Fig. 8 Simulated belowground biomass (BGB) of wheat under different relative available soil water (RAW) conditions using the pre-optimized Agro-C model and the optimized Agro-C model. Green triangles represent simulation results from the optimized Agro-C model, and orange triangles represent those from the pre-optimized Agro-C model.

4. Discussion

4.1 Model performance evaluation

By incorporating dynamic response functions of photosynthate allocation to water stress and crop development, the optimized Agro-C model substantially improved the simulation of crop growth across all developmental stages in both maize and wheat. Overall, the model exhibited higher accuracy for simulating AGB than BGB, a trend consistently observed in both the calibration and validation datasets (Figs. 3 and 4). This difference likely reflects the greater availability of observational data and the more comprehensive understanding of aboveground physiological

删除[authors]: coefficients

删除[authors]: developmental stage

删除[authors]: achieved significantly

删除[authors]: accuracy

删除[authors]: crops

删除[authors]: growth phases

删除[authors]: Fig

删除[authors]: , Fig.

删除[authors]: abundant observations and better mechanistic

删除[authors]: for

删除[authors]: <sp>

processes, which together contribute to more reliable model parameterization and improved predictive performance (Asseng et al., 2013; Li et al., 2015).

删除[authors]: improving predictability

Although the optimized Agro-C model better simulated wheat AGB and BGB during the jointing stage, its accuracy was surpassed by maize simulations during the reproductive phase. This contrast can be attributed to the distinct allocation strategies between the two crops during the reproductive transition. For wheat, photosynthate allocation during the jointing stage characterized primarily by leaf expansion and root development, which are relatively well represented in crop models. However, during the reproductive phase, grain filling in wheat relies heavily on the remobilization of stem-reserved assimilates (Bertheloot et al., 2008; Effah et al., 2022), while the root system undergoes rapid senescence (Wang et al., 2014), complicating model representation.

删除[authors]: is relatively straightforward, focusing

删除[authors]: on

删除[authors]: —processes that

删除[authors]: easier to capture through modeling

The simplified model structure does not fully represent the complexity of belowground processes, resulting in relatively low R^2 values (0.33–0.44) during the heading and maturity stages. Nevertheless, due to small BGB magnitudes, even modest deviations result in relatively low RMSE values (8.45 and 8.23 gC m⁻²), indicating reasonable model performance at the magnitude level. In contrast, as a C4 crop, maize relies more directly on continuous leaf photosynthesis for grain formation (Boyer & Westgate, 2004). Water stress significantly suppresses leaf expansion and photosynthetic activity, but leaf area index can recover following rehydration, enhancing aboveground dry matter accumulation (Ma et al., 2025). Therefore, the dynamic adjustment of water and leaf allocation functions enhances model performance for simulating maize biomass during the reproductive stage.

删除[authors]: model's

删除[authors]: capture

删除[authors]: complexities

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: . However

删除[authors]: markedly

删除[authors]: The inclusion

删除[authors]: trials

删除[authors]: showed unsatisfactory

删除[authors]: ,

删除[authors]:)

删除[authors]: lacking

删除[authors]: response, while

删除[authors]: better

删除[authors]: photosynthetic biomass

Because of multiple water stress treatments in the validation dataset, the pre-optimized Agro-C model exhibited relatively limited performance (low R^2 and high RMSE), likely due to its inability to explicitly represent crop responses to water stress. In contrast, the optimized Agro-C model more accurately captured photosynthate allocation under water stress (Figs. 4 and S2). This further demonstrates that incorporating water-sensitive parameters into allocation functions is

设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Calibri, 五号

删除[authors]: <sp>

485 a critical strategy for enhancing the drought responsiveness of crop models
486 (Monteleone et al., 2023; Hammer et al., 2010). After parameter optimization, the
487 simulation accuracy of Agro-C was significantly improved across all water regimes,
488 especially for the belowground biomass simulation. Agro-C is a coupled Crop-C and
489 Soil-C model (Huang et al., 2009), in which simulated crop residues and root biomass
490 are directly transferred to the Soil-C module as carbon inputs. Therefore, improving
491 photosynthate allocation reduces uncertainties in residue and root carbon inputs,
492 especially belowground carbon, providing a more reliable basis for SOC simulation.

493 4.2 Effect of soil water on photosynthate allocation across crop growth

494 The response of photosynthate allocation to water stress exhibits strong stage
495 dependence and crop specificity. The continuous DVI-based allocation functions
496 (Tables 1 and 2) showed that drought stress altered photosynthate allocation during
497 the vegetative stage in both maize and wheat. Specifically, carbon allocation shifted
498 from leaves to roots, as evidenced by increased PR and decreased PL (Fig. 2(a) and
499 (d)), likely enhancing root water uptake under drought conditions (Çakir, 2004). As
500 crops transition into the reproductive phase, maize at silking and wheat at heading
501 display heightened sensitivity of allocation coefficients to soil moisture. Under
502 moderate to severe drought conditions (RAW < 60%), both maize and wheat exhibit
503 decreasing trends in PL and YGR with increasing soil moisture (Fig. 2(b) and (e)),
504 probably due to impaired plant capacity to maintain photosynthetic area and delay leaf
505 senescence under water-limited conditions (Vadez et al., 2024). Notably, under mild
506 drought to optimal water conditions (RAW = 60–85%), maize exhibits increasing PL
507 and YGR with increasing moisture, indicating that appropriate irrigation during this
508 stage effectively alleviates water stress and promotes greater allocation of
509 photosynthates to foliage (Ma et al., 2025).

510 Importantly, maize and wheat also exhibit divergent photosynthate allocation
511 patterns when exposed to water stress at the same developmental stage. During the
512 reproductive transition phase, maize allocated more photosynthates to leaves under
513 optimal water conditions, leading to increased LAI and prolonged leaf functionality.

删除[authors]: Following

删除[authors]: with

删除[authors]: most notable enhancement observed in the ...

删除[authors]: . This effectively corrected the bias of ...

删除[authors]: in representing root dynamics. Given that ...

