

2009

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity at a site in the Loess Plateau of China

Z. Gao
Chinese Academy of Sciences

L. Wang
Chinese Academy of Sciences

R. Horton
Iowa State University, rhorton@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/agron_pubs



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#), [Soil Science Commons](#), and the [Statistical Models Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/agron_pubs/384. For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Agronomy at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Agronomy Publications by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity at a site in the Loess Plateau of China

Abstract

Soil thermal diffusivity is a crucial physical parameter that affects soil temperature. Six prevalent algorithms to calculate soil thermal diffusivity are inter-compared by using soil temperature data collected at the depths of 0.05 m and 0.10 m at a bare site in the China Loess Plateau from DOY 201 through DOY 207 in 2005. Five of the six algorithms (i.e., Amplitude, Phase, Arctangent, Logarithm, and Harmonic or HM algorithms) are developed from the traditional one-dimensional heat conduction equation. The other algorithm is based on the one-dimensional heat conduction-convection equation which considers the vertical heterogeneity of thermal diffusivity in soil and couples thermal conduction and convection processes (hereinafter referred to as the Conduction-convection algorithm). To assess these six algorithms, we (1) calculate the soil thermal diffusivities by using each of the algorithms, (2) use the soil thermal diffusivities to predict soil temperature at the 0.10 m depth, and (3) compare the estimated soil temperature against direct measurements. Results show that (1) HM algorithm gives the most reliable estimates among the traditional five algorithms; and (2) generally, the Conduction-convection algorithm provides the second best estimates. Among all of the algorithms, the HM algorithm has the best description of the upper boundary temperature with time, but it only includes conduction heat transfer in the soil. Compared to the HM algorithm, the Conduction-convection algorithm has a less accurate description of the upper boundary temperature, but by accounting for the vertical gradient of soil diffusivity and the water flux density it includes more physics in the soil heat transfer process. The Conduction-convection algorithm has potential application within land surface models, but future effort should be made to combine the HM and Conduction-convection algorithms in order to make use of the advantages of each.

Disciplines

Agriculture | Soil Science | Statistical Models

Comments

This article is published as Gao, Z., L. Wang, and R. Horton. 2009. Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil apparent thermal diffusivity at a site in the Loess Plateau of China. *Hydrol. Earth Sys. Sci. Discuss.* 6:2247-2274. Posted with permission.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).

Papers published in *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* are under open-access review for the journal *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity at a site in the Loess Plateau of China

Z. Gao^{1,2}, L. Wang¹, and R. Horton³

¹State Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer Physics and Atmospheric Chemistry, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, CAS, Beijing, China

²State Key Laboratory of Severe Weather, Chinese Academy of Meteorological Science, CMA, Beijing, China

³Department of Agronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, USA

Received: 26 January 2009 – Accepted: 6 February 2009 – Published: 12 March 2009

Correspondence to: Z. Gao (zgao@mail.iap.ac.cn)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

HESSD

6, 2247–2274, 2009

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Abstract

Soil thermal diffusivity is a crucial physical parameter that affects soil temperature. Six prevalent algorithms to calculate soil thermal diffusivity are inter-compared by using soil temperature data collected at the depths of 0.05 m and 0.10 m at a bare site in the China Loess Plateau from DOY 201 through DOY 207 in 2005. Five of the six algorithms (i.e., Amplitude, Phase, Arctangent, Logarithm, and Harmonic or HM algorithms) are developed from the traditional one-dimensional heat conduction equation. The other algorithm is based on the one-dimensional heat conduction-convection equation which considers the vertical heterogeneity of thermal diffusivity in soil and couples thermal conduction and convection processes (hereinafter referred to as the Conduction-convection algorithm). To assess these six algorithms, we (1) calculate the soil thermal diffusivities by using each of the algorithms, (2) use the soil thermal diffusivities to predict soil temperature at the 0.10 m depth, and (3) compare the estimated soil temperature against direct measurements. Results show that (1) HM algorithm gives the most reliable estimates among the traditional five algorithms; and (2) generally, the Conduction-convection algorithm provides the second best estimates. Among all of the algorithms, the HM algorithm has the best description of the upper boundary temperature with time, but it only includes conduction heat transfer in the soil. Compared to the HM algorithm, the Conduction-convection algorithm has a less accurate description of the upper boundary temperature, but by accounting for the vertical gradient of soil diffusivity and the water flux density it includes more physics in the soil heat transfer process. The Conduction-convection algorithm has potential application within land surface models, but future effort should be made to combine the HM and Conduction-convection algorithms in order to make use of the advantages of each.

