



# NASA Public Access

Author manuscript

*Remote Sens (Basel)*. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2021 January 26.

Published in final edited form as:

*Remote Sens (Basel)*. 2019 May 1; 11(9): . doi:10.3390/rs11091138.

## Advances in the Remote Sensing of Terrestrial Evaporation

Matthew F McCabe<sup>1,\*</sup>, Diego Miralles<sup>2</sup>, Thomas R.H. Holmes<sup>3</sup>, Joshua B Fisher<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Water Desalination and Reuse Center, Division of Biological and Environmental Sciences and Engineering, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

<sup>2</sup>Laboratory of Hydrology and Water Management, Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

<sup>3</sup>Hydrological Sciences Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

<sup>4</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109, USA

### Abstract

Characterizing the terrestrial carbon, water and energy cycles depends strongly on a capacity to accurately reproduce the spatial and temporal dynamics of land surface evaporation. For this, and many other reasons, monitoring terrestrial evaporation across multiple space and time scales has been an area of focused research for many decades. Much of this activity has been supported by developments in satellite remote sensing, which have been leveraged to deliver new process insights, model development and methodological improvements. In this Special Issue, published contributions explored a range of research topics directed towards the enhanced estimation of terrestrial evaporation. Here we summarize these cutting-edge efforts and provide an overview of some of the state-of-the-art approaches for retrieving this key variable. Some perspectives on outstanding challenges, issues, and opportunities are also presented.

### Keywords

evaporation; remote sensing; Earth observation; novel sensing; land surface modeling; land surface flux; cubesats; high-resolution

## 1. Introduction

The conceptually simple physics involved in the exchange of water between the surface and the atmosphere understate the critical role that this process plays in the complex dynamics driving the Earth's carbon, water and energy cycles. As the only variable interlinking these system-level processes, the estimation of evaporation has been a focus of sustained research for many decades [1, 2]. While early process descriptions tended to focus on local scale

Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

\*Correspondence: matthew.mccabe@kaust.edu.sa.

**Author Contributions:** All authors contributed equally to the development of this Editorial.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

estimation using available ground-based data, developments in satellite based remote sensing were exploited to produce some of the first large scale evaporation products [3–5]. In more recent times, efforts describing terrestrial exchanges have culminated in multi-decadal and multi-resolution products that combine satellite and numerical weather prediction model output to span local, regional and global scales [6–10].

While the various methodological approaches for flux estimation are relatively well developed [8, 11, 12], recent advances in Earth observation technologies [13], coupled with the exploitation of new retrieval and sensing techniques [14], provide an opportunity for further insights into the evaporative process. We are in a “golden-age” of Earth-observation [13], with a wide variety of distributed sensing approaches and techniques available for routine Earth system characterization, providing data at unprecedented spatial and temporal detail. New types of satellite observations, such as solar induced chlorophyll fluorescence (SIF) [15], together with advances in spatial and temporal resolution from CubeSats [16] or unmanned aerial vehicles [17], provide an opportunity to challenge both our process understanding and the models that we use to describe evaporative dynamics.

Indeed, a major driver of evolution in model descriptions is through confrontation with new data-sets. However, improving our process understanding and representation is not purely a function of increasing the resolution of observations. For instance, forcing inappropriate modeling constructs with finer and finer spatio-temporal observations may not necessarily deliver new or deeper process insights. It is important that community progress in advancing process understanding through new modeling approaches or improved physical descriptions, keeps pace with our capacity to observe the system. That is, model development efforts should aim to be transformational rather than iterative. Of course, a plateauing of model improvements is not necessarily problematic, especially if accurate results can be maintained when confronted by new observations. However, it would be naive to believe that the field of evaporation modeling (or observation) has reached its nadir, and that there are no further improvements to be made.

As a consequence, there remain many opportunities for advancing our description, estimation and understanding of the terrestrial evaporation process. In a recent contribution, Fisher et al. [14] provided a motivational call to the community to address some of the science and application questions related to evaporation estimation. These included improvements in the accuracy of retrievals, spatio-temporal resolution, multi-scale coverage and long-term monitoring, amongst many others. In light of such outstanding modeling and observational “challenges”, this Special Issue sought to explore some of the technological and methodological advances that take the first steps towards developing new paradigms in evaporation estimation. The collection of contributions spans the exploration of both new and existing techniques, high-resolution (in space and time) approaches, as well as fundamental improvements in modeling descriptions and frameworks. The following sections provide an overview of the twelve manuscripts that comprise this Special Issue, together with some concluding thoughts and perspectives.