删除[authors]: SOC modeling, thereby enabling

删除[authors]: accurate assessment of

删除[authors]: stocks

删除[authors]: Nevertheless, limitations remain in the cur ...

删除[authors]: Using

删除[authors]:), it is evident

删除[authors]: ,

删除[authors]: adopt a “root-priority” strategy

删除[authors]: enhance water uptake under drought stress

删除[authors]: reflected

删除[authors]: a significant increase in the

删除[authors]: a concurrent decrease in the

删除[authors]:);

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: likely

删除[authors]: Interestingly

删除[authors]: Notably

删除[authors]: biomass

删除[authors]: exhibited a significant increase in PL

删除[authors]: accompanied by a peak in leaf area index (

删除[authors]:), which helps maintain

删除[authors]: and ensures successful

删除[authors]: <sp>

514 which are critical for pollination and subsequent kernel formation (Ma et al., 2025). In
515 contrast, wheat showed a continuous decline in PL, suggesting that photosynthates
516 were increasingly diverted to the developing spike during anthesis stage, indicating a
517 reduced dependence on leaf investment (Farooq et al., 2014). This divergence
518 underscores an evolutionary trade-off between C4 and C3 crops in carbon use
519 efficiency. Under water stress, maize prioritizes the protection of leaf function,
520 whereas wheat ensures grain filling through strategic assimilate redistribution (Borrás
521 et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2018). At maturity, maize exhibits reduced PR under drought,
522 because of premature root senescence, whereas PR increases under optimal or
523 excessive soil moisture conditions (Fig. 2(c)). Inversely, wheat shows a simultaneous
524 decline in both PR and YGR with increasing soil moisture (Fig. 2(f)). This finding
525 indicates that, during the late grain-filling stage, wheat adopts a distinct photosynthate
526 allocation strategy in which rapid root senescence promotes assimilate translocation
527 from roots to grains, thereby supporting grain development.

528 In addition, excessive water availability also significantly affects the
529 photosynthates allocation. At maize maturity, excessive soil moisture condition
530 (RAW > 85%) resulted in higher YGR values than those observed under optimal
531 water conditions. This response may be attributed to accelerated leaf senescence
532 under excessive moisture conditions, which facilitates the remobilization of
533 assimilates from vegetative tissues to grains. Excessive soil moisture reduces root
534 aeration and increases respiratory losses, thereby weakening root activity (Shao et al.,
535 2013; Herzog et al., 2015). Thus, excessive water supply can also disrupt the optimal
536 allocation of photosynthates, ultimately impairing yield formation. For maize, both
537 drought stress and excessive water conditions should be avoided during the silking
538 and maturity stages to preserve leaf functionality and root activity. For wheat, careful
539 water management is particularly important from jointing to heading to support
540 proper spike differentiation and subsequent grain development.

541 4.3 Applicability and limitations of the optimized Agro-C model

542 4.3.1 Enhanced representation of water stress responses

- 删除[authors]: -
- 删除[authors]: roots senesce prematurely
- 删除[authors]: , leading to a decline in PR, while
- 删除[authors]: , PR increases
- 删除[authors]: exhibits
- 删除[authors]: consistent
- 删除[authors]: root senescence in
- 删除[authors]:
- 删除[authors]: enables greater carbon
- 删除[authors]: to kernels, ultimately enhancing yield potential
- 删除[authors]: excess
- 删除[authors]: partitioning of
- 删除[authors]: . During
- 删除[authors]: YGR under conditions of
- 删除[authors]: was
- 删除[authors]: supply, suggesting that overwatering
- 删除[authors]: induce premature
- 删除[authors]: and accelerate assimilate translocation to
- 删除[authors]: grain
- 删除[authors]: partitioning
- 删除[authors]: compromising
- 删除[authors]: it is crucial to avoid
- 删除[authors]: over-irrigation
- 删除[authors]: maintain
- 删除[authors]: function
- 删除[authors]: vitality
- 删除[authors]: particular attention should be paid to water
- 删除[authors]: stages
- 删除[authors]: ensure
- 删除[authors]: Representation
- 设置格式[authors]: 缩进: 首行缩进: 2 字符, 调整中文
- 设置格式[authors]: 字体: (默认) Times New Roman
- 删除[authors]: in the Agro-C model
- 删除[authors]: <sp>

543 Crop models adopt various approaches to represent water stress. For instance, the
 544 DSSAT model constructs stress factors (TURFAC and SWFAC) based on the ratio of
 545 soil water supply to demand, applying them to processes such as photosynthesis,
 546 transpiration, leaf area development, and biomass accumulation (Jones et al., 2003;
 547 He et al., 2013). Although DSSAT effectively represents the effects of drought on
 548 photosynthesis and transpiration, photosynthate allocation is typically governed by
 549 fixed or stage-dependent allocation schemes, limiting the model's ability to simulate
 550 the dynamic redistribution of assimilates among plant organs. The APSIM model uses
 551 water stress factors to simulate the effects of water stress on root growth, leaf area
 552 expansion, and photosynthesis, while its modular and transparent framework enables
 553 its application across diverse cropping systems (Pasley et al., 2020; Githui et al., 2022;
 554 Monteleone et al., 2023). But the APSIM primarily relies on empirical functions to
 555 describe photosynthate allocation and does not explicitly represent the dynamic
 556 redistribution of assimilates among roots, leaves, and grains, limiting its ability to
 557 characterize carbon allocation at the organ level. The AquaCrop model uses
 558 threshold-based functions to simulate the effects of water stress on canopy expansion,
 559 stomatal conductance, leaf senescence, and harvest index, and generally performs
 560 well in simulating yield and water use efficiency under drought conditions. However,
 561 its representation of belowground processes remains relatively simplified, as root
 562 biomass is estimated mainly through adjustments to RSR, without explicitly
 563 accounting for root senescence or dynamic carbon allocation (Zhou et al., 2024;
 564 Fallah et al., 2025).
 565 Compared with the aforementioned models, the optimized Agro-C model
 566 developed in this study provides a more mechanistic representation of crop responses
 567 to water stress by integrating a process-based root water uptake module with a
 568 dynamic photosynthate allocation scheme. Rather than relying solely on the RAW,
 569 the optimized model quantifies crop water status through root water uptake and water
 570 deficit (ΔW), allowing carbon allocation (PR, PL, and YGR) to respond dynamically
 571 to both crop DVI and water availability. This enables the model to better represent

key physiological responses, such as enhanced root allocation and accelerated leaf senescence, under water stress, thereby improving the simulation of AGB and BGB across a range of moisture conditions. Furthermore, because the optimized allocation scheme is constrained by observed biomass data and crop physiological characteristics, it provides a more physiologically realistic representation of organ-level carbon allocation than conventional approaches based on fixed allocation coefficients.