HESSD

6, 2247–2274, 2009

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

1 Introduction

Soil temperature plays an important role in land surface processes, and it is critical in energy balance applications such as land surface modeling, numerical weather forecasting, and climate prediction (Holmes et al., 2008). It is especially true for the soil surface. Accurate prediction of soil surface temperature requires a realistic understanding of the soil thermal properties, i.e., thermal conductivity (λ), thermal diffusivity (k), and volumetric heat capacity (C_g). The volumetric heat capacity C_g can be estimated as follows (De Vries, 1963),

$$C_g = (1 - \eta_s)C_s + \eta C_w, \quad (1)$$

where η is the volumetric water content, η_s is the saturated value of η , and C_s and C_w are the volumetric heat capacities of dry soil and water respectively. If C_g is known, only thermal conductivity, λ , or thermal diffusivity, k , must be determined to characterize the thermal properties of a soil (Passerat et al., 1996). k is of primary importance in determining soil temperature propagation (Zhang and Osterkamp, 1995).

Several algorithms have been proposed to estimate soil thermal diffusivity. Most of the algorithms are based on solutions of the one-dimensional conduction heat transfer equation. Lettau (1971) calculated the thermal diffusivity as a function of depth below the soil surface. In order to utilize this algorithm, measurements of soil temperature with time are required at the soil surface and at several subsurface depths. However, the lack of soil temperature data at several subsurface depths often limits the utility of this algorithm (Horton et al., 1983). Assuming that the thermal diffusivity is independent of depth, and considering that temperature at the upper boundary is well described by a sinusoidal function, the analytical solution of the one-dimensional heat conduction equation can be used to estimate k . Based on this solution, the thermal diffusivity can be estimated by the Amplitude algorithm and Phase algorithm. Errors due to the assumption of single sinusoidal temperature wave at the soil surface can be reduced by using a Fourier series to accurately describe the diurnal variation in surface soil temperature (Van Wijk, 1963). In this way, the thermal diffusivity is estimated by

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



the Arctangent algorithm (Nerpin and Chudnovskii, 1967) with two harmonics. It was shown by Seemann (1979) that, in analogy to the Arctangent algorithm, the thermal diffusivity can also be calculated by the Logarithmic algorithm. These two algorithms are analogous to the Amplitude algorithm and Phase algorithm but take advantage of greater number of temperature observations to approximate a potentially nonsinusoidal behavior (Horton et al., 1983). However, a two-harmonic function cannot describe the surface temperature very well, and a series of harmonics for the upper boundary offers advantages. Based on this boundary, the solution of the one-dimensional heat conduction equation is developed from the assumption of a sinusoidal function. According to the solution, the thermal diffusivity can be selected to minimize the sum of squared differences between the calculated and measured soil temperature values (Horton et al., 1983). And it can also be estimated from an iteration process by fitting the amplitude and phase of soil temperature at one depth (Heusinkveld et al., 2004). All algorithms mentioned above are based on solutions of the one-dimensional conduction heat equation and constant diffusivity, and thus apply to uniform soils only. In fact, soil heat transfer is caused by a combination of conduction and intra-porous convection (Passerat et al., 1996). Gao et al. (2003) pointed out that soil temperature changes in response to both conduction and convection processes, where convection was understood as “vertical heat transfer caused by the vertical movement of liquid water in the soil”. They solved analytically the equation for one-dimensional conduction-convection, and derived a simple algorithm to accurately estimate soil thermal diffusivity.

Few efforts have been made to quantitatively test the various k algorithms by using an identical soil temperature data set. The land-air interaction over the Loess Plateau located in mid-western China affects the weather and climate in northwest China. A realistic description of soil temperature helps better understanding the land-air interaction over the Loess Plateau however few attempts have been made to determine the Loess Plateau soil thermal parameters for soil temperature algorithms. The measurements of soil temperature and soil water content during the LOess Plateau land surface process field EXperiment (LOPEX) in 2005 provided us an opportunity to evaluate the k algo-

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

rithms for use on Loess Plateau soil. In order to improve the accurate knowledge of the soil thermal diffusivity in this area, the objective of this paper is to compare six algorithms for determination of the soil thermal diffusivity by using the direct measurements of soil temperature restricted to the upper 0.1 m of soil.

5 2 Theoretical considerations

Previous algorithms to calculate soil thermal diffusivity k are listed in the supplement Table 1 <http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/6/2247/2009/hessd-6-2247-2009-supplement.pdf>.