## 2. Overview of Contributions

### 2.1 Innovative Techniques in Monitoring Evaporation

Several articles in this Special Issue explored the potential of innovative techniques to map terrestrial evaporation, from local to global scales. Pagan et al. [18] investigate the use of satellite observations of solar-induced chlorophyll fluorescence to diagnose transpiration using data from the Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment 2 (GOME-2) and a variety of FLUXNET eddy-covariance sites. Results demonstrate that SIF data normalized by photosynthetic active radiation (PAR) is empirically related to the ratio of transpiration to potential evaporation. Overall, SIF/PAR dynamics capture the effect of phenological changes and environmental stress on transpiration, adequately reflecting the timing of this variability, especially during the growing season. Moreover, the skill of state-of-the-art land surface models (LSMs) is contrasted against eddy-covariance data and SIF/PAR retrievals, indicating deficiencies in the way models estimate transpiration and suggesting that SIF data can be used to constrain the formulations of transpiration via data assimilation.

Another innovative technique is presented by Vanella et al. [19], who focused on the estimation of evaporation during water stress and irrigated conditions using local meteorology and Sentinel 2 vegetation data. The authors adjust a dual crop coefficient FAO-56 approach using electrical resistivity tomography (ERT) data to monitor the soil wetting distribution patterns during and after irrigation phases. More precisely, ERT is used to accurately estimate the wet exposed fraction and therefore the water evaporated from the soil surface. Results indicate that differences in evaporation estimates relative to in situ eddy-covariance measurements can be substantially reduced when using ERT. Moreover, the authors propose to empirically derive water stress factors by combining the eddy covariance data and the ERT-adjusted FAO-56 evaporation estimates.

The study by Cheng and Kustas [20] applies the two-source energy balance (TSEB) model to thermal observations taken from an aircraft at a few meters resolution. Results are compared to analogous evaporation estimates based on coarser scale (~90 m) data from the Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER), and validated against data from a series of eddy covariance towers. The evaporation data using aircraft observations shows satisfactory patterns and a higher accuracy than the ASTER-based estimates when both are compared against flux tower measurements. In particular, the authors show that the high-resolution aircraft driven evaporation product is more suitable for heterogeneous terrains covering urban, agriculture, and natural vegetation, and suggest that TSEB can be used to accurately monitor the impact of urbanization on the surface energy balance using high resolution thermal observations.

### 2.2 XXX

Cheng and Kustas [20] is a clear example of the transition towards higher resolutions in evaporation remote sensing research that has been highlighted in this special issue. In another study...

**High Resolution Remote Sensing-CubeSats/GLEAM/Thermal Revisit**—Guillevic et al. (2019) [21] Impact of revisit time on ET and uncertainty

One of the critical outstanding questions in satellite remote sensing of ET is: what temporal resolution is required? There are trade-offs between temporal resolution, spatial resolution, and coverage from an engineering standpoint. Are the trade-offs linear, or are there inflection points whereby optimal compromises can be made? Guillevic et al. (2019) investigated this question in depth using *in situ* eddy covariance measurements from AmeriFlux sites. The authors evaluated the uncertainty in monthly averaged ET by removing data from the hourly/daily measurements. They found non-linearities where an optimal compromise was a 4-day revisit scenario, which provided a significant improvement in ET estimation. The 4-day scenario reduced uncertainty in ET by 40% relative to a 16-day revisit (e.g., Landsat). Moreover, they found that any return period greater than 8-days was severely detrimental to ET estimation. Interestingly, they found no significant biases based on time of day—morning or afternoon. Finally, the authors clearly point out that these estimates vary quite a lot depending on land cover type or climate zone, so their numbers should be taken contextually to the objective of the reader.

Aragon et al. (2019) [22] CubeSats

Martens et al. (GLEAM) [23]

Anderson et al. (2019) [24] demonstrates the application of a multi-scale energy balance algorithm to provide a region-specific analysis of consumptive water use associated with land use changes in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region in California. The fusion approach combines ET map timeseries based on thermal observations with high spatial but low temporal resolution and with moderate resolution but frequent temporal coverage. The methodology provides an effective tool for policymakers and farmers to understand how land use conversion could impact consumptive use and demand.

