

Supplement of Biogeosciences, 17, 3733–3755, 2020
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-17-3733-2020-supplement>
© Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Supplement of


Wide discrepancies in the magnitude and direction of modeled solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence in response to light conditions

Nicholas C. Parazoo et al.

Correspondence to: Nicholas C. Parazoo (nicholas.c.parazoo@jpl.nasa.gov)


The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.

1 Supplemental




2
3 **Figure S1.** Observed diurnal cycle of PAR from two sensors at NR1, averaged from July-August
4 2017 (solid) and from July-Aug 2018 (dashed). The first sensor, LICOR LI-190R (blue), is mounted
5 on the PhotoSpec . The second sensor, SQ-500-SS (red), is mounted on the main flux tower.

6



7
 8 **Figure S2.** Observed diurnal cycle of APAR, averaged from July-August, 2017, derived for each of
 9 six below-ground sensors (color) and averaged across sensors (black). This shows the potential
 10 range of variability in observed APAR (~50%) based on location of below-canopy sensor and
 11 distribution of sunlight within heterogeneous tree canopy.

12




13

14 **Figure S3.** Example of bi-directional effects on the observed diurnal SIF pattern. Relative SIF
 15 (SIF_{rel}), shown in (C) after normalizing far red SIF (A) by far red incoming reflected radiance (B)
 16 reduces the diurnal hysteresis (early morning peak) in far red SIF. Since SIF_{rel} is dimensionless, we
 17 multiply by the ratio of daily maximum SIF to daily maximum SIF_{rel} to convert to SIF units (D).

18


19



20


21 **Figure S4.** Diurnal cycle of gross productivity production (GPP) using daytime, Lasslop
 22 partitioning (red) and nighttime, Reichstein partitioning (blue), averaged from July-August in
 23 2017 (solid) and from 2015-2018 (dashed). Both partitioning techniques show an afternoon
 24 depression, consistent with PAR (Fig S1) and APAR (Fig S2).

25



26

27 **Figure S5.** Simulated quantum yields in *SCOPE-exp2* for (a) fluorescence (ϕ_F), (b) photochemistry
 28 (ϕ_P), and (c) non photochemical quenching (ϕ_{npq}). *SCOPE-exp2* accounts for NPQ in drought
 29 stressed Mediterranean species (Table 1). Results are shown for top of canopy (maroon) and the
 30 canopy average (red), the latter representing the average of leaf-level yields through shaded and
 31 non-shaded portions of the canopy. Results show increased ϕ_F in the canopy average due to the
 32 larger contribution of shaded leaves.




33

34 **Figure S6.** Observed and simulated emissions of SIF for different illumination conditions at diurnal
 35 (left, hourly) and synoptic (right, 5-day) scale. Illumination conditions are separated into direct vs
 36 diffuse light for PhotoSpec, shaded vs sunlit canopies for CLM4.5, and classified as either low light
 37 (diffuse/shaded) or high light (direct/sunlit). (top row) Emissions from low light (dotted) and high
 38 light (dashed) conditions, with the total emission in solid; (middle row) Ratio of SIF emission in
 39 high light vs low light conditions; (bottom row) Sunlit and shaded portion of LAI in CLM4.5.

40 Observed values are shown for absolute and relative SIF (black and grey lines, respectively),
41 where diffuse and direct light are calculated based on the 0.5 threshold (Sec 2.2.2). SIF_{rel} is
42 plotted to alleviate the effect of viewing angle in the morning and afternoon, which has little
43 impact on observed SIF emission in diffuse vs direct light. Model values (orange) are derived
44 from CLM4.5-exp3 (seasonal and reversible NPQ) for sunlit and shaded portions of the canopy,
45 where shaded represents the fraction of the canopy that is self-shaded, and sunlit is the fraction
46 that is not self-shaded. Given differences in diurnal and synoptic variability of atmospheric
47 conditions driving direct vs diffuse light, and self shading in the canopy due to sun angle, these
48 results are meant for general comparison of lighting effects rather than model validation.


49



50

51 **Figure S7.** Simulated diurnal cycles of canopy SIF (top row), Leaf-level SIF (2nd row), Leaf Area
 52 Index (LAI, 3rd row), photosynthesis (4th row), and light saturation (bottom row) for three CLM4.5
 53 experiments. Results are shown as total amounts in the left column, and partitioned by sunlit and
 54 shaded fractions in the middle and right columns, respectively.

55



56

57 **Figure S8.** Observed and predicted relationship between GPP and SIF yields. Regression lines for
 58 (A) observed SIF_{yield} vs GPP_{yield} (B) model simulated SIF_{yield} vs GPP_{yield} , and (c) model
 59 simulated fluorescence quantum yield (ϕ_f) vs photochemical quantum yield (ϕ_p). Observed
 60 regressions of absolute SIF (black) and relative SIF (grey) shown in (A). Correlations between
 61 observed yields and model yields are shown in legends in (A) and (B), respectively.

62