2.1 Classical thermal conduction equation for soil temperature

10 Conduction heat transfer in a one-dimensional isotropic medium is described by

$$C_g \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right), \quad (2)$$

where T is the soil temperature (K), t the time (s), z the depth (m), C_g the volumetric heat capacity, and λ the thermal conductivity ($\text{W m}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$). Assuming that a soil is vertically homogeneous, in this case that C_g and λ are independent of depth, provides

$$15 C_g \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2}, \quad (3)$$

where the thermal diffusivity $k = \lambda / C_g (\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1})$. The following five algorithms based on the solution of Eq. (3) have been used to estimate k .

2.1.1 Amplitude algorithm

Given the surface boundary condition:

$$20 T \Big|_{z=0} = \bar{T} + A \sin(\omega t + \Phi), \quad (t \geq 0), \quad (4)$$

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where \bar{T} is the mean soil surface temperature, A is the amplitude of the diurnal soil surface temperature wave, and ω is the angular velocity of the Earth's rotation and $\omega=2\pi/P$ (rad s⁻¹) with P representing the period of the diurnal cycle. The soil temperature (T) at a depth z can be calculated via

$$5 \quad T(z, t) = \bar{T} + A \exp(-z/d) \sin(\omega t - z/d + \Phi), \quad (5)$$

here $d = \sqrt{2k/\omega}$ is the damping depth of the diurnal temperature wave.

Soil temperature measured at two different depths (z_1 and z_2) are often assumed to be approximated by a sinusoidal function when estimating k . The sinusoidal functions are given by

$$10 \quad T \Big|_{z=z_1} = \bar{T}_1 + A_1 \sin(\omega t + \Phi_1), \quad (6)$$

$$\text{and } T \Big|_{z=z_2} = \bar{T}_2 + A_2 \sin(\omega t + \Phi_2), \quad (7)$$

where A_1 (A_2), Φ_1 (Φ_2) and \bar{T}_1 (\bar{T}_2) are the amplitude, phase and mean soil temperature at the depth z_1 (z_2). \bar{T}_1 (\bar{T}_2) is the arithmetical average of the daytime maximum soil temperature and the nighttime minimum soil temperature; and A_1 (A_2) is half of the difference between the daytime maximum value and the nighttime minimum value for soil depth of z_1 (z_2); and Φ_1 (Φ_2) is the initial phase of soil temperature at depth z_1 (z_2), obtained by using the best fit algorithm (Horton et al., 1983). Then the thermal diffusivity k is determined by the Amplitude algorithm

$$15 \quad k = \frac{\omega(z_1 - z_2)^2}{2 \ln(A_1/A_2)^2}. \quad (8)$$

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

2.1.2 Phase algorithm

If the time interval between the measured occurrences of maximum soil temperature at the depths of z_1 and z_2 is $\Delta t = t_2 - t_1$, the Phase algorithm stemming from Eq. (4) is (Horton et al., 1983)

$$k = \frac{\omega(z_1 - z_2)^2}{2(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2)^2}. \quad (9)$$

2.1.3 Arctangent algorithm

Soil surface temperature can be described by a Fourier series:

$$T = \bar{T} + \sum_{i=1}^n [a_i \sin(i\omega t) + b_i \cos(i\omega t)], \quad (10)$$

where n is the number of harmonics, and a_i and b_i are the amplitudes. With boundary condition $n=2$, k can be calculated by the Arctangent algorithm

$$k = \frac{\omega \Delta z^2}{2 \left\{ \arctan \left[\frac{(T_1 - T_3)(T_2' - T_4') - (T_2 - T_4)(T_1' - T_3')}{(T_1 - T_3)(T_1' - T_3') + (T_2 - T_4)(T_2' - T_4')} \right] \right\}^2}, \quad (11)$$

where temperatures T_j and T_j' are recorded each 6 h ($j=1, 2, 3$, and 4) at two different depths z_1 and z_2 , respectively. The first reading is taken at 02:00 (Local time, hereinafter, referred to as LT), then 08:00 (LT), 14:00 (LT), 20:00 (LT).