删除[authors]: -priority
删除[authors]: premature
删除[authors]: , enhancing
删除[authors]: accuracy

4.3.2 Limitations of the optimized Agro-C model

Despite the improved performance of the optimized Agro-C model, several limitations remain. Specifically, although the model accounts for nitrogen fertilization through site-specific management inputs, the effects of nitrogen on photosynthate allocation are not explicitly represented. Because crop growth and photosynthate allocation are jointly regulated by water and nitrogen availability, future model development should incorporate dynamic water–nitrogen interactions to improve the representation of crop physiological processes.

删除[authors]: optimized Agro-C model captures the water-dependent variability
删除[authors]: carbon partitioning during key growth stages overcoming the limitations of conventional models

Moreover, the model still shows relatively lower accuracy in simulating BGB than AGB, suggesting that root growth processes are not yet fully represented. The current allocation scheme adjusts root carbon allocation primarily according to water conditions, while key root processes, such as root architecture, turnover, and carbon remobilization, are simplified. These processes, together with interactions among water availability, nitrogen, and temperature, are likely to influence root dynamics and should be incorporated in future (Lynch et al., 2014; Calleja-Cabrera et al., 2022; Li et al., 2025).

删除[authors]: rely on fixed rules or lack dynamic regulation across stages. Finally, the parameter calibration is based on observed AGB and BGB data, enabling the model to not only simulate yield variations, but also provide mechanistic representation insights into organ-level allocation dynamics, thereby improving its physiological interpretability and robustness.

Furthermore, the current model can simulate different water conditions using site-specific irrigation inputs or relative available soil water, but it does not explicitly differentiate among irrigation strategies, including drip, sprinkler, and flood irrigation. To further improve the model, more detailed irrigation management practices, together with dynamic water–nitrogen interactions and root processes, should be incorporated to better capture crop physiological responses and belowground carbon

删除[authors]: However, the current scheme still simplifies root processes by adjusting root allocation coefficients solely based on water status, without accounting for key parameters such as root architecture and turnover rate—factors that are particularly critical under extreme moisture conditions (Lynch et al., 2014). Overall, the optimized Agro-C model proves capable of capturing carbon allocation under diverse water regimes, suggesting strong applicability. In the future, the proposed framework can potentially be integrated into land surface and Earth system models to improve the representation of carbon–water coupling under future climate scenarios.

删除[authors]: <sp>

dynamics under diverse environmental and management conditions.

5. Conclusion

This study incorporated water stress effects into crop carbon allocation by linking the root and leaf allocation coefficients (PR and PL) and the yellow-to-green leaf ratio (YGR) to soil moisture and DVI, thereby optimizing the Agro-C model. The optimized Agro-C model addresses limitations of fixed allocation rules by capturing stage-sensitive responses and dynamic shifts in allocation under drought and over-irrigation. Compared with the pre-optimized Agro-C model, the optimized Agro-C model demonstrated a substantial improvement in simulation accuracy, achieving R² values of 0.74–0.95 for AGB and 0.48–0.61 for BGB in validation datasets. Moreover, the optimized Agro-C model effectively captured biomass dynamics across a wide range of soil moisture conditions—from drought to excessive moisture—achieving R² values of 0.77–0.95 for AGB and 0.62–0.83 for BGB in maize and wheat, thereby demonstrating improved robustness and physiological fidelity. Nonetheless, the representation of root system architecture and turnover remains simplified, highlighting the need for further mechanistic refinement. Overall, the model presents a robust tool for simulating drought-induced carbon allocation strategies and can be applied in broader climate–agriculture interactions to inform sustainable water and carbon management strategies.

Author contributions

WX: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Visualization, Writing – original draft. WZ: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. YY: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. QZ: Conceptualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Writing – review & editing.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: partitioning

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: -

删除[authors]: WZ, QZ and YY elaborated the algorithmic concept; WX implemented the codes, conducted the numerical experiments, visualized the results, and prepared the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

删除[authors]: <sp>

628 paper.

629 **Disclaimer. Publisher’s note:**

630 Copernicus Publications remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims
631 made in the text, published maps, institutional affiliations, or any other geographical
632 representation in this paper. While Copernicus Publications makes every effort to
633 include appropriate place names, the final responsibility lies with the authors.

634 **Code and data availability**

635 The code that supports the findings of this study is openly available in Zenodo at
636 Xu et al. (2026; <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19970992>), reference number
637 19970992. All data used in this study are publicly available. Meteorological data for
638 the crop growing period were obtained from *ERA5* (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/>).
639 The calibration data of the model are sourced from Duan (2020); Feng et al. (1997);
640 Feng (2014); Ge et al. (2005); Ge et al. (2012); Gheysari et al. (2017); Jiang (2019);
641 Li et al. (2010); Lu et al. (2020); Wang (2011); Wang et al. (2014); Wang (2014);
642 Zhang (2023). The validation data of the model are sourced from Allard et al. (2013);
643 Cai et al. (2017); Chen et al. (2021); Fang et al. (2017); Liu et al. (2017); Núñez et al.
644 (2022); Pouri et al. (2019); Xu et al. (2020); Zhao et al. (2018); Zou et al. (2021).

645 **Acknowledgments**

646 This study was financially supported by the the National Key R&D Program of
647 China (2022YFD1901604), National Natural Science Foundation of China
648 (42171064), and the Key Research and Development Program of Yunnan Province
649 (202303AC100009).