### 2.3 XXX

**Modeling/Remote Sensing/ML**—Spectral Mixture Analysis (SMA) is applied by Sousa and Small (2019) [25] in a study of Landsat 8 spectral scenes over the Sacramento Valley. In this analysis they relate the radiometric surface temperature to subpixel fractions of substrate, vegetation, and dark spectral endmembers. Their proposed approach provides a physically-based conceptual framework for mapping ET that unifies two widely-used approaches by simultaneously mapping the effects of albedo and vegetation abundance on the surface temperature field. The SMA fractions are relatively insensitive to sensor spatial resolution, unlike spectral indices that currently often represent vegetation abundance in ET estimation. Because SMA uses the full reflectance spectrum it could also be integrated with planned global hyperspectral imagers.

Poon and Kinoshita (2019) [26] Remote sensing and ML

Talsma et al. (2019) [27] Sensitivity of model components

We often think of ET in terms of total ET, but it is in fact comprised of multiple sources including canopy transpiration, soil evaporation, and interception evaporation. All sources are differentially impacted by and sensitive to changes in climate and CO<sub>2</sub>. Global satellite remote sensing ET retrievals have now advanced to delineate those ET sources. Yet, no study had as yet evaluated the sensitivities of those models—PT-JPL, GLEAM, and PM-MOD—to the components until Talsma et al., (2018). The authors revealed that while each model was quite sensitive to each of the ET sources, and, naturally, different among models, that sensitivity dissipated when aggregated back up to total ET. Internally, each model had managed to balance an over-reliance on one component with an under-reliance on another component. Talsma et al. conclude that the total ET estimates, especially among PT-JPL and GLEAM, were very accurate even though the models disagreed on the contribution to total ET by the respective sources.

Moyano et al. (2019) [28] VWU in a thermal model (PT-JPL)

Multiple papers in this Special Issue noted the advancements and high accuracy of ET remote sensing algorithms, particularly for sensitive ecosystems. Arguably nowhere are water resources more constrained than in dryland systems, where people and natural ecosystems compete for limited water availability. It is these regions where accurate ET estimation may be of utmost importance to determine water use and management among sectors. Moyano et al. (2019) apply the PT-JPL ET model with dryland thermal modifications to a critical region: the World Heritage UNESCO Doñana region of Spain. They demonstrated that the remote sensing retrieval captured *in situ* measurements, giving confidence that they can use this approach for management of these critical systems.

Kumar et al. (2019) [29] investigated the level of agreement in flux partitioning among outputs from a suite of land surface models in the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS) configuration. The authors quantify the contributions of two key factors explaining inter-model disagreements to the uncertainty in total domain-wide ET: (1) contribution of the local partitioning and (2) regional distribution of ET. The results indicate that while the uncertainty in local partitioning dominates the inter-model spread in modeled soil evaporation E<sub>s</sub>, the inter-model differences in T are dominated by the uncertainty in the distribution of ET over the Eastern U.S. and the local partitioning uncertainty in the Western U.S.

### 3. Concluding Thoughts and Perspectives

The monitoring and measurement of terrestrial evaporation remains a topic of considerable relevance to multi-disciplinary studies in hydrology, meteorology and ecology, as well as the agricultural and plant sciences (to name just a few). As such, it has been an area of active investigation for decades: driven in large part by the many challenging research questions that remain unanswered. These include fundamental questions on the influence and impacts that climate changes will have on our coupled water, energy and food systems; the relationship between evaporation and land-atmosphere feedbacks, extremes and other climate feedbacks [30]; to more applied aspects such as the effective management and

optimization of our water resource systems (see Fisher et al. [14] for further discussion on some of these outstanding research questions).

Developments in our capacity to observe the Earth system and its dynamics provide an opportunity for further insights and improved descriptions of the terrestrial evaporative process. In recent times, the Sentinel platforms [31] have provided a needed upgrade to the series of NASA satellites that have been the backbone of Earth observation research for the last decade and more. In parallel, emerging satellite platforms [13] and technologies such as CubeSats [16] and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) [17], are delivering unprecedented spatio-temporal capabilities, and facilitating novel sensor-fusion approaches relevant to enhancing evaporation [32]. Others platforms such as the ECOSTRESS sensor [33], provide a source for monitoring diurnal temperature patterns at high-resolutions, offering important insights into plant response and behavior.