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Logarithmic algorithm

Using the same assumption of the Arctangent algorithm, k is expressed by

$$k = \left\{ \frac{0.0121\Delta z}{\ln \left\{ \frac{[(T_1 - T_3)^2 + (T_2 - T_4)^2]}{[(T'_1 - T'_3)^2 + (T'_2 - T'_4)^2]} \right\}} \right\}^2. \quad (12)$$

Harmonic algorithm

Equation (10) can also be changed into another form as

$$T = \bar{T} + \sum_{i=1}^n C_i \sin(i\omega t + \Phi_i), \quad (13)$$

where C_i is the amplitude of the harmonic i :

$$C_i = \sqrt{a_i^2 + b_i^2}, \quad (14)$$

and Φ_i is the phase of the harmonic i :

$$\Phi_i = \arctan(a_i/b_i) \text{ or } \arcsin(a_i/C_i) \text{ depending on the quadrant.} \quad (15)$$

Given the following boundary condition:

$$T \Big|_{z=0} = \bar{T} + \sum_{i=1}^n C_{0i} \sin(i\omega t + \Phi_{0i}), \quad (t \geq 0), \quad (16)$$

the solution of Eq. (3) is

$$T(z, t) = \bar{T} + \sum_{i=1}^n C_{0i} \exp(-z/d_i) \sin(i\omega t + \Phi_i - z/d_i), \quad (17)$$

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where C_{0i} and Φ_{0i} are the amplitude and phase of the harmonic i for the upper depth, respectively, and $d_i = \sqrt{2k/(i\omega)}$ corresponds to the depth at which the signal is propagated during a period P/i . Based on Eq. (17), the thermal diffusivity k can be determined by the Least Squares Algorithm (Horton et al., 1983). On the other hand, C_{1i} (C_{2i}) and Φ_{1i} (Φ_{2i}) at the depth of z_1 (z_2) can be obtained by the approximation of the observed data at these two depths with the harmonic curve fit. In addition, according to Eq. (17), the amplitude C_{2i} and initial phase Φ_{2i} at the depth of z_2 can be predicted from

$$C_{2i} = C_{1i} \exp(-z/d_i), \quad (18)$$

$$\text{and } \Phi_{2i} = \Phi_{1i} - z/d_i. \quad (19)$$

After an initial guess of k , the predicted results of amplitude and initial phase are compared with the fitted ones, and the parameter is adjusted depending on the differences in amplitude and initial phase (Heusinkveld et al., 2004).

2.2 Soil temperature rate equation with vertical heterogeneity of soil thermal diffusivity coupled with thermal conduction and heat transfer by water flux

Equation (3) assumes that k is independent of depth, however, k can vary (increase or decrease) from the surface downward in the shallow surface layer of most soils. Equation (2) can therefore be improved as follows (Gao et al., 2008):

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{C_g} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{C_g} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{C_g} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial z} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \approx k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial k}{\partial z} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}. \quad (20)$$

Neglecting the vertical heterogeneity of k , Gao et al. (2003) incorporated thermal conduction and convection together as follows:

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} - \frac{C_w}{C_g} w \theta \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}. \quad (21)$$

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where w is the liquid flow rate (positive downward) and θ is the volumetric water content of the soil. C_w is the heat capacity of water. Assuming these three parameters are also independent of z for a thin soil layer in present work. $-\frac{C_w}{C_g}w\theta$ was defined as water flux by Gao et al. (2003). Based on Eqs. (19) and (21), Gao et al. (2008) presented the following equation

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + W \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}, \quad (22)$$

where $W = \frac{\partial k}{\partial z} - \frac{C_w}{C_g}w\theta$ consisted of the vertical gradient of soil diffusivity ($\frac{\partial k}{\partial z}$) and the water flux density ($-\frac{C_w}{C_g}w\theta$).

With the boundary condition Eq. (7), the expression of the soil temperature at the depth z_1 is

$$T(z_1, t) = \bar{T}_1 + A_2 \exp[-\alpha(z_1 - z_2)M] \sin[\omega t + \Phi_2 - \alpha(z_1 - z_2)N], \quad (23)$$

where $M = \frac{\alpha}{\omega} \{W + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [W^2 + (W^4 + \frac{4\omega^4}{\alpha^4})^{1/2}]^{1/2}\}$ and $N = \sqrt{2}(\frac{\omega}{\alpha}) [W^2 + (W^4 + \frac{4\omega^4}{\alpha^4})^{1/2}]^{-1/2}$.

They also gave the expression of k and W

$$k = - \frac{(z_1 - z_2)^2 \omega \ln(A_1/A_2)}{(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2) \left[(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2)^2 + \ln^2(A_1/A_2) \right]}, \quad (24)$$

$$W = \frac{\omega(z_1 - z_2)}{\Phi_1 - \Phi_2} \left[\frac{2 \ln^2(A_1/A_2)}{(\Phi_1 - \Phi_2)^2 + \ln^2(A_1/A_2)} - 1 \right]. \quad (25)$$

We call it as the Conduction-convection algorithm in this paper. Applying $W=0$ to Eq. (25) results in $\Phi_2 - \Phi_1 = -\ln(A_2/A_1)$ or $-\ln(A_2/A_1) = \Phi_2 - \Phi_1$, then Eq. (24) reduces to be Eq. (8) or Eq. (9).