References

- Ahuja, L., Ma, L., Timlin, D., Stockle, C., and Boote, K. J.: Current Water Deficit Stress Simulations in Selected Agricultural System Models, Response of Crops to Limited Water: Understanding and Modeling Water Stress Effects on Plant Growth Processes, <https://doi.org/10.2134/advagricsystmodell.c1>, 2008.
- Allard, V., Martre, P., and Le Gouis, J.: Genetic variability in biomass allocation to roots in wheat is mainly related to crop tillering dynamics and nitrogen status, *European Journal of Agronomy*, 46, 68–76, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2012.12.004>, 2013.
- Allen, R. G., Pereira, L. S., Smith, M., Raes, D., and Wright, J. L.: FAO-56 Dual Crop Coefficient Method for Estimating Evaporation from Soil and Application Extensions, *J. Irrig. Drain Eng.*, 131, 2–13, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9437\(2005\)131:1\(2\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9437(2005)131:1(2)), 2005.
- Allen, R. G., Pruitt, W. O., Wright, J. L., Howell, T. A., Ventura, F., Snyder, R., Itenfisu, D., Steduto, P., Berengena, J., Yrisarry, J. B., Smith, M., Pereira, L. S., Raes, D., Perrier, A., Alves, I., Walter, I., and Elliott, R.: A recommendation on standardized surface resistance for hourly calculation of reference ETo by the FAO56 Penman-Monteith method, *Agricultural Water Management*, 81, 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2005.03.007>, 2006.
- Asseng, S., Ewert, F., Rosenzweig, C., Jones, J. W., Hatfield, J. L., Ruane, A. C., Boote, K. J., Thorburn, P. J., Rötter, R. P., Cammarano, D., Brisson, N., Basso, B., Martre, P., Aggarwal, P. K., Angulo, C., Bertuzzi, P., Biernath, C., Challinor, A. J., Doltra, J., Gayler, S., Goldberg, R., Grant, R., Heng, L., Hooker, J., Hunt, L. A., Ingwersen, J., Izaurralde, R. C., Kersebaum, K. C., Müller, C., Naresh Kumar, S., Nendel, C., O’Leary, G., Olesen, J. E., Osborne, T. M., Palosuo, T., Priesack, E., Ripoche, D., Semenov, M. A., Shcherbak, I., Steduto, P., Stöckle, C., Stratonovitch, P., Streck, T., Supit, I., Tao, F., Travasso, M., Waha, K., Wallach, D., White, J. W., Williams, J. R., and Wolf, J.: Uncertainty in simulating wheat yields under climate change, *Nature Clim Change*, 3, 827–832, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1916>, 2013.
- Bernacchi, C. J. and VanLoocke, A.: Terrestrial Ecosystems in a Changing Environment: A Dominant Role for Water, *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, 66, 599–622, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-043014-114834>, 2015.
- Bertheloot, J., Martre, P., and Andrieu, B.: Dynamics of Light and Nitrogen Distribution during Grain Filling within Wheat Canopy, *Plant Physiol*, 148, 1707–1720, <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.108.124156>, 2008.
- Boretti, A. and Rosa, L.: Reassessing the projections of the World Water Development Report, *npj Clean Water*, 2, 15, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41545-019-0039-9>, 2019.
- Borrás, L., Slafer, G. A., and Otegui, M. E.: Seed dry weight response to source–sink manipulations in wheat, maize and soybean: a quantitative reappraisal, *Field Crops Research*, 86, 131–146, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2003.08.002>, 2004.
- Boyer, J. S.: Grain yields with limited water, *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 55, 2385–2394, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erh219>, 2004.
- Cai, Q., Zhang, Y., Sun, Z., Zheng, J., Bai, W., Zhang, Y., Liu, Y., Feng, L., Feng, C., Zhang, Z.,

删除[authors]: <sp>

690 Yang, N., Evers, J. B., and Zhang, L.: Morphological plasticity of root growth under mild
 691 water stress increases water use efficiency without reducing yield in maize, *Biogeosciences*,
 692 14, 3851–3858, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-3851-2017>, 2017.

693 Cai, G., Ahmed, M. A., Abdalla, M., and Carminati, A.: Root hydraulic phenotypes impacting
 694 water uptake in drying soils, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 45, 650–663,
 695 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14259>, 2022.

696 Çakir, R.: Effect of water stress at different development stages on vegetative and reproductive
 697 growth of corn, *Field Crops Research*, 89, 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2004.01.005>,
 698 2004.

699 Calleja-Cabrera, J., Boter, M., Oñate-Sánchez, L., and Pernas, M.: Root Growth Adaptation to
 700 Climate Change in Crops, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00544>,
 701 2020.

702 Chen, R., Xiong, X., and Cheng, W.: Root characteristics of spring wheat under drip irrigation and
 703 their relationship with aboveground biomass and yield, *Sci Rep*, 11, 4913,
 704 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84208-7>, 2021.

705 Chen, Z., Niu, Y., Zhao, R., Han, C., Han, H., and Luo, H.: The combination of limited irrigation
 706 and high plant density optimizes canopy structure and improves the water use efficiency of
 707 cotton, *Agricultural Water Management*, 218, 139–148,
 708 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.03.037>, 2019.

709 Cook, B. I., Smerdon, J. E., Seager, R., and Coats, S.: Global warming and 21st century drying,
 710 *Clim Dyn*, 43, 2607–2627, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-014-2075-y>, 2014.

711 Dai, A.: Increasing drought under global warming in observations and models, *Nature Clim*
 712 *Change*, 3, 52–58, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1633>, 2013.

713 Duan, W.: Dynamic Response of Root-shoot Growth of Summer Maize to Soil Moisture under
 714 Deficit Irrigation, Northwest A&F University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements,
 715 2022.

716 van Diepen, C. a., Wolf, J., van Keulen, H., and Rappoldt, C.: WOFOST: a simulation model of
 717 crop production, *Soil Use and Management*, 5, 16–24,
 718 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-2743.1989.tb00755.x>, 1989.

719 Dodd, I. C., Egea, G., Watts, C. W., and Whalley, W. R.: Root water potential integrates discrete
 720 soil physical properties to influence ABA signalling during partial rootzone drying, *Journal*
 721 *of Experimental Botany*, 61, 3543–3551, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erq195>, 2010.