To a certain degree, the theoretical constructs upon which the majority of our evaporation models are based have remained largely unchanged since the middle of the last century. As a consequence, one may start to question whether foundational concepts (for example, Penman's "big-leaf assumption") remain relevant in the face of observational improvements (i.e. if the capacity to observe individual leaves is routinely available). Of course, advances will not be driven solely by just increasing spatial and temporal resolutions. Certainly, one of the most important aspects required to advance the development of evaporation models is our representation of the vegetation components inherent in the partitioning between evaporation and transpiration: an aspect that will benefit not only from resolution improvements, but also new retrieval approaches [28, 29, 34]. Given the array of existing sensing systems that span the visible, near-infrared, thermal and microwave spectral ranges, efforts to utilize the varied information to better characterize land surface influences (e.g. plant form and function) are likely to provide further knowledge gains [35–37]. Likewise, new sensing approaches such as SIF [18] as well as other enhanced metrics of vegetation function and condition [32] are providing supplementary sources of data to better inform key process elements [38].

The idea of new observations spurring development and advances in physical representations is not new, but it is one that is increasingly relevant in evaporation studies. Observational improvements and model developments provide parallel (yet overlapping) pathways towards advancing our knowledge and understanding of the evaporation response, with many excellent examples comprising this Special Issue. Another aspect that is likely to become increasingly important is the use of data-driven approaches, exemplified through the adoption of artificial intelligence and machine learning techniques [39, 40]. Regardless of the path taken, it is clear that efforts towards advancing the understanding, description and interactions of terrestrial evaporation present numerous challenges and opportunities. Given the central role that this important topic plays in multi-disciplinary investigations, there is clear potential to undertake novel, innovative and impactful research towards addressing these outstanding problems.

## Acknowledgments:

The Guest Editors would like to thank all of the authors who contributed their research to this Special Issue, and also the many reviewers who provided valuable feedback on all of the submitted manuscripts.

**Funding:** MFM was supported by the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology. JBF contributed to this work at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, California Institute of Technology. Government sponsorship acknowledged. JBF was supported in part by NASA programs: SUSMAP, INCA, IDS, and ECOSTRESS. Copyright 2019. All rights reserved.

## References

1. Kalma JD, McVicar TR, and McCabe MF, Estimating land surface evaporation: A review of methods using remotely sensed surface temperature data. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 2008 29(4–5): p. 421–469.
2. Wang K. and Dickinson RE, A review of global terrestrial evapotranspiration: Observation, modeling, climatology, and climatic variability. *Rev. Geophys.*, 2012 50(2): p. RG2005.
3. Moran MS, Jackson RD, Raymond LH, Gay LW, and Slater PN, Mapping surface energy balance components by combining Landsat Thematic Mapper and ground-based meteorological data. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 1989 30: p. 77–87.
4. Kustas WP, Jackson RD, and Asrar G, Estimating Surface Energy Balance from Remotely Sensed Data, in *Theory and Applications of Optical Remote Sensing*, Asrar G, Editor. 1989, John Wiley and Sons: New York p. pp. 605–626.
5. Brutsaert W. and Sugita M, Regional surface fluxes from satellite-derived surface temperatures (AVHRR) and radiosonde profiles. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 1992 58(4): p. 355–366.
6. McCabe MF, Ershadi A, Jimenez C, Miralles DG, Michel D, and Wood EF, The GEWEX LandFlux project: evaluation of model evaporation using tower-based and globally gridded forcing data. *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 2016 9(1): p. 283–305.
7. Jiménez C, Prigent C, Mueller B, Seneviratne SI, McCabe MF, Wood EF, Rossow WB, Balsamo G, Betts AK, Dirmeyer PA, Fisher JB, Jung M, Kanamitsu M, Reichle RH, Reichstein M, Rodell M, Sheffield J, Tu K, and Wang K, Global intercomparison of 12 land surface heat flux estimates. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2011 116(D2): p. D02102.
8. Fisher JB, Tu KP, and Baldocchi DD, Global estimates of the land-atmosphere water flux based on monthly AVHRR and ISLSCP-II data, validated at 16 FLUXNET sites. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2008 112(3): p. 901–919.
9. Miralles DG, Jiménez C, Jung M, Michel D, Ershadi A, McCabe MF, Hirschi M, Martens B, Dolman AJ, Fisher JB, Mu Q, Seneviratne SI, Wood EF, and Fernández-Prieto D, The WACMOSET project – Part 2: Evaluation of global terrestrial evaporation data sets. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2016 20(2): p. 823–842.
10. Miralles DG, De Jeu RAM, Gash JH, Holmes TRH, and Dolman AJ, Magnitude and variability of land evaporation and its components at the global scale. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2011 15(3): p. 967–981.
11. Ershadi A, McCabe MF, Evans JP, Chaney NW, and Wood EF, Multi-site evaluation of terrestrial evaporation models using FLUXNET data. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 2014 187: p. 46–61.
12. Anderson MC, Kustas WP, Norman JM, Hain CR, Mecikalski JR, Schultz L, Gonzalez-Dugo MP, Cammalleri C, d’Urso G, Pimstein A, and Gao F, Mapping daily evapotranspiration at field to continental scales using geostationary and polar orbiting satellite imagery. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2011 15(1): p. 223–239.
13. McCabe MF, Rodell M, Alsdorf DE, Miralles DG, Uijlenhoet R, Wagner W, Lucieer A, Houborg R, Verhoest NEC, Franz TE, Shi J, Gao H, and Wood EF, The future of Earth observation in hydrology. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 2017 21: p. 3879–3914. [PubMed: 30233123]
14. Fisher JB, Melton F, Middleton E, Hain C, Anderson M, Allen R, McCabe MF, Hook S, Baldocchi D, Townsend PA, Kilic A, Tu K, Miralles DD, Perret J, Lagouarde J-P, Waliser D, Purdy AJ,