3 Field experiments

The experiment was conducted on soil in the China Loess Plateau during an intensive observation period from DOY 197 through 241 in LOPEX in 2005. The soil measurements were collected at a bare soil site located at 106.42° E, 35.35° N at an altitude of 1592 m in Pingliang county of Gansu Province in western China.

The ground surface of this site was bare, flat and homogeneous. The soil at the site was predominantly medium loam with a high proportion of silt. The site is located within a semiarid climate zone. The maximum air temperature was 307 K and the lowest was 249 K, the annual air temperature and precipitation were 279 K and 510 mm with 2425 h of sunshine, and 170 frost-free days per year all averaged over the last 50 years (Gao et al., 2008).

Soil temperature was measured with four TCAV averaging soil thermocouple probes (Campbell Scientific Inc., USA) at 0.05 and 0.10 m depths. The volumetric water content of the soil was measured at 0.05 and 0.10 m depths by two soil moisture reflectometers (CS615, Campbell Scientific Inc. USA). All of the sensor outputs were recorded and averaged over 10 min intervals.

4 Results

The data used in this paper were collected in a 7-day period from (DOYs 201 through 207 (i.e., 20 through 26 July), 2005. The soil temperature measured at 0.05 and 0.10 m depths changed diurnally during DOYs 203–207, as shown in Fig. 1a. The amplitudes of the soil temperature decreased and the phases shifted ahead when the soil depth increased. The soil temperature at 0.05 m changed in response to intermittent cloudiness during DOYs 202 and 203. The maximum soil temperature reached 310.78 K on DOY 204, and the minimum soil temperature was 287.77 K at 0.05 m depth on DOY 203. Figure 1a also shows that the soil vertical temperature gradient reached 191.20 K m⁻¹ for the soil layer from 0.05 to 0.10 m depths at 14:45 (LT) on DOY 204 at this site.

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The temporal variations in volumetric soil water content at 0.05 and 0.10 m depths during the same period are shown in Fig. 1b. Precipitation occurred from DOYs 199 to 201 with an amount of 15.7 mm. Since then, owing to evaporation from the bare soil surface, the soil volumetric water content was decreasing gradually at both depths from DOYs 202 through 207. Gao et al. (2008) pointed out that under evaporation conditions there is a net upward flux of water (liquid and vapor) that responds to the progressively drying surface condition. The net flux of water causes an associated net convective heat flux. The soil physics implies that the heat transfer should incorporate a vertical convective heat transfer component. Figure 1b also shows that the soil volumetric water content changed diurnally and soil volumetric water content at the shallow level was lower than that at the deeper level in rain-free days.

After using a 2-h smoothing technique for soil temperature measured at the depth of 0.05 m, A_1 , A_2 , Φ_1 , Φ_2 , \bar{T}_1 , \bar{T}_2 , \bar{T} , C_i and Φ_i are obtained by using the approximation of soil temperature collected at the depths of 0.05 m and 0.10 m for each day, respectively. The temporal variations of k are calculated by using the Amplitude, Phase, Conduction-convection and HM algorithms (Horton et al., 1983; Heusinkveld et al., 2004; Gao et al., 2008) for the soil layer from 0.05 m to 0.10 m. Temperatures at each depth for the arbitrary times of 02:00 (LT), 08:00 (LT), 14:00 (LT), and 20:00 (LT) were used for Arctangent algorithm and Logarithmic algorithm. Results are shown in Fig. 2. The Amplitude, Arctangent, Logarithmic and HM algorithms provided relatively low values of k during this period. This is especially true for the Arctangent algorithm. The Phase algorithm and the Conduction-convection algorithm provided k values approximately twice as large as the other algorithms. The two HM algorithms provided similar values of k . The thermal diffusivity estimated by the Logarithmic algorithm changed from day to day in the drying period. The maximum, minimum and mean values of k calculated by these six algorithms are listed in Table 1. The smallest value of k is $0.6 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, and it is obtained from the Arctangent algorithm on DOY 202. The maximum value is $5.47 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, and it is obtained from the Phase algorithm on DOY 207. The maximum, minimum and mean values of k calculated by the Phase al-

gorithm and by the Conduction-convection algorithm are larger than the values derived by the other algorithms. The two HM algorithms and the Amplitude algorithm provide similar estimates of the mean values of k .