722 Effah, Z., Li, L., Xie, J., Karikari, B., Wang, J., Zeng, M., Wang, L., Boamah, S., and Padma
 723 Shanthi, J.: Post-anthesis Relationships Between Nitrogen Isotope Discrimination and Yield
 724 of Spring Wheat Under Different Nitrogen Levels, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 13,
 725 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.859655>, 2022.

726 Fallah, M., Rasulov, A., Ekambaram, Y., Khudayberganov, K., Devi Kosuru, S. n. v. j., and Ghate,
 727 A. D.: Simulating Plant Growth Under Water Stress Using the AquaCrop Model, *Natural and*
 728 *Engineering Sciences*, 10, 447–458, <https://doi.org/10.28978/nesciences.1763853>, 2025.

删除[authors]: <sp>

729 Fang, Y., Du, Y., Wang, J., Wu, A., Qiao, S., Xu, B., Zhang, S., Siddique, K.H.M., Chen, Y.:
730 Moderate Drought Stress Affected Root Growth and Grain Yield in Old, Modern and Newly
731 Released Cultivars of Winter Wheat, *Front. Plant Sci.* 8, 672,
732 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00672>, 2017.

733 Farooq, M., Wahid, A., Kobayashi, N., Fujita, D., and Basra, S. M. A.: Plant drought stress:
734 effects, mechanisms and management, *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, 29, 185–212,
735 <https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:2008021>, 2009.

736 Farooq, M., Hussain, M., and Siddique, K. H. M.: Drought Stress in Wheat during Flowering and
737 Grain-filling Periods, *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 33, 331–349,
738 <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352689.2014.875291>, 2014.

739 Feng, G., Luo, Y.: Simulation on Functional Equilibrium of Winter Wheat Root and Shoot under
740 Different Soil Water Regimes, *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 19, 1, 1999.

741 Feng, H., Tan, X., Bi, Jian.: Study on the Root Distribution and Root Characteristics of Winter
742 Wheat under Different Soil and Water Conditions, *Journal of Anhui Agri. Sci.* 2013, 41(35) :
743 13465 - 13467,13471, 2013.

744 Field, C. B., Randerson, J. T., and Malmström, C. M.: Global net primary production: Combining
745 ecology and remote sensing, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 51, 74–88,
746 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257\(94\)00066-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(94)00066-V), 1995.

747 Ge, T., Sui, F., Li, J., Lv, Y., Zhou, G.: Effects of Drought on Growth of Root and Shoot of
748 Summer Maize, *Chinese Agricultural Science Bulletin* 21, 1, 2005.

749 Ge, T., Sui, F., Bai, L., Tong, C., and Sun, N.: Effects of water stress on growth, biomass
750 partitioning, and water-use efficiency in summer maize (*Zea mays* L.) throughout the growth
751 cycle, *Acta Physiol Plant*, 34, 1043–1053, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11738-011-0901-y>, 2012.

752 Gheysari, M., Sadeghi, S.-H., Loescher, H. W., Amiri, S., Zareian, M. J., Majidi, M. M., Asgarinia,
753 P., and Payero, J. O.: Comparison of deficit irrigation management strategies on root, plant
754 growth and biomass productivity of silage maize, *Agricultural Water Management*, 182,
755 126–138, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2016.12.014>, 2017.

756 Githui, F., Beverly, C., Aiad, M., McCaskill, M., Liu, K., and Harrison, M. T.: Modelling
757 Waterlogging Impacts on Crop Growth: A Review of Aeration Stress Definition in Crop
758 Models and Sensitivity Analysis of APSIM, *International Journal of Plant Biology*, 13,
759 180–200, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijpb13030017>, 2022.

760 Gupta, A., Rico-Medina, A., and Caño-Delgado, A. I.: The physiology of plant responses to
761 drought, *Science*, 368, 266–269, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz7614>, 2020.

762 Hafner, B. D., Hesse, B. D., Bauerle, T. L., and Grams, T. E. E.: Water potential gradient, root
763 conduit size and root xylem hydraulic conductivity determine the extent of hydraulic
764 redistribution in temperate trees, *Functional Ecology*, 34, 561–574,
765 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13508>, 2020.

766 Hammer, G. L., Van Oosterom, E., McLean, G., Chapman, S. C., Broad, I., Harland, P., and
767 Muchow, R. C.: Adapting APSIM to model the physiology and genetics of complex adaptive
768 traits in field crops, *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 61, 2185–2202,