- French A, Schimel D, Famiglietti JS, Stephens G, and Wood EF, The future of evapotranspiration: Global requirements for ecosystem functioning, carbon and climate feedbacks, agricultural management, and water resources. *Water Resources Research*, 2017 53(4): p. 2618–2626.
15. Frankenberg C, Fisher JB, Worden J, Badgley G, Saatchi SS, Lee J-E, Toon GC, Butz A, Jung M, Kuze A, and Yokota T, New global observations of the terrestrial carbon cycle from GOSAT: Patterns of plant fluorescence with gross primary productivity. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 2011 38(17): p. n/a-n/a.
  16. McCabe MF, Aragon B, Houborg R, and Mascaro J, CubeSats in Hydrology: Ultra-High Resolution Insights into Vegetation Dynamics and Terrestrial Evaporation. *Water Resources Research*, 2017: p. n/a-n/a.
  17. Manfreda S, McCabe M, Miller P, Lucas R, Pajuelo Madrigal V, Mallinis G, Ben Dor E, Helman D, Estes L, Ciraolo G, Müllerová J, Tauro F, de Lima M, de Lima J, Maltese A, Frances F, Caylor K, Kohv M, Perks M, Ruiz-Pérez G, Su Z, Vico G, and Toth B, On the Use of Unmanned Aerial Systems for Environmental Monitoring. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(4): p. 641.
  18. Pagán BR, Maes WH, Gentine P, Martens B, and Miralles DG, Exploring the Potential of Satellite Solar-Induced Fluorescence to Constrain Global Transpiration Estimates. *Remote Sensing*, 2019 11(4): p. 413.
  19. Vanella D, Ramírez-Cuesta JM, Intrigliolo DS, and Consoli S, Combining Electrical Resistivity Tomography and Satellite Images for Improving Evapotranspiration Estimates of Citrus Orchards. *Remote Sensing*, 2019 11(4): p. 373.
  20. Cheng J. and Kustas WP, Using Very High Resolution Thermal Infrared Imagery for More Accurate Determination of the Impact of Land Cover Differences on Evapotranspiration in an Irrigated Agricultural Area. *Remote Sensing*, 2019 11(6): p. 613.
  21. Guillevic PC, Olioso A, Hook SJ, Fisher JB, Lagouarde J-P, and Vermote EF, Impact of the Revisit of Thermal Infrared Remote Sensing Observations on Evapotranspiration Uncertainty—A Sensitivity Study Using AmeriFlux Data. *Remote Sensing*, 2019 11(5): p. 573.
  22. Aragon B, Houborg R, Tu K, Fisher JB, and McCabe M, CubeSats Enable High Spatiotemporal Retrievals of Crop-Water Use for Precision Agriculture. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(12): p. 1867.
  23. Martens B, De Jeu RAM, Verhoest NEC, Schuurmans H, Kleijer J, and Miralles DG, Towards Estimating Land Evaporation at Field Scales Using GLEAM. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(11): p. 1720.
  24. Anderson M, Gao F, Knipper K, Hain C, Dulaney W, Baldocchi D, Eichelmann E, Hemes K, Yang Y, Medellin-Azuara J, and Kustas W, Field-Scale Assessment of Land and Water Use Change over the California Delta Using Remote Sensing. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(6): p. 889.
  25. Sousa D. and Small C, Spectral Mixture Analysis as a Unified Framework for the Remote Sensing of Evapotranspiration. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(12): p. 1961.
  26. Poon PK and Kinoshita AM, Estimating Evapotranspiration in a Post-Fire Environment Using Remote Sensing and Machine Learning. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(11): p. 1728.
  27. Talsma CJ, Good SP, Miralles DG, Fisher JB, Martens B, Jimenez C, and Purdy AJ, Sensitivity of Evapotranspiration Components in Remote Sensing-Based Models. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(10): p. 1601.
  28. Moyano MC, Garcia M, Palacios-Orueta A, Tornos L, Fisher JB, Fernández N, Recuero L, and Juana L, Vegetation Water Use Based on a Thermal and Optical Remote Sensing Model in the Mediterranean Region of Doñana. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(7): p. 1105.
  29. Kumar S, Holmes T, Mocko DM, Wang S, and Peters-Lidard C, Attribution of Flux Partitioning Variations between Land Surface Models over the Continental U.S. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(5): p. 751.
  30. Miralles DG, van den Berg MJ, Gash JH, Parinussa RM, de Jeu RAM, Beck HE, Holmes TRH, Jiménez C, Verhoest NEC, Dorigo WA, Teuling AJ, and Johannes Dolman A, El Niño–La Niña cycle and recent trends in continental evaporation. *Nature Clim. Change*, 2014 4(2): p. 122–126.
  31. Malenovsky Z, Rott H, Cihlar J, Schaepman ME, García-Santos G, Fernandes R, and Berger M, Sentinels for science: Potential of Sentinel-1, -2, and -3 missions for scientific observations of ocean, cryosphere, and land. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2012 120: p. 91–101.