5 Discussion

5 The variations of the thermal diffusivity k obtained by the six algorithms with the volumetric soil water content θ for the 0.05 m to 0.10 m layer are shown in Fig. 3. Estimates of k from five of the six algorithms change in a narrow range with θ during this drying period ($\theta < 25\%$). The exception is the Logarithmic algorithm. The values of k from the Phase algorithm and the Conduction-convection algorithm have similar trends with θ . The variations of k shown by the other four algorithms show a similar trend with θ . These results make sense because values of k from the Phase and the Conduction-convection algorithms mainly depend on $\Phi_1 - \Phi_2$, while estimates of k with the other algorithms mainly depend on the amplitude. All of the algorithms indicate that the largest value of k does not occur at the largest soil water content. Earlier researchers
10 have reported that k does not monotonically increase with increasing θ . It tends to increase as dry soil begins to wet, but it approaches a constant value or even decreases as the soil continues to wet.

In the Conduction-convection algorithm, another parameter W is needed and is calculated with Eq. (25) (see values in Table 2).

20 The measured and modeled soil temperatures at the 0.10 m depth from DOY 201 through 207 are presented in Fig. 4. It is obvious that the fitted temperature by using Arctangent, Logarithmic and the two HM algorithms gave poor approximation in the early morning of DOY 203 because the assumption of repeating surface periodic temperature is not valid between DOY 202 and 203. To better show the model outputs, we take DOY 204 as an example (see Fig. 5). Overall, The Phase algorithm reasonably estimated the soil temperature phases but overestimated the amplitudes, and the amplitude algorithm reasonably estimated the soil temperature amplitudes but overestimated
25

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

the phase shift. In fact, as shown in Table 3, the values of $\ln(A_1/A_2)$ are larger than $\Phi_1 - \Phi_2$ for the whole 7-day period. Using the Phase algorithm to estimate k implies forcing $\ln(A_1/A_2)$ to be equal to $\Phi_1 - \Phi_2$, which overestimates the soil temperature amplitude by about 0.74 K on average for DOYs 201 to 207. Similarly, using the Amplitude algorithm to estimate k implies that $\Phi_1 - \Phi_2$ is equal to $\ln(A_1/A_2)$, which overestimates the soil temperature phase shift by $\ln(A_1/A_2) - (\Phi_1 - \Phi_2) = 0.2397$ rad (55 min) on average for DOYs 201 to 207.

The Logarithmic and Arctangent algorithms require four pairs of soil temperature measurements. The modeled k values are very sensitive to the measurement time of four pairs of soil temperatures, so we have to average the calculated values of k for different selections of four pairs of soil temperatures for each day.

The two HM algorithms generated similar values of k . For most of the study days, the HM algorithm gave realistic estimations of soil temperature at the depth of 0.10 m. However, as mentioned above, it did not give a good estimation in the early morning of DOY 203 because of the invalid assumption of the repeating periodic for soil temperature. Results obtained by two HM algorithms indicate that fitting measurements of soil temperature by using the Least Squares approach directly and simultaneously determining the amplitude and initial phase of the soil temperature may provide realistic values of k . Comparison of the results obtained by the HM algorithms, Phase algorithm, Amplitude algorithm, Logarithmic algorithm and Arctangent algorithm shows that the HM algorithms gave the most accurate values of k . This conclusion agrees with those by both Horton et al. (1983) and Verhoef et al. (1996).

The Conduction-convection algorithm provided realistic daytime soil temperature values. However, it underestimated the soil temperature during the period from 18:00 (LT) to 08:00 (LT), and a noteworthy difference between the measurements and the model output occurred around 00:00 (LT) for all days in this study. A similar underestimation was also encountered by Lin (1980) and Gao et al. (2008). Our explanation is that the model always keeps W constant although the actual W may decrease to zero or even become negative during the nighttime, and also the model does not account for water

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

phase changes that usually happen in shallow soil during the nighttime.

Scatter plots of soil temperature modeled by using the six algorithms against the measured soil temperature at the depth of 0.1 m are given in Fig. 6. The results show that the HM algorithms and Conduction-convection algorithm generated larger correlation coefficients (r), than did the other algorithms. All of the regression lines had slopes of 1.

Statistical analyses are also used to examine the error of model output as follows,

$$SEE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (T_m - T)^2}{n - 2}}, \quad (26)$$

$$NSEE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (T_m - T)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n T^2}}. \quad (27)$$

Where T_m is modeled temperature; T is measured temperature; n is the total number of data points; SEE is the standard error of the estimate; and NSEE is a normalized SEE which denotes an estimate of relative uncertainty. The statistical indices SEE and NSEE are presented in Table 4 for the modeled period. It is obvious that the HM algorithm has the lowest values both of SEE and NSEE. The Conduction-convection algorithm has the second lowest values of SEE and NSEE.

