



## Supplement of

## Evaluating the E3SM land model version 0 (ELMv0) at a temperate forest site using flux and soil water measurements

Junyi Liang et al.

Correspondence to: Junyi Liang (liangj@ornl.gov) and Gangsheng Wang (wanggs@ou.edu)

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



Figure S1: Relationship between changes in simulated annual soil respiration ( $\Delta$ SR) and gross primary production ( $\Delta$ GPP) induced by improvement of soil water potential using the Hanson model.



Figure S2 Impact of the changed SWP on the moisture modifiers of GPP (btran, a) and heterotrophic respiration ( $\xi_W$ , b). MOD<sub>default</sub>: model output before soil water potential improvement; MOD<sub>H</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model.



Figure S3 Comparison of the observed and modeled soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks. OBS: observation; MOD: model output before soil water potential improvement;  $MOD_{H}$ : model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model;  $MOD_{H_param}$ : model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model and parameter adjustments.



**Figure S4. Residual (modeled – observed) of soil respiration (SR) from 2005 to 2013.** The respective negative and positive residuals indicate that the E3SM underestimated SR during peak growing seasons and overestimated SR during other seasons.







**Figure S6 Modeled evapotranspiration (ET) and runoff in response to the improved SWP and parameter adjustments.** OBS: observation; MOD<sub>default</sub>: model output before soil water potential improvement; MOD<sub>H</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model; MOD<sub>H\_param</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model and parameter adjustments.



Figure S7 The annual mean cycles of photosynthesis (Pn), net primary production (NPP) and C allocations to fine root (Allocation<sub>froot</sub>), leaf (Allocation<sub>leaf</sub>) and woody tissue (Allocation<sub>wood</sub>). MOD<sub>default</sub>: model output before soil water potential improvement; MOD<sub>H</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model; MOD<sub>H\_param</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement using the Hanson model and parameter adjustments.



Figure S8: Annual soil respiration (SR) and gross primary production (GPP). Blue lines are the ELMv0 simulations with default parameters ( $MOD_{default}$ ), red lines with the soil water potential improved using the calibrated Clapp & Hornberger model ( $MOD_{cCP}$ ), and purple lines with the soil water potential improved using the Hanson model ( $MOD_{H}$ ). Black lines and grey area are the observed (OBS) mean and 1 sigma range, which were calculated from eight field replications for SR, and from three different net ecosystem exchange partitioning methods for GPP. The inserted bar plots are mean annual average  $\pm 1$  sigma across 2005-2011.



**Figure S9. Mean annual precipitation and evapotranspiration at the MOFLUX site from 2005 to 2013.** Both precipitation and evapotranspiration were lower in 2012 than other years. The grey bars show the multi-year standard deviation.



Figure S10. Mean annual soil water potential (SWP) at 10 cm and 100cm at the MOFLUX site. The grey bars show the multi-year standard deviation.



Figure S11. An example showing the effect of  $Q_{10}$  on the seasonality of soil heterotrophic respiration. a, soil temperature; b, temperature modifier on soil heterotrophic respiration with  $Q_{10}$  of 1.5 (blue) and 2.5 (orange).



Figure S12. Effect of  $Q_{10}$  modification on soil respiration (SR). OBS: observation; MOD<sub>H\_param</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement and parameter modification but with the default  $Q_{10}$  value (i.e., 1.5); MOD<sub>H\_param\_q</sub>: model output after soil water potential improvement and parameter modification with modified  $Q_{10}$  (i.e., 2.5). The blue and red lines are almost overlap with each other, indicating that changing  $Q_{10}$  resulted in little change in SR.