删除[authors]: <sp>

769 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erq095>, 2010.
 770 He, J., Cai, H., and Bai, J.: Irrigation scheduling based on CERES-Wheat model for spring wheat
 771 production in the Minqin Oasis in Northwest China, *Agricultural Water Management*, 128,
 772 19–31, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2013.06.010>, 2013.
 773 Herzog, M., Striker, G. G., Colmer, T. D., and Pedersen, O.: Mechanisms of waterlogging
 774 tolerance in wheat – a review of root and shoot physiology, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 39,
 775 1068–1086, <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12676>, 2016.
 776 Hijmans, R. J., Lens, I. M. G., and Diepen, C. A. van: WOFOST 6.0: user's guide for the
 777 WOFOST 6.0 crop growth simulation model, 1994.
 778 Hu, J., Zhao, X., Gu, L., Liu, P., Zhao, B., Zhang, J., and Ren, B.: The effects of high temperature,
 779 drought, and their combined stresses on the photosynthesis and senescence of summer maize,
 780 *Agricultural Water Management*, 289, 108525, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2023.108525>,
 781 2023.
 782 Hu, T., Zhang, X., Khanal, S., Wilson, R., Leng, G., Toman, E. M., Wang, X., Li, Y., and Zhao,
 783 K.: Climate change impacts on crop yields: A review of empirical findings, statistical crop
 784 models, and machine learning methods, *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 179, 106119,
 785 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2024.106119>, 2024.
 786 Huang, Y., Yu, Y., Zhang, W., Sun, W., Liu, S., Jiang, J., Wu, J., Yu, W., Wang, Y., and Yang, Z.:
 787 Agro-C: A biogeophysical model for simulating the carbon budget of agroecosystems,
 788 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 149, 106–129,
 789 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.07.013>, 2009.
 790 Jiang, P., Cai, F., Zhao, Z.Q., Meng, Y., Gao, L.Y., and Zhao, T.H.: Physiological and Dry Matter
 791 Characteristics of Spring Maize in Northeast China under Drought Stress, *Water*, 10, 1561,
 792 <https://doi.org/10.3390/w10111561>, 2018.
 793 Jiang, P.: Northeast Corn Material Production and Root Water Absorption Study on the Response
 794 of Water Stress, Shenyang Agricultural University, 2019.
 795 Jones, J. W., Hoogenboom, G., Porter, C. H., Boote, K. J., Batchelor, W. D., Hunt, L. A., Wilkens,
 796 P. W., Singh, U., Gijsman, A. J., and Ritchie, J. T.: The DSSAT cropping system model,
 797 *European Journal of Agronomy*, 18, 235–265,
 798 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00107-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00107-7), 2003.
 799 Kang, J., Peng, Y., and Xu, W.: Crop Root Responses to Drought Stress: Molecular Mechanisms,
 800 Nutrient Regulations, and Interactions with Microorganisms in the Rhizosphere, *Int J Mol Sci*,
 801 23, 9310, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23169310>, 2022.
 802 Kang, M.-S., Srivastava, P., Song, J.-H., Park, J., Her, Y., Kim, S. M., and Song, I.: Development
 803 of a Component-Based Modeling Framework for Agricultural Water-Resource Management,
 804 *Water*, 8, 351, <https://doi.org/10.3390/w8080351>, 2016.
 805 Keating, B. A., Carberry, P. S., Hammer, G. L., Probert, M. E., Robertson, M. J., Holzworth, D.,
 806 Huth, N. I., Hargreaves, J. N. G., Meinke, H., Hochman, Z., McLean, G., Verburg, K., Snow,
 807 V., Dimes, J. P., Silburn, M., Wang, E., Brown, S., Bristow, K. L., Asseng, S., Chapman, S.,
 808 McCown, R. L., Freebairn, D. M., and Smith, C. J.: An overview of APSIM, a model

删除[authors]: <sp>

809 designed for farming systems simulation, *European Journal of Agronomy*, 18, 267–288,
810 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00108-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00108-9), 2003.

811 Khatun, M., Sarkar, S., Era, F. M., Islam, A. K. M. M., Anwar, M. P., Fahad, S., Datta, R., and
812 Islam, A. K. M. A.: Drought Stress in Grain Legumes: Effects, Tolerance Mechanisms and
813 Management, *Agronomy*, 11, 2374, <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11122374>, 2021.

814 Lesk, C., Rowhani, P., and Ramankutty, N.: Influence of extreme weather disasters on global crop
815 production, *Nature*, 529, 84–87, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16467>, 2016.

816 Li, H., Qiu, J., Wang, L., and Yang, L.: Advance in a terrestrial biogeochemical model—DNDC
817 model, *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 31, 91–96, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chnaes.2010.11.006>,
818 2011.

819 Li, T., Hasegawa, T., Yin, X., Zhu, Y., Boote, K., Adam, M., Bregaglio, S., Buis, S., Confalonieri,
820 R., Fumoto, T., Gaydon, D., Marcaida III, M., Nakagawa, H., Oriol, P., Ruane, A. C., Ruget,
821 F., Singh, B., Singh, U., Tang, L., Tao, F., Wilkens, P., Yoshida, H., Zhang, Z., and Bouman,
822 B.: Uncertainties in predicting rice yield by current crop models under a wide range of
823 climatic conditions, *Global Change Biology*, 21, 1328–1341,
824 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12758>, 2015.

825 Li, Y., Wang, Q., Gao, S., Wang, X., He, A., and He, P.: Effects of Water–Nitrogen Coupling on
826 Root Distribution and Yield of Summer Maize at Different Growth Stages, *Plants*, 14, 1278,
827 <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants14091278>, 2025.

828 Lidon, Z.: An overview on drought induced changes in plant growth, water relations and
829 photosynthesis, *Emir. J. Food Agric*, 24, 57, <https://doi.org/10.9755/ejfa.v24i1.10599>, 2012.

830 Liu, Z., Zhu, K., Dong, S., Liu, P., Zhao, B., and Zhang, J.: Effects of integrated agronomic
831 practices management on root growth and development of summer maize, *European Journal*
832 *of Agronomy*, 84, 140–151, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2016.12.006>, 2017.

833 Lu, H., Xia, Z., Fu, Y., Wang, Q., Xue, J., and Chu, J.: Response of Soil Temperature, Moisture,
834 and Spring Maize (*Zea mays* L.) Root/Shoot Growth to Different Mulching Materials in
835 Semi-Arid Areas of Northwest China, *Agronomy*, 10, 453,
836 <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10040453>, 2020.

837 Lynch, J. P., Chimungu, J. G., and Brown, K. M.: Root anatomical phenes associated with water
838 acquisition from drying soil: targets for crop improvement, *J Exp Bot*, 65, 6155–6166,
839 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru162>, 2014.

840 Ma, Y., Ren, J., Yang, S., Ding, R., Du, T., Kang, S., and Tong, L.: Enhancing maize yield and
841 water productivity through coordinated root-shoot growth under mild water stress in dense
842 planting, *Field Crops Research*, 323, 109786, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2025.109786>,
843 2025.

844 Manghwar, H., Hussain, A., Alam, I., Khoso, M. A., Ali, Q., and Liu, F.: Waterlogging stress in
845 plants: Unraveling the mechanisms and impacts on growth, development, and productivity,
846 *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 224, 105824,
847 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2024.105824>, 2024.

848 McCown, R. L., Hammer, G. L., Hargreaves, J. N. G., Holzworth, D. P., and Freebairn, D. M.:

删除[authors]: <sp>

849 APSIM: a novel software system for model development, model testing and simulation in
850 agricultural systems research, *Agricultural Systems*, 50, 255–271,
851 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-521X\(94\)00055-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-521X(94)00055-V), 1996.

852 Monteleone, B., Borzí, I., Arosio, M., Cesarini, L., Bonaccorso, B., and Martina, M.: Modelling
853 the response of wheat yield to stage-specific water stress in the Po Plain, *Agricultural Water*
854 *Management*, 287, 108444, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2023.108444>, 2023.

855 Munns, R. and Tester, M.: Mechanisms of Salinity Tolerance, *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, 59,
856 651–681, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.032607.092911>, 2008.

857 Núñez, A., Ball, R., and Schipanski, M.: Plant and soil microbial responses to irrigation retirement
858 in semiarid cropping systems, *Environ. Res. Commun.*, 4, 035004,
859 <https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ac59c3>, 2022.

860 Novák, V., Hurtalová, T., and Matejka, F.: Predicting the effects of soil water content and soil
861 water potential on transpiration of maize, *Agricultural Water Management*, 76, 211–223,
862 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2005.01.009>, 2005.

863 Oktem, A.: Effect of water shortage on yield, and protein and mineral compositions of
864 drip-irrigated sweet corn in sustainable agricultural systems, *Agricultural Water Management*,
865 95, 1003–1010, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2008.03.006>, 2008.

866 Palta, J. A., Kobata, T., Turner, N. C., and Fillery, I. R.: Remobilization of Carbon and Nitrogen
867 in Wheat as Influenced by Postanthesis Water Deficits, *Crop Science*, 34, 118–124,
868 <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1994.0011183X003400010021x>, 1994.

869 Pasley, H. R., Huber, I., Castellano, M. J., and Archontoulis, S. V.: Modeling Flood-Induced
870 Stress in Soybeans, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 11, 62, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00062>, 2020.

871 Pouri, K., Mardeh, A. S.-S., Sohrabi, Y., and Soltani, A.: Crop phenotyping for wheat yield and
872 yield components against drought stress, *Cereal Research Communications*, 47, 383–393,
873 <https://doi.org/10.1556/0806.47.2019.05>, 2019.

874 Priestley, C. H. B. and Taylor, R. J.: On the Assessment of Surface Heat Flux and Evaporation
875 Using Large-Scale Parameters, 1972.

876 Protto, V., Bauget, F., Rishmawi, L., Nacry, P., and Maurel, C.: Primary, seminal and lateral roots
877 of maize show type-specific growth and hydraulic responses to water deficit, *Plant*
878 *Physiology*, 194, 2564–2579, <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiad675>, 2024.

879 Rishmawi, L., Bauget, F., Protto, V., Bauland, C., Nacry, P., and Maurel, C.: Natural variation of
880 maize root hydraulic architecture underlies highly diverse water uptake capacities, *Plant*
881 *Physiology*, 192, 2404–2418, <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiad213>, 2023.

882 Ritchie, J. T.: Soil water balance and plant water stress, in: *Understanding Options for*
883 *Agricultural Production*, edited by: Tsuji, G. Y., Hoogenboom, G., and Thornton, P. K.,
884 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 41–54, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3624-4_3,
885 1998.

886 Saseendran, S. a., Ahuja, L. r., Ma, L., and Trout, T. j.: Modeling for Best Management of the
887 Effects of Irrigation Frequencies, Initial Water, and Nitrogen on Corn, in: *Practical*

删除[authors]: <sp>

888 Applications of Agricultural System Models to Optimize the Use of Limited Water, John
889 Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 25–52, <https://doi.org/10.2134/advagricsystmodel5.c2>, 2014.

890 Saxton, K. E. and Rawls, W. J.: Soil Water Characteristic Estimates by Texture and Organic
891 Matter for Hydrologic Solutions, Soil Science Soc of Amer J, 70, 1569–1578,
892 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2005.0117>, 2006.

893 Seleiman, M. F., Al-Suhaibani, N., Ali, N., Akmal, M., Alotaibi, M., Refay, Y., Dindaroglu, T.,
894 Abdul-Wajid, H. H., and Battaglia, M. L.: Drought Stress Impacts on Plants and Different
895 Approaches to Alleviate Its Adverse Effects, Plants, 10, 259,
896 <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10020259>, 2021.

897 Shao, G. C., Lan, J. J., Yu, S. E., Liu, N., Guo, R. Q., and She, D. L.: Photosynthesis and growth
898 of winter wheat in response to waterlogging at different growth stages, Photosynthetica, 51,
899 429–437, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11099-013-0039-9>, 2013.

900 Smith, M. R., Rao, I. M., and Merchant, A.: Source-Sink Relationships in Crop Plants and Their
901 Influence on Yield Development and Nutritional Quality, Front. Plant Sci., 9,
902 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01889>, 2018.

903 Steduto, P., Hsiao, T. C., Raes, D., and Fereres, E.: AquaCrop—The FAO Crop Model to
904 Simulate Yield Response to Water: I. Concepts and Underlying Principles, Agronomy
905 Journal, 101, 426–437, <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2008.0139s>, 2009.

906 Stöckle, C. O., Donatelli, M., and Nelson, R.: CropSyst, a cropping systems simulation model,
907 European Journal of Agronomy, 18, 289–307,
908 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00109-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00109-0), 2003.

909 Tsuji, G. Y.: Understanding Options for Agricultural Production, 1st ed., Springer Netherlands,
910 Dordrecht, 1 pp., 1998.

911 Vadez, V., Grondin, A., Chenu, K., Henry, A., Laplaze, L., Millet, E. J., and Carminati, A.: Crop
912 traits and production under drought, Nat Rev Earth Environ, 5, 211–225,
913 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-023-00514-w>, 2024.

914 [van Genuchten, M. T.: A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of](https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x)
915 [unsaturated soils, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 44\(5\), 892–898,](https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x)
916 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x>, 1980.

917 Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Peña-Angulo, D., Beguería, S., Domínguez-Castro, F., Tomás-Burguera,
918 M., Noguera, I., Gimeno-Sotelo, L., and El Kenawy, A.: Global drought trends and future
919 projections, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A., 380, 20210285, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2021.0285>,
920 2022.