Another comparison of the accuracies of the six algorithms is shown in Fig. 7 using the empirical probability distribution functions (PDF) of difference between the modeled and measured soil temperatures at the depth of 0.10 m. The differences between the modeled and measured soil temperatures using the HM algorithm ranged between -1 K and 1 K, and most were near zero. The Conduction-convection algorithm generated the second best results.

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

6 Conclusions

Six algorithms for calculating soil thermal diffusivity are evaluated with shallow soil measurements collected during LOPEX in 2005. The Phase algorithm and the Amplitude algorithm overestimated the phase and overestimated the amplitude of the soil temperature, respectively. Although the Arctangent algorithm and the Logarithmic algorithm only required four measures of temperature spaced equally in time at two depths, the timing of the four measures of temperature affected the values of soil thermal diffusivity greatly. The HM algorithm gave a reasonable result for most days. However, the assumption of repeating periodicity for soil temperature is invalid on cloudy or rainy days. The algorithms mentioned above are based upon the one-dimensional conduction equation. The Conduction-convection algorithm which is based on the one-dimensional conduction-convection equation, provided satisfactory results for daytime temperatures, but it systematically underestimated nighttime soil temperatures. Overall, the Conduction-convection algorithm provided better results than all of the other algorithms except for the HM algorithm. Future efforts should focus on combining the HM and the Conduction-convection algorithms in order to develop an improved method that combines the advantages of each algorithm. The new method should include multiple harmonics to describe the upper boundary temperatures and include conduction and convection heat transfer processes.

Acknowledgements. This study was supported by MOST (2006CB403600, 2006CB400500), by CMA (GYHY(QX)2007-6-5), and by the Centurial Program sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Sciences. The work described in this publication was also supported by the European Commission (Call FP7-ENV-2007-1 Grant nr. 212921) as part of the CEOP – AEGIS project (<http://www.ceop-aegis.org/>) coordinated by the Université Louis Pasteur. This study was partly supported by the Hatch Act and State of Iowa funds. The LOPEX05 field campaign was supported by a grant from the Centurial Program sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Sciences (2004406) and the field station foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Equipment and logistical support was from the Pingliang Lightning and Hail Storm Experiment Station of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

References

- Gao, Z., Fan, X., and Bian, L.: An analytical solution to one-dimensional thermal conduction-convection in soil, *Soil Sci.*, 168, 99–107, 2003.
- 5 Gao, Z., Lenschow, D. H., Horton, R., Zhou, M., Wang, L., and Wen, J.: Comparison of Two Soil Temperature Algorithms for a Bare Ground Site on the Loess Plateau in China, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, doi:10.1029/2008JD010285, 2008.
- Heusinkveld, B. G., Jacobs, A. F. G., Holtslag, A. A. M., and Berkowicz, S. M.: Surface energy balance closure in an arid region: role of soil heat flux, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 122, 21–31, 2004.
- 10 Holmes, T. R. H., Owe, M., Jeu De, R. A. M., and Kooi, H.: Estimating soil temperature profile from a single depth observation: A simple empirical heat flow solution, *Water Resour. Res.*, 44, W02412, doi:10.1029/2007WR005994, 2008.
- Horton, R., Wierenga, P. J., and Nielsen, D. R.: Evaluation of methods for determination apparent thermal diffusivity of soil near the surface, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 47, 23–32, 1983.
- 15 Lettau, B.: Determination of thermal diffusion in the upper layers of a natural ground cover, *Soil Sci.*, 112, 173–177, 1971.
- Lin, J. D.: On the force-restore method for prediction of ground surface temperature, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85(C6), 3251–3254, 1980.
- Nerpin, S. V. and Chudnovskii, A. F.: *Physics of the soil*, Israel Program for Scientific Translations, Keter press, Jerusalem, 194–233, 1967.
- 20 Passerat de Silans, A. M. B., Monteny, B. A., and Lhomme, J. P.: Apparent soil thermal diffusivity, a case study: HAPEX-Sahel experiment, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 81, 201–216, 1996.
- Seemann, J.: *Measurement technology, Agrometeorology*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 40–45, 1979.
- 25 Zhang, T. and Osterkamp, T. E.: Considerations in determining thermal diffusivity from temperature time series using finite difference methods, *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.*, 23, 333–341, 1995.
- Van Wijk, W. R. and De Vries, D. A.: Periodic temperature variations in a homogeneous soil, in: *Physics of Plant Environment*, edited by: Van Wijk, W. R., North-Holland Amsterdam, 103–143, 1963.
- 30 Verhoef, A., Van den Hurk, B. J., Jacobs, J. M., and Heusinkveld, A. F. G.: Thermal soil properties for a vineyard (EFEDA-I) and a savanna (HAPEX-Sahel) site, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 78, 1–18, 1996.