32. Houborg R. and McCabe MF, Daily Retrieval of NDVI and LAI at 3 m Resolution via the Fusion of CubeSat, Landsat, and MODIS Data. *Remote Sensing*, 2018 10(6): p. 890.
33. Hulley G, Hook S, Fisher J, and Lee C. ECOSTRESS, A NASA Earth-Ventures Instrument for studying links between the water cycle and plant health over the diurnal cycle. in *International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS) 2017*.
34. Talsma CJ, Good SP, Jimenez C, Martens B, Fisher JB, Miralles DG, McCabe MF, and Purdy AJ, Partitioning of evapotranspiration in remote sensing-based models. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 2018 260–261: p. 131–143.
35. Guan K, Wu J, Kimball JS, Anderson MC, Froelking S, Li B, Hain CR, and Lobell DB, The shared and unique values of optical, fluorescence, thermal and microwave satellite data for estimating large-scale crop yields. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2017 199: p. 333–349.
36. Purdy AJ, Fisher JB, Goulden ML, Colliander A, Halverson G, Tu K, and Famiglietti JS, SMAP soil moisture improves global evapotranspiration. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2018 219: p. 1–14.
37. Holmes TRH, Hain CR, Crow WT, Anderson MC, and Kustas WP, Microwave implementation of two-source energy balance approach for estimating evapotranspiration. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci*, 2018 22(2): p. 1351–1369. [PubMed: 30449998]
38. Qiu B, Xue Y, Fisher JB, Guo W, Berry JA, and Zhang Y, Satellite Chlorophyll Fluorescence and Soil Moisture Observations Lead to Advances in the Predictive Understanding of Global Terrestrial Coupled Carbon-Water Cycles. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 2018 32(3): p. 360–375.
39. Alemohammad SH, Fang B, Konings AG, Aires F, Green JK, Kolassa J, Miralles D, Prigent C, and Gentile P, Water, Energy, and Carbon with Artificial Neural Networks (WECANN): a statistically based estimate of global surface turbulent fluxes and gross primary productivity using solar-induced fluorescence. *Biogeosciences*, 2017 14(18): p. 4101–4124. [PubMed: 29290755]
40. Shen C, Laloy E, Elshorbagy A, Albert A, Bales J, Chang FJ, Ganguly S, Hsu KL, Kifer D, Fang Z, Fang K, Li D, Li X, and Tsai WP, HESS Opinions: Incubating deep-learning-powered hydrologic science advances as a community. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci*, 2018 22(11): p. 5639–5656.