921 Wang, C., Liu, W., Li, Q., Ma, D., Lu, H., Feng, W., Xie, Y., Zhu, Y., and Guo, T.: Effects of
922 different irrigation and nitrogen regimes on root growth and its correlation with
923 above-ground plant parts in high-yielding wheat under field conditions, Field Crops Research,
924 165, 138–149, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2014.04.011>, 2014.

925 Wang, G., Huang, Y., Zhang, W., Yu, Y., and Sun, W.: Quantifying carbon input for targeted soil
926 organic carbon sequestration in China's croplands, Plant Soil, 394, 57–71,
927 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2508-3>, 2015.

删除[authors]: <sp>

928 Wang, L., Liu, X., Liu, X., Bao, X., Zhang, X., Yin, B., Wang, W., Wang, Y., and Zhen, W.:
 929 Effects of spring limited irrigation on grain yield and root characteristics of winter wheat in
 930 groundwater-overexploitation areas in the North China Plain, *Agricultural Water*
 931 *Management*, 294, 108729, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2024.108729>, 2024.

932 Wang, Y.: Study on the relationship among root system and shoot dry matter accumulation and
 933 yield from winter wheat under different cultivation and management modes, Henan
 934 Agricultural University, 2011

935 Wang, Y.: Studies on Formation of Root Configuration and Its Relationships to Utilization of
 936 Water and Nitrogen Fertilizers and Grain Yield in Winter Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)
 937 under Different Cultivation Management Patterns, Henan Agricultural University, 2014.

938 Wolf, J.: Calibration of WOFOST crop growth simulation model for use within CGMS, n.d.

939 Xu, H., Vandecasteele, B., Maenhout, P., Pannecoucq, J., De Neve, S., and Sleutel, S.: Maize
 940 root biomass and architecture depend on site but not on variety: Consequences for prediction
 941 of C inputs and spread in topsoil based on root-to-shoot ratios, *European Journal of*
 942 *Agronomy*, 119, 126121, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2020.126121>, 2020.

943 Xu, W., Zhang, W., Yu, Y., Sun, W., Yu, L., Shang, D., Xue, C., and Zhang, Q.: Response of crop
 944 photosynthetic product allocation under different water supply conditions: A global synthetic
 945 analysis, *Field Crops Research*, 333, 110104, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2025.110104>,
 946 2025.

947 Xu, W., Zhang, W., Yu, Y., & Zhang, Q.: Optimization code of Agro-C water module and
 948 photosynthetic product allocation module. In *Improving photo (1.0)*, Zenodo.
 949 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19970992>, 2026

950 Xue, Q., Zhu, Z., Musick, J. T., Stewart, B. A., and Dusek, D. A.: Root growth and water uptake
 951 in winter wheat under deficit irrigation, *Plant and Soil*, 257, 151–161,
 952 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026230527597>, 2003.

953 Yan, Z., Liu, Y., Gao, S., Yang, H., Feng, D., Gao, K., Ming, B., Wang, K., Hou, P., Li, S., and
 954 Xie, R.: Water management mitigates drought stress effects on maize leaf senescence and
 955 post-anthesis dry matter accumulation, *Agricultural Water Management*, 318, 109709,
 956 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2025.109709>, 2025.

957 Yang, Y., Ma, X., Yan, L., Li, Y., Wei, S., Teng, Z., Zhang, H., Tang, W., Peng, S., and Li, Y.:
 958 Soil–root interface hydraulic conductance determines responses of photosynthesis to drought
 959 in rice and wheat, *Plant Physiology*, 194, 376–390, <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiad498>,
 960 2023.

961 Yu, Y., Huang, Y., and Zhang, W.: Changes in rice yields in China since 1980 associated with
 962 cultivar improvement, climate and crop management, *Field Crops Research*, 136, 65–75,
 963 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2012.07.021>, 2012.

964 Zeitoun, M., Lankford, B., Krueger, T., Forsyth, T., Carter, R., Hoekstra, A. Y., Taylor, R., Varis,
 965 O., Cleaver, F., Boelens, R., Swatuk, L., Tickner, D., Scott, C. A., Mirumachi, N., and
 966 Matthews, N.: Reductionist and integrative research approaches to complex water security
 967 policy challenges, *Global Environmental Change*, 39, 143–154,
 968 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.04.010>, 2016.

删除[authors]: <sp>

969 Zhao, J., Xue, Q., Jessup, K. E., Hou, X., Hao, B., Marek, T. H., Xu, W., Evett, S. R.,
970 O'Shaughnessy, S. A., and Brauer, D. K.: Shoot and root traits in drought tolerant maize (*Zea*
971 *mays* L.) hybrids, *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 17, 1093–1105,
972 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(17\)61869-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(17)61869-0), 2018.

973 Zhang, Q., Zhang, W., Li, T., Sun, W., Yu, Y., and Wang, G.: Projective analysis of staple food
974 crop productivity in adaptation to future climate change in China, *Int J Biometeorol*, 61,
975 1445–1460, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-017-1322-4>, 2017.

976 Zhang, X.: Effects of Different Water-Nitrogen Treatments on Root Growth and the Accumulation
977 and Translocation of Aboveground Dry Matter together with Yield in Wheat, Henan
978 Agricultural University, 2023.

979 Zhou, D., Wang, H., Wang, X., Wang, F., Zhang, J., and Ma, D.: Evaluation of AquaCrop's
980 Ability to Simulate Water Stress Based on 2-Year Case Study of Maize Crop, *Agronomy*, 14,
981 354, <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy14020354>, 2024.

982 Zlatev, Z. and Lidon, F.: An overview on drought induced changes in plant growth, water relations
983 and photosynthesis, *Emirates Journal of Food and Agriculture*, 24, 2012

984 Zou, Y., Saddique, Q., Ali, A., Xu, J., Khan, M. I., Qing, M., ... & Siddique, K. H.: Deficit
985 irrigation improves maize yield and water use efficiency in a semi-arid environment,
986 *Agricultural Water Management*, 243, 106483, 2021.