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Table 1. The maximums, minimums and mean values of k calculated by six algorithms for the layer of 0.05–0.10 m on the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

Name	Max ($k \times 10^7$)	Min ($k \times 10^7$)	Mean ($k \times 10^7$)
Phase algorithm	5.47	2.45	4.24
Amplitude algorithm	2.65	1.69	2.06
Arctangent algorithm	1.60	0.60	1.07
Logarithmic algorithm	3.93	1.50	2.34
HM (Horton et al., 1983)	3.02	1.42	2.22
HM (Heusinkveld et al., 2004)	2.73	1.66	2.30
Conduction-convection algorithm	4.65	2.43	3.92

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Table 2. The values of W calculated by Conduction-convection algorithm for the layer of 0.05–0.10 m on the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

DOY	W ($\times 10^7 \text{ m s}^{-1}$)
201	0.722
202	2.755
203	1.454
204	3.112
205	2.453
206	3.669
207	4.696

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Table 3. The values of the phase shift and the logarithm of amplitude ratio of soil temperature obtained by using one sine function approximation algorithm at the 0.05 m and 0.10 m depths on the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

DOY	$\Phi_1 - \Phi_2$	$\ln(A_1/A_2)$
201	0.6008	0.6875
202	0.4788	0.7001
203	0.4819	0.5858
204	0.4367	0.6468
205	0.4587	0.6316
206	0.4367	0.7008
207	0.4078	0.7323

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.

Table 4. Computed Standard Error of the Estimate (SEE) and Normalized Standard Error of the Estimate (NSEE) of soil temperature at 0.10 m depth on the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

Name	SEE	NSEE
Phase algorithm	0.8288	0.0028
Amplitude algorithm	0.6481	0.0022
Arctangent algorithm	1.2693	0.0043
Logarithmic algorithm	0.9796	0.0033
HM (Horton et al., 1983)	0.1963	0.0006
HM (Heusinkveld et al., 2004)	0.2132	0.0007
Conduction-convection algorithm	0.5091	0.0017

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 1. Temporal variations of (a) soil temperature (K) and (b) soil water content (%) measured at depths of 0.05 m and 0.10 m at a bare soil site over the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 through DOY 207, 2005.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 2. Temporal variation of soil thermal diffusivity k ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$) at a bare soil site over the Loess Plateau from DOY 201 through 207, 2005.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)


[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 3. Variation of soil thermal diffusivity k ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$) with volumetric soil water content θ (%) at a bare soil site over the Loess Plateau from DOYs 201 through 207, 2005.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 4. Comparisons of soil temperature modeled by using Phase algorithm, Amplitude algorithm, Arctangent algorithm, Logarithmic algorithm, algorithm by Horton et al. (1983), algorithm by Heusinkveld et al. (2004), and Conduction-convection algorithm, against measurements of soil temperature at 0.10 m depth at a bare soil site over the Loess Plateau from DOYs 201 through 207, 2005.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

⏪ ⏩

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 5. Comparisons of soil temperature modeled by using Phase algorithm, Amplitude algorithm, Arctangent algorithm, Logarithmic algorithm, algorithm by Horton et al. (1983), algorithm by Heusinkveld et al. (2004), and Conduction-convection algorithm, against measurements of soil temperature at 0.10 m depth at a bare soil site over the Loess Plateau on DOY 204, 2005.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 6. Scatter plots of the temperature modeled by using Phase algorithm, Amplitude algorithm, Arc tangent algorithm, Logarithmic algorithm, Horton et al. (1983), Heusinkveld et al. (2004), and Conduction-convection algorithm for the soil depth of 0.10 m against the soil temperature at 0.10 m depth from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Comparison of six algorithms to determine the soil thermal diffusivity

Z. Gao et al.




Fig. 7. Empirical probability distribution function, PDF, of subtraction between the temperature modeled by using the Phase algorithm, Amplitude algorithm, Arctangent algorithm, Logarithmic algorithm, Horton et al. (1983), Heusinkveld et al. (2004), and Conduction-convection algorithm for the soil layer ranging from 0.05 m to 0.10 m with the soil temperature at 0.10 m depth from DOY 201 to DOY 207, 2